

---

HYDERABAD – ccNSO Council Preparatory Meeting  
Friday, November 04, 2016 – 12:15 to 13:45 IST  
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: ccNSO Council Preparatory Meeting starting at 12:15 p.m.

KATRINA SATAKI: Dear colleagues, I hope you've had your first bites from your lunches. Welcome, everyone. I'm glad to see so many of you here in this city and this venue which does not allow bottles being brought in. I'm very, very, very angry because I had to deal with security.

Our Board members will join us a little bit later. They finish at half past 12 so Kristy and Michael will be joining us and Becky too. So we will defer our second agenda item to when they are here.

Let's move to agenda item #3 for our Prep Meeting. It's about the CCWG and Internet Governance. As you may remember, we're one of the chartering organizations just as the GNSO. And the GNSO has recently tried to discuss this issue with us over several meetings. Unfortunately, we didn't have time but the idea is that they believe that the working group does not work, something is

---

*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.*

---

definitely wrong with the setup and they want to end their role as the chartering organization.

Actually, from our perspective, we haven't seen much activity from this working group either apart from the recent e-mail from Olivier forwarded to the Council. It was around ITU and there are actually few African countries submitting a request to the ITU to deal with the country and territory names as level domains basically.

So here, actually, we have observed a very strange fusion of several processes that we're dealing with. One is this working group. Another is use of country and territory names as top-level domains.

I know that Young Eum is one of our co-Chairs here on this working group so could you maybe elaborate a little bit more. Is this working group active? Maybe it's really time to close the working group and re-launch the effort under some different umbrella or something. Any comment from you will be appreciated.

YOUNG EUM LEE:

One of the reasons why that working group seems to be not doing anything is because most of the things that that group is

---

involved in does not have anything to do with what's happening in ICANN.

I think there has been enough activity in that group but the activity is mostly focused on how the ICANN community should be responding to other external events, and so that group has been involved in issues such as the WTSA and recently the ITU sessions in 2014.

That group is not attempting to become a representative of ICANN. What it has been involved in is actually cooperating with the ICANN staff. When things like the WTSA happens, members relatively actively participate and try to contribute to helping the ICANN staff members, how to respond to those issues.

The recent letter was one of it and so that's why it seems that that group is not doing anything but actually I would think that—I don't know if charting the status of a working group and this chartering organization status is the correct setup because it's not a working group in the normal sense that we think of working groups.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you Young Eum. Bart?

---

BART BOSWINKEL:

Maybe just for clarification, the reason why it was chartered was I think when it was kicked off, that was in the context of NETmundial and in preparation of the NETmundial it's the initiative of FADI at the time.

In preparation of the NETmundial, it issued a statement claiming to represent the SOs and ACs although people were on it. And there was never a feedback loop into the supporting organization, it was envisioned as Cross-Community Working Group.

At the time particular decisions of Council required either a charter or would retract from that group so then we started building then it was a chartered organization and ALAC, GNSO season is on, I believe.

I don't know if the GAC is one of the chartering organizations but at least these three are chartering organizations. That's why you've got the three co-Chairs as well.

So that's a little bit on the background. Whether it's a good vehicle, I don't know.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: My understanding is that you Young Eum also believe that perhaps this working group is not the right vehicle and probably shutting it down—

YOUNG EUM LEE: I don't know about shutting it down because I think that really, in certain cases they have, the group has been helpful, I would say, actually mostly to the ICANN staff, especially Nigel. He's a person that participates in the UN and ITUN, these external sorts of meetings. So I don't know if it's a good idea to close it down but the current setup is not the normal sort of working group setup that we think of.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. Now what should we do? If GNSO withdraws from this Cross-Community Working Group, and they will do that apparently, there will be not much of cross-community thing in that working group.

Maybe we should have it as a standing committee or something from the ccNSO perspective because you can have, of course, maybe two committees as chartering organizations but maybe that's not the best setup either.

---

**BART BOSWINKEL:** Young Eum, do know how many ccTLD managers or people from the CC community are actively involved in the group? I'm subscribed to that list and it's mostly participants from the GNSO and ALAC. I sometimes see you, I sometimes see [inaudible], but that's it. So it's very, very limited participation from the CC community.

**YOUNG EUM LEE:** Limited but recently—occasionally Becky participates and contributes, but then I would say it's mostly not even the GNSO, I would say it's mostly the ALAC.

**BART BOSWINKEL:** Just an observation that while this group certainly had an important role when it was initially formed, I think we could argue that perhaps that was for a time from a previous error now in the construct of all the Internet Governance work that was happening at that time. NETmundial, the uncertainty around the transition from the USG and all of the activities that would happen during that time warranted a working group like that.

Given that we are in a post transition world, the issues of Wicket, NETmundial, IANA Transition, are all to a lesser degree behind us. Perhaps that working group has outlived the intent, its original intent.

---

And like we have wound down or are winding down the [I-star] Group, maybe it's time to do the same, throw that out there for consideration for this working group.

YOUNG EUM LEE:

I wouldn't disagree with that but that group has actually been kind of changing in the role that it has been taking on, and I think that although the transition issue is all behind us, there are still some issues being raised or attempting to be raised within the UN and the ITU Community and that's something that I think the ICANN community should not overlook.

If we decide to do that and retract the chartership, we should still try to have some kind of an arrangement to help us be made aware of issues when they arise.

I don't have any specific concrete suggestions as to how to do it but some of the issues that the group has been discussing and raising are issues that people still need to be aware of.

For example, last year the working group on in-house corporation, which we thought was closed, I think, in 2013 or 2014 got restarted and so they haven't done much but there are still efforts going on.

So we should still try to be aware, not all the time because it doesn't have a lot to do with what's happening in ICANN, but

---

should something come up and become a stronger force like what was happening in Wicket, that's something that we should still look out for. That's what I'm saying.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Young Eum. To sum it up a little bit, probably GNSO is going to withdraw from this Cross-Community Working Group, and probably Cross-Community Working Group is not the best vehicle to address the issues.

But there are issues and we have to keep an eye on those issues, so the question is how to do that and how to ensure that we do not overlook some very crucial thing going on somewhere else.

Later today and later in this meeting, we will have discussions tonight with ALAC and with GNSO.

BART BOSWINKEL: Tomorrow.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, tomorrow afternoon. This is something that we need to discuss with these communities as well and later on Monday when we have Council meeting we can maybe decide on what our next steps are, at least some clarity about our next steps.



---

Unfortunately, the Board is still discussing actively so we're still waiting for our Board members to join us. Therefore, let's move to the next agenda item, preliminary discussion on the current status of another Cross-Community Working Group on the use of country and territory names.

Annebeth, our co-Chair of this working group is here with us. To give a brief summary, the group cannot come up with a joint or consensus decision and probably Annebeth would like to brief us a little bit more but most probably we'll need to close the working group and look for other ways to address these issues. Annebeth? Just join us at the table.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Hello, everybody. I will give a presentation on Sunday morning for the whole ccNSO, but the resume of our work is actually that on two-letter strings, we have arrived to, I would say, consensus that we continue to reserve all the two-letter strings. Not only ISO but also the two letters not in the ISO list by now because it's not IANA or ICANN on our task or mandate to decide what will be countries in the future and it would be quite bad if a new country is there and there are no two-letter codes for them left.

But three-letter codes, that was next on our agenda. We have worked with that for over one year and it's impossible to get a common consensus on what to do with them. And we are very

---

far apart on the right side, open everything, no restrictions, no conditions, and on the other side keep it as it is today in the Applicant Guidebook and that is that they are reserved, those who are on the ISO list. All other three-letter combinations, and there are about 17,000 combinations to choose from, they will be out there. But still it's a lot of people, especially in the GNSO that wants to open up also those in the ISO list.

So that's how it stands today. This discussion has shown that it's very, very difficult in the Cross-Community Working Group. Also referring to what we just said, to come to a common understanding on what we should do in the future so to arrive at a common framework where we all can agree on these country and territory names seems like a very difficult task.

So in this meeting we will deliver a preliminary report or a progress report on how we are now and a draft interim report. The result can easily be that everything will be transferred to a PDP and the GNSO of course feels that this should be in the subsequent rounds PDP that they are discussing now.

A lot of voices there say that they are waiting for input to this but we are following the charter and our mandate was to see if we could arrive at a common framework and we haven't arrived there. We could continue to discuss but I don't think we will achieve that anyway.

---

So in your position you have to think, “Is this a good place to give everything to GNSO or should we do something ourselves?” Thank you. Questions? Bart knows just as much as I so come on.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Maybe one additional comment or remark from the [CCWO], especially from the ccNSO or ccTLD managers’ perspective. If you go back to the study group report, it had two recommendations effectively. One was the creation of this Cross-Community Working Group and the second recommendation was to send a letter to the ICANN Board on the exclusion of country and territory names in the subsequent rounds of new gTLD applications.

Now, the question probably at some point in the near future will be for the Council, whether they want to send such a letter to the ICANN Board. And it may be a suggestion to have that discussion with the GAC as well on Monday if you know where they are at the geographic names and their interest as well, because at the time they were excluded as a joint effort by the ccNSO and GAC.

So that’s the real underlying issue and that’s the real concern of some of the ccTLD members on the group that because of if you put everything in the basket of the PDP on subsequent rounds, at the end the GNSO will determine how country and territory names will be used as TLDs.

---

ANNEBETH LANGE:

One more comment from me here that I agree we have to decide or you have to decide if we should send that letter and that will result in the text in the Applicant Guidebook from 2012 remaining until if in the future we can find a way that we agree on.

I know that in the GAC camp it's also different views but none of them are opening up completely. It's either don't use them at all like we have in the Applicant Guidebook today, or the protection that's for the capitals and other elements in the geographical names that is there in chapter 2 today in the module 2 today, that they need some kind of support non-objection from the relevant public authority in the relevant country.

So some countries want to take it and use it for public purposes so they want that solution but not to open up completely. That's how it stands today. So I agree we have to talk to GAC about it and, in my personal opinion, I think it's wrong to give this to the GNSO completely.

I attended the GNSO meeting yesterday about subsequent rounds and it was an interesting discussion about what is generic. Is it generic any more, the g in the gTLD? And it's not and that has been for a long time because these brands are not generic, geographical nominations are not generic, so it was a

---

suggestion to call the g for a global TLD since there are not generic TLDs so we'll see what turns up in the discussion. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO: First of all, I totally agree that we cannot leave this as being a PDP for GNSO only. It's a crazy thing of course that the country codes and territory names are related to the CCs and it will be a very bad idea to leave this just for one constituency.

Another point of warning, in my opinion, is that we have to be very careful about the reinterpretation of g. I think g has to remain as generic because if you begin the taxonomy of categories and maybe community TLDs and maybe other things, we are also a kind of community TLD then this can be a way to in some way dissolve our constituency and I think it is a very, very bad and very not viable idea.

Just to be very short, I think we cannot leave this issue just to be a part of the PDP of the GNSO. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Ching.

---

CHING CHIAO: While I actually agree with what Demi just pointed out, I also want to—and I think people here in the room must have better knowledge than I do—is are we really making a good fire on the two-letter term, meaning that if, let’s say, a big corporation like HP or Louis Vuitton, they are driving their GAC representative to push the two-letter into a generic space.

Do we know GAC is firmly standing by the best practices in the next few years while they’re thinking about opening up the three four or even more letters for the country territory names? Just my two cents.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Let me assure you that Louis Vuitton will never get there. Peter, please.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you, Katrina. First of all, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Annebeth for her hard work the last year, year and a half. You have been in a very uneasy spot to deal with this because, as you said, there are very diverse positions toward this topic.

---

On the one hand we have the GNSO folks that clearly almost unanimously want to liberate all things and say, “Just allow everything to be accessible as a TLD.” And then of course you have strong counterbalance from GAC and CC somewhere in the middle. It hasn’t been an easy task to do so I fully appreciate what you have been doing over the last couple of months.

I have two practical questions. The first is about the agenda of the Cross-Community Working Group. We have debated on the two-letters and three three-letters. If I’m not mistaken, there was something about country names in itself as well, so my suggestion would be given that there is no progress anymore or no common position on the three letters, that it might be wise to put that aside for the time being and try to proceed with the work but then focus on the topic or the subtopic of country names. Maybe there can be some consensus or at least some progress in that area so I think that we should grasp the opportunity at least to explore that route.

The second thing is suppose that it all ends up in a PDP on the GNSO side, what are all possibilities to tap into that? Is there some kind within the structure of ICANN and within the framework?

I cannot imagine that even a PDP process within the GNSO would allow them full rights to make decisions on each and

---

every item. Is there some way, a guarantee where the other ACs and SOs can have a blocking right? Because if we do so, maybe deferring the three-letters discussion to the PDP within the GNSO is not so bad after all if they really go down the road saying, “We are unanimous and we are advisors just to allow everything.” If it can be blocked, we really have serious concerns. We can do it at that time. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

I think as for the policy aspect, Bart knows more about that than I do but what I do now is to try to be into the work tracks that the GNSO have now. They have four work tracks for these subsequent g procedures and two of them are really relevant for us.

It’s the legal and policy about the rotor of names they’re taking up again. The result of the Reserved Names Working Group from 2011 or something like that and also the legal aspects.

But what I heard yesterday was that a lot of them said that the Applicant Guidebook 2012 is default as long as we’re not finding consensus on otherwise, but then the question is what is consensus? Is it their consensus or is it consensus for the whole community?



---

And what we saw on the last round was that they gave one Applicant Guidebook with no protection of country and territory names at all, the first [inaudible].

We have been working for years to attain what we have today and I think that it was a good result to get this on the Board on the last Applicant Guidebook so we could think through and work subtly to find a common understanding.

But then GAC went in very heavily and we had seven versions of the Applicant Guidebook before we ended up with what we have today. So the GNSO also are interested in getting things done so if it's a lot of resistance, that will slow the procedures and the process so the best thing we could do is try to take the simple things first that are not controversial and leave the controversial things like the country and territory names.

And for your question, Peter, I must say that I think that if three-letter codes were difficult, the long and short names of countries will be even worse because then we have the meaningful understanding of what is—it's much more difficult then. You have to interpret the name, you have the audience and all the letters, those with audience and only ASCII and it will be even worse. But we will see. Thank you.

---

**BART BOSWINKEL:** May I add something? Going back to your first question about the potential powers of other SOs and ACs with respect to a PDP, probably not because if you would look at the ccNSO's PDP, there is no blocking power either from another SOAC so other SO/ACs may participate in it on equal footing but they will not have a blocking power like the ccTLD and you wouldn't allow it either.

So that's vice versa. You can't ask them from one end to the other. Maybe it's something to raise at the meeting tomorrow afternoon because this item is on the agenda. Because this is a major concern I know from the co-Chairs, from the GNSO as well, so again this is one of the topics that is on the agenda for tomorrow afternoon's meeting and you've raised it for the Board meeting as well to take the next steps. So it's on the Board ccNSO meeting as well on Monday morning.

That's one and I think you're right about it, from where I sit, when you talk about the full and short names of country and territories. That's going to create even more confusion, havoc, whatever you want to call it. So that was one of the reasons why at this stage the co-Chairs for various reasons, and that's documented in the progress report for various reasons.

The first one is non feasibility but the second one is there are various initiatives going on right now in the community. You

---

were moderating the session in Helsinki where you saw all these sessions coming up so like the GAC Working Group, that mandate is unclear. You see what's going on in the outside world, what—going back to what you just discussed around the Internet Governance—the ITU is trying to fish in this pond as well.

So there are a lot of initiatives going on and having it consolidated, that was a concern as well. Having a consolidated effort dealing with geographic names was again one of the issues or that's one of the things, especially on the GNSO side that was very important.

They didn't want to deal with on the one hand side a group just with country and territory names and at the same time dealing with another group who is just doing its secluded work in geographic names and namely the GAC Working Group. That was a second reason for closing this one down.

And the third one goes back to your original question, if there is output from this working group, how does it feed into PDPs because that's not clear either. If it's taken on board as the ultimate outcome and then it will be voted upon, nobody knows. That was not dealt with in the charter so what will happen with the result of this working group even if they would have achieved a harmonized framework.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO: This is very short. I have a question on this. I understand this beginning as a cross-community group but then I don't know why one of the communities that have particular interest in this can call this a PDP. I think if some constituency has the right to do a PDP on that, it would be the CCs because these are country codes and territory names. So related to our role here as a bad analogy, we have to have at least the first refusal right.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. [Barrack].

[BARRACK OTIENO]: Thank you. Just to pick up on some of the comments that have been made and also just share an observation around the whole DOA discussion, Digital Object Architecture, that is going on in the ITU, I think we need to engage with the GAC to clarify a few issues.

I just saw two weeks ago our Cabinet Secretary share on a list that he thinks DOA is cool. As it is in our region, most of the ccTLDs are basically being run by regulators. So with this kind of

---

confusion, I don't know what we're staring at because ITU seems to be making a lot of inroads with the whole DOA subject.

I heard that the GAC team plans to do something next year in Africa with the GAC representatives and the sooner we clarify this subject, the better because it affects ccTLDs in a big way.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, [Barrack]. Actually, our options look very gloomy. Either it's a GNSO PDP or it's some process within ITU. It's very difficult to choose. Okay, we'll have to discuss it with GAC, with ALAC, apparently with the GNSO as well and the Board.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Just one comment to Demi as well. I agree that that is following up on the thing that we started with. We have so many different GTLDs.

We have the brands, we have the geographical things, and we have the more ordinary like .shop, .music, .sport, which are the truly generic.

And that's the problem because we feel ownership to everything that originates from the ISO list. Even if we have the two-letter codes it's also a kind of identifier for—even the three-letters are identifiers for other country so we feel closely connected to it

---

and we don't want the confusion. There are a lot of things that we want to take care of.

So we have different perceptions because the trade owners want it and it's a lot of people wanting it so it's a difficult issue and I agree our options are gloomy at the moment so we have to try to find companions to support us.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much and I hope that you, Annebeth, and Peter will raise this issue with the Board and other communities that we're going to meet.

I just spotted a mosquito flying to that spot of the room so if you see one, please kill the blood-sucker because it can have everything, basically, starting from malaria, ending with Zika and everything. Yes, that's unfortunately true and it looked particularly big. Not as big as that but still rather big.

The Boards are still working. No problem with that because we still have a few more items on our agenda.

About topics, as you remember, we have agreed not to assign counselors to the topic because we're not very active reporters back. Yes, Bart.

---

**BART BOSWINKEL:** The reason this is assigning topics in the joint meetings. That was the intention. It is not about attending meetings and then reporting back, this is really assigning tasks for people to present at meetings.

**KATRINA SATAKI:** Yes. So, just as I was saying, we decided not to send people and ask them to report back but we still have a list of things, these joint meetings where we need people to raise issues and to start discussions.

The first will be the meeting tonight with ALAC. Maybe let's move to the next meeting with ccNSO, GNSO Council meeting which is tomorrow lunch time. We will cover CWG principles and Becky will do that. Then, as we agreed on the use of country and territory names as TLDs, we'll have Heather from the GNSO side and Annebeth from our side.

CWG and Internet Governance: As you remember, they're going to step out from this Cross-Community Working Group. We have to talk to them about how do they see these issues addressed in the future.

And on this CCWG and new gTLD auction proceeds, as you remember, it was a recent vote and we decided to change our decision from March this year and so we changed our mind and

---

decided to participate in this working group. So something also to discuss with the GNSO as they are the most active in this working group.

Then other hot topics, the future scheduling of the ICANN meetings. I must tell you that there's a lot of discussions going on around the organization of ICANN meetings. And I'm really thankful to Alejandra who keeps an eye on all those discussions, high interest topics and other things. But SO/ACs are not as lucky to have Alejandra. She cannot serve them all. But they are really frustrated. Well, we are frustrated too because these requests, they come the last moment and actually I think even one week before the meeting, there were still many unanswered questions so the process is really very hectic.

We kind of proposed to take a step back and start with basics and decide how these things are going to be run and try not to have these discussions with all possible participants from all SO/ACs but just limit the number of people who can decide on the high interest topics. Because when they, for example, launch a vote on high interest topics, it's not quite clear who's supposed to vote. Is it one person per SO/AC or as I proposed, maybe we can send it out to the ccNSO members and ask them all to do the voting. It's really not clear.



---

Of course GNSO is not happy to have only one vote per [SSO] because there are many different subgroups within the GNSO and they would like to have their high interest topics beyond the agenda.

But again, high interest topic, it's something that supposed to be interesting for many people. And we have problems with identifying those but we are working, yup. And then we're going to talk about implementation of new Bylaws by the ccNSO.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And also the other side [of the] GNSO, how they do it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, sure. That's really interesting to know. How are they doing it if they are doing it?

Any questions about this ccNSO, GNSO Council meeting? Any proposals – but we cannot amend the agenda because we kind of agreed with the GNSO. And we won't have much time to cover everything but these are the basic things that we are planning to cover.

Then on Sunday, and again, that's lunch meeting. We have discussion meeting with the GAC. And again, it's – well, really GAC issue about use of country and territory names, again

---

Annabeth and Peter. And progress on the PDP, so Becky and Bart.

And then of course, another issue that they are interested in is on EPSRP, that's Extended Panel on String Review Pan –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Similarity Review.

KATRINA SATAKI: Similarity Review Panel. Again?

BART BOSWINKEL: Extended Process Similarity Review Panel, that's EPSRP.

KATRINA SATAKI: It's very, very easy. Yeah. And this is one of the items we have deferred to rating for our Board members. Then Monday, please note 8:30. It's an early start on Monday. After the seasons of cocktail it is going to be tough but I am sure that we will manage because well we have to talk to the Board.

We start at 8:30 and as you remember Board has sent us a couple of questions. So what do they have to do to make this transition work for us?

---

And here we proposed to have – bless you – Byron and Steven because Byron has raised the issue in respect to the Customer Standing Committee that it needs some resources to – from the staff to – around the exercise to set up everything. And as far as I know, his request has been carefully considered and definitely will be addressed and everything that Byron wants will be given to him. Byron, would you like to comment on that?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Sure. So by way of making this comment, the CSC has just very recently come to life. As of October 1st, we've had a couple of calls, formation stock calls. We had a prep meeting this morning with the four members. There are also five liaisons but we had the first four-member meeting which is really just around preparing for our official meeting. Which is November 8<sup>th</sup>, it's open; anybody can attend.

As we get the CSC, as we bring it to life one of the things that we know we will need is further resources from ICANN. So we have Maria right here who is helping us out. She's the first resource that ICANN has provided to us which I definitely appreciate but we will also be requiring some other [and varied] resources during the life cycle of the CSC which may include more policy development-oriented folks or technical folks with website and other requirements.

---

So I have actually reached out directly to Göran and made him aware of our coming needs and he graciously acknowledged them as you said, and kicked it to David Olive, but my sense was that they were open to whatever the CSC's requirements were going to be. Although that's still to be defined and I'm sure we will be having conversation with David Olive in the coming days.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. So that's clearly an example of ask and it will be given. Yeah, all right. Well if you don't ask, you do not get. Yes.

And then Stephen, about the thing we discussed this morning that we need some support for cross-community decision-making and other processes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But also making aware of the others shoot start the process.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yup.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And also the translation of NxD.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, on the Board there are many people who know different languages. They can start translating actually.

BART BOSWINKEL: This is [clinging on] now.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Second question about the Board organization and community need to do to advance trust and confidence in what we do. So any ideas? Any ways we can advance trust and confidence?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I just get a clarification?

KATRINA SATAKI: Sure.

BART BOSWINKEL: When you put that there and you say trust and confidence in what we do. What do you mean by “we”?

KATRINA SATAKI: I think if they say, what do “we” Board ICANN organization community need to do.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We as a whole?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, I think as a whole.

BART BOSWINKEL: As the broad community. So I just want to make sure that –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think that –

BART BOSWINKEL: When we as the ccNSO ask that question, they understand that we are talking about we as the broad eyes in the community.

KATRINA SATAKI: It's the question they are asking, yeah so –

BART BOSWINKEL: Oh, I'm sorry.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: So they should know what they mean.

BART BOSWINKEL: So that's what I am trying to get clarification on is what is we?  
And it is the broad community?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that is their interpretation or it's their question and it was  
– so I suggested a direction of travel is it is such a high-level  
question that you could almost interpret the question one as a  
specific question for number two. So before you get to hit  
number two, you can – again the trust building exercise starts  
with number one. Get your act together and do what you're  
supposed to do. That's how I looked at it.

BART BOSWINKEL: So how specific should we get? Should we bring specific  
suggestions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't know.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are we going to keep it at broad generalities?

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't know. I think – I would go specifically because otherwise then it becomes a meaningful discussion. That's why I suggested, but that's my suggestion.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Mm-hmm.

BART BOSWINKEL: So the whole process and procedure around these specific review teams is not helpful. It's how the selection process is geared and I think most of you are not subscribed but it is a mer à boire. And I'm very polite. It's a mess. And it probably – Katrina, you could raise that because you're deeply involved and this is not a good start of the whole ICANN 3.0.

KATRINA SATAKI: But this is more related to the first question than the second one.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, but that's going back to Byron's point, how specific do you want to be? If you want to build trust, don't do it this way. Don't go off and start with a specific review team where the rules are



---

unclear. Where you don't know how people get appointed. It's not a good part of trust building.

Trust building you do with very – you walk the talk at least, but that's my personal interpretation. So that's what I meant with the specific example and that's why I think number one is probably the first step in building trust.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Okay, not to belay with this point which is so – this is an opportunity to put the Board on notice. To provide constructive suggestions and to try and get a better understanding for us which is why I'm belaboring in a bit. So transparency and trust would – are obviously cord of the question here.

Since IANA and CSC for me right now is top of mind, but IANA transition in general is high interest topic for everybody. One of the challenges that may present itself is reporting. And certainly right now, IANA would suggest that the reporting has basically been done. The dashboard is up, SLE is met. We're all good. That might be IANAs perspective right now.

My perspective and the CSCs might be, "Those are some very pretty graphics you've put up, very helpful. Thank you. But what we want is the raw data in a machine to machine environment so we can look at the data. The general community can look at

---

the data.” If IANA changed the way they conducted themselves and said, “Yes, no problem. Here you go.” That would – is a very specific example of how we might get to transparency and therefore trust in a way that’s very different than we’ve been interacting now.

So is that the kind of specificity that you think we should bring to the table, is that what you’re talking about? I just want to make sure that we get as much out of this as we can and respond to the question as best as we can.

BART BOSWINKEL:

My suggestion would be to do that. Otherwise, you say – in that sense, the ccNSO in the fortunate position that you are Chair of the CSC, that’s the first group that has met of all the new committees. And that lives – yeah, the new ICANN and what needs to happen. The EC is a second very important group. It hasn’t met and again, they will come up and they will face the same type of issues.

So I think in that sense, it is an opportunity for you to raise it together with say, “How do you see...” So the question you raise to Göran in another frame is, “How do we ensure that everybody is kept abreast of what’s going on?” so that’s a transparency and the Rules and Procedures. It’s not just between you or the CSC

---

and the community but also between the CSC and PTI. That's something as well and that's what they will be facing, the EC.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Okay. Thank you. Well, if the Board wants the answers, they will get the answers to these questions.

Then our topics, the topics that we proposed for discussion and especially the first one. It seems it opened a can of worms and the worms are literally running to all possible directions so first, initiated by Peter from one angle and then elaborated more by Debbie from a completely different angle and I totally agree with Debbie.

I had some exchange with Nick Tomasso from Meetings Team because he tried to explain this regionality thing and other things but... Well, since we have a meeting here and there are specific guidelines for women, I'm slightly mad, yeah.

Debbie, I hope you have some really strong words to say to the Board.

DEBBIE MONAHAN:

I've got a feeling I'm not going to need to say much cause as you said, I think the ball's already in the court but I actually do feel quite strongly that you can't hide being a woman. And one of the

---

things in Abu Dhabi is that women aren't – need to be on the streets walking alone. And one of the key things about in ICANN meeting is a social side [of thing] and I like being able to go out for dinner and drink and then walk back to my hotel when I'm ready to go back.

Are we going to be able to do that in Abu Dhabi? We've been told don't do that in India already, but India is not as bad as what Abu Dhabi women are facing. So I feel quite strongly about it. I think you're coming from a position.

I recognize that they want regional representation, that's fine. So we want people from the regions to attend ICANN. But we don't want women. I mean that's essentially the message that they give by sending us to a country where women do not enjoy the freedoms of a lot of other places. So I won't [inaudible] it quite so bluntly.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Why not?

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Maybe not.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Please do but not say that they do not enjoy same freedoms as in other – same freedoms as men. It doesn't matter other countries or not. If men are also not allowed to walk alone, it is fine.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I found that interesting that the exchange that we had on the list, Chris Disspain's comment and reactions. And when Peter asked, "Does that mean we shouldn't go somewhere we gays – it's illegal to be gay." Well you shouldn't go anywhere where you're in trouble for being yourself or potentially in trouble for being yourself.

Now, if you are gay you can – it doesn't need to be obvious. Males – you know you're out there, it's male. Females cannot hide who they are. The moment they walk down the street it's quite clear what this gender is.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you. As I put it in my e-mail response to Nick, "If there is a need for additional guidelines for any group, subgroup of ICANNers, this place is definitely should be out.

If you need special guidelines for women, for gay, for people of other race or anything, that place is out. Because again, the

---

main idea is to be open, free to participate, and so on. So if you're not free to participate so what are we talking about?

Actually, very many other communities they're also very interested in – and I think that they're very happy that ccNSO so that's such a bad behaving baby. All we want to talk about because everyone's talking about that but they talking behind their backs but we are the first ones who said, “We want to know the names who selected the place?” Yes? Please, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND:

While I come from a Western perspective as well and wholeheartedly agree and support those principles, I think we also need to be ready to have a discussion then about cultural relativity in how we support the fact that – I'm just going to use the I because I'm not going to presume what anybody else believes in – that I support those kinds of values and the freedom of women to behave and act as they want to and walk where they want to. On the other hand, there are many other cultures where, as we have just pointed out, they don't necessarily – those beliefs are not shared.

And as soon as we step into kind of the cultural relativism discussion, we better be prepared to have a solid base upon which to make those comments. Because then fundamentally as a Westerner, I am making a comment that your culture whether I

---

subscribe to those principles or not; that your culture is somehow potentially lesser than my culture and my beliefs.

And obviously, as a Western male, this is a particularly awkward place to be talking so I subscribe to those beliefs too, but then I end up suggesting that somebody else’s culture is inferior to my culture and my beliefs and that we are not going to come there because of that.

That is quite a statement to make and this is a difficult one. So how do you deal with saying, “Because my Western beliefs aren’t consistent with your Middle Eastern beliefs in this specific instance? Mine should trump yours.” Even though, those are my beliefs, that’s a hard place to be and if we as a ccNSO, as technical operators are going to wade into that morass, we just want to make sure that we’re ready for whatever that ends up bringing us.

KATRINA SATAKI: We are.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: As a female, I have no problem in saying that I accept and appreciate other cultures but you shouldn’t ensuite me into another culture to do part of my job where I have no rights in that particular culture.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: So that is exactly the kind of thing that I am suggesting we be ready to bring, is a statement like that that underpins the point of view without stepping on somebody else's culture that whether I believe or not. We just need to be sensitive to it. And if we come from this point, with that kind of statement then we'll probably be in good stead. Let's just make sure we're ready to back it up with reasonable non-culturally discriminatory points of view.

So if you said exactly what you say then I think we're probably in reasonable shape. And obviously, you're going to have to – the women on this table are in the best position to lead on this with the support of their colleagues – the rest of their colleagues are on this table.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: First of all I'd like to express my complete support for Debbie's position and I would also suggest that you give them no quarter and be blunt. And lastly, to follow up on Byron's comment. There are within that region, multiple locales that would work out much better from this standpoint than the chosen one.



---

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments on this? This is going to be fun.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You wake up.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, well everybody will wake up. I hope we will keep them awake. And well actually that's a good question. Who is the ultimate authority to decide on the place? Who? You?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Mm-hmm.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: In fact, it's all of us around this table. If this work of the ccNSO does not appear to be able to be done properly in a particular location, it is open to ccNSO Council to say, "For this ICANN meeting, we ain't turning up." If we want to do that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yup. Thank you. It will save a lot of money to ICANN. Okay. No, no, I totally agree and I think that is a –

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: No. I don't remember. I wasn't around perhaps.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: We start already? Okay. Apparently our Board members will not join us so let's finish with these topics we are going to discuss with the Board and then go back to agenda item number two about – well you remember the acronym. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And do we have a reason why our Board members are not joining us today?

BART BOSWINKEL: First of all, they'd been invited very shortly. They would try to and they will come next meeting. And they are in the middle of – also Becky and Chris and Mike who are in the middle of a Board committee appointment meetings. So that's high Board level stuff so that there is an overlap and because we scheduled this –

---

we invited them very late; came up as an idea around the EPSRP but Katrina will allude to it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah well it was expected that the meeting ends half past 12 but apparently the discussions are –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Heated.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, heated discussions. Almost as heated as discussions about locations.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are they televised?

KATRINA SATAKI: No. So second is about the country and territory names. If we'll have time after our heated discussion about ICANN meetings so we will try to cover remaining two as well.

So country territory names we discussed it already. Annabeth and Peter will take the lead there and the third one is about this EPSRP WG advice. So that's our agenda, item number two and probably this is the time we talk about it.

---

So as you may remember, the Board asked the ccNSO to provide guidance on a very specific issue following from the third review of the fast track process. And they asked us to develop guidelines on – including issues of split recommendations.

As you remember, there we had some issues with .eu in Greek. and as some other cases when somebody just said, “No, it’s not working out. It’s confusingly similar. It’s bad this, bad that.” So the Board asked us to work on these issues and consult the community and in particular GAC and SSAC.

The working group was created and we asked GAC and SSAC to participate. GAC did not participate as a chartering organization or did not participate officially but they were representatives from GAC. SSAC refused to participate in this working group. So the working group kept working. So there were several representatives from ccTLDs, representatives from GAC, some experts from the outside and they have come up with report and the report was posted for public comments.

GAC and ALAC, [perhaps] they support for this report. Verisign also supported and – in terms of the treatment ccTLDs and gTLDs has to be equal and other stuff. SSAC on the contrary, they issued their advice and submitted to the Board and the advice is not to adopt this – not to take the advice of the working group.

---

So if we talk about the SSAC document, SSAC advice, SSAC comments, so I don't know if you had time to look at the document. So it's item eight for our meeting. It's IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process history. So it's historic overview, we have historic overview of all the history of what was happening. And then we have another document – what was the name of the document where we have –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It was sent to you yesterday.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, it was sent yesterday but – so after, if you remember we had in our last Council call, we asked the secretary together with this EPSRP to develop a document explaining – actually, addressing those issues that were mentioned in SSAC's advice to the Board.

And they did that and they analyzed SSAC's paper and – let's put it bluntly – it's a very sloppy paper. It's a sloppily written paper. Advice itself – okay, it's not favorable for us but at least advice is fine. Yeah, well advice is what advice is. We could not expect anything else from them. But the paper is really very, very badly written.

---

It contains some factual errors. For example, it refers to a ccNSO PDP from 2014. Anyone around the table knows about the ccNSO of PDP from 2014? Yup, nobody actually at the cc – but they know. Not only they know, but they also put a reference into their official document.

And actually if you read the report, you might be surprised that actually something like that could leave SSAC. As you know, perhaps SSAC is supposed to adopt all the documents by consensus and according to their advice, nobody withdrew from this document.

So there are many things that – first of all, they do not understand that the Board actually asked the ccNSO to come up with a proposal. So for some reason, they just believed that we're trying to change the rules on the go. But that's – not irrelevant – but that's just as a side dish.

Personally, I think that the worst thing is that the SSAC has been given multiple opportunities to comment, to participate. And even – as the EPSRP published their report, they had opportunity to comment on the report. So giving proper opportunity to the working group to address those concerns and issues. Instead they went past this public comments thing and just went directly to the Board which effectively means that they are trying to exercise some veto power.

---

And even worse to that, because – as far as I understand, one of the guys from SSAC sent an e-mail to the European Commission saying that they want to meet with them, to explain their position on ccNSO policy. Which personally I think is totally unacceptable because if they want to talk about the ccNSO policy, they should talk to the ccNSO, not to the European Commission.

I deeply respect European Commission being one of the member states but sorry, that's really – so basically, everything that could have been done wrong was done wrong by SSAC. Now they finally want to meet with us. Personally I'd say, "Sorry. The train has left already." But yes, most probably we'll have to meet but anyway I'd like to know your opinion taking into account how it all evolved. Yes, Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: Thanks Katrina. When do they want to meet us exactly?

KATRINA SATAKI: Whenever we say apparently.

PETER VERGOTE: My suggestion would be not to engage them in any kind of way before we have been talking to the Board about this.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Fair enough. Any other comments? Stephen, you wanted to say something?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Following up on Peter’s remark. When we do confer with the Board on this, how deeply into the weeds, how much level of detail as you just outlined do we want to bring up with the Board?

BART BOSWINKEL: The Board is aware of the diverging views or the divergence between SSAC on one hand and GAC, ALAC, and the ccNSO, potentially ccNSO on the other hand. And they’re very concerned about it because that’s one of the things they need to resolve if the ccNSO would decide to adopt the final report and send it to the Board.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Well, as a follow up to their questions as to what they can do better, I would argue that we should beat them up pretty badly on this one. That is the Board and that the need to get SSAC in line.



---

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Any other comments? Okay, yeah. These are issues that we are going to discuss with other communities as well. Yeah and we'll see how – yeah, an hour ago I spoke to Patrick and yes, now they want to meet. I'd say it was a little bit too late but yes. Okay, we'll just have to meet them and talk and see how we can solve this whole issue. Yes? I know he's very soft deep in heart.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: From a logical point of view, if you would meet and SSAC advice 84 is still on the table then what is the purpose of the meeting? We make sense in my view but maybe I was too much involved in the EPSRP Working Group and the staff before. So a meeting like this only makes sense either to explain their views, that's fine and you listen. And that you can – the Council and all the working group can explain their views so it's an exchange of views or you really want to come to a closure on that on a joint position. But that means the SSAC paper needs to go.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Is there a mechanism to act for them to actually withdraw? Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: What happened is imagine you have the meeting and the outcome is okay we all agree on a path forward but you still have the advice.

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Is there a mechanism for them to withdraw?

BART BOSWINKEL: I don't know. That's their concern.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI: Actually I advise you all to read this report because it really highlights all the aspects of that advice – the reasoning behind that advice. And from that report you can very clearly see what's actually wrong with their document. It's not a long. It's like six pages document.

At least executive summary and some blocks [inaudible] because it's – yeah, another thing is how are we going and apparently we have to decide what to do with this report. Are we going to send it as just a pack of documents, the report history – historical overview and the report on the report which addresses SSAC advice? Or are we sure that that report has a Council statement saying that – highlighting all the things that are wrong in the report.

---

Therefore, I would really urge you to read that document so that we can decide how are we going to proceed. We just submit it to the Board or we issue it as a Council statement.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There is a comment in the chat.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yup?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm reading the comment by David McAuley made in the chat of the Adobe connect room. One note about Verisign comment, our comment was positive about a promise of IDNs but we also stated two important qualifications. First that you regard to be paid to RFC6912 and second, that IDN TLDs be treated equally irrespective of whether a gTLD or a ccTLD. Accepting only those aspects of treatment that relay to uniquely cc aspects of a ccTLD.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Thank you, David. I tried to elaborate a little bit on Verisign's paper but David is very accurate. He's from Verisign, by the way. Yeah, so that's why he kn0ws.

---

Okay, so this is something that we have to – and actually one of the points from that report from the group is that really needs to be a... ccTLDs and gTLDs need to be treated equally, yes. So this is one of the things. And if for example, web and webs are not confusingly similar then why would some IDN ccTLDs should be considered when they are basically not?

Yeah, and another thing that for example is written in SSAC's advice is that whenever you put something into the root zone, it's not processed as a natural language. It's – yeah, okay. Sorry. They're kicking us out.

Just please read the paper, it's really very interesting and enlightening. And then we have high interest topics and two of them are ours. It's on outreach and legal advice given to ICANN.

So thank you very much and see you around. And yeah, sorry, we have to leave. I would love to chat with you whole day but apparently we're not allowed to. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**