
HYDERABAD – ALAC & ccNSO Meeting
Friday, November 04, 2016 – 17:00 to 18:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

ALAN GREENBERG: If I can bring the meeting to order. We have a meeting of the ALAC and ccNSO. I have the honor of sitting beside Katrina Sataki and I'm going to ask you if you would like to chair the meeting. We could hand it back and forth five times but we—

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, we can do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, we will.

KATRINA SATAKI: It's a real pleasure, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I've been speaking here all day. All right. Do we want to take some time to go very quick round the room for people to give their names but not much more? Because we really don't want to spend a whole hour doing that but there are enough people

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.

who may not know who the others are that it may be worthwhile.

If we could start at the far end with Alberto. Alberto Soto?

ALBERTO SOTO: I'm Alberto Soto, ALAC-elect member.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible] .kr.

SATISH BABU: Satish Babu from APRALO.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise, NARALO.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] EURALO.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Maureen Hilyard, ALAC and ccNSO Liaison.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche, ALAC.

CHING CHAO: Ching Chao, NomCom appointee.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Dev Anand Teelucksingh, At-Large member.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Alejandra Reynoso, .gt.

KATRINA SATAKI: Katrina Sataki, .lv.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg, North American ALAC Chair.

ANNABETH LANGE: Annabeth Lange, .nl.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Stephen Deerhake, .as (American Samoa).

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Debbie Monahan, .nz.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, ALAC.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] [Arash], APRALO.

SARAH KIDEN: Sarah Kiden, APRALO.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible], ALAC member and also [.n] manager.

JIMMY SCHULZ: Jimmy Schulz, ALAC member.

SEUN ODEDEJI: Seun Odedeji, ALAC.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Isaac Maposa, At-Large member.

HAROLD ARCOS: Harold Arcos, ALAC member from LACRALO.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda Scartezini, ALAC from LACRALO.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet, ALAC and Board member of AFNIC.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie Hammer, ALAC Liaison to the SSAC.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible], At-Large, APRALO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The first item on our agenda is outreach and cooperation. Do we have a demonstration ready? One of our people, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, in his spare time put together a little tool that if you specify a country, for instance, it would show you all of the At-Large ALSes, details about the ccTLD, details about GAC.

We've been talking for ages that we should have ALSes cooperate with ccTLDs among other things and we also say that we should cooperate with our GAC members. It's sometimes really hard to find out who they are.

I know we've had cases with the ALSes and ccTLDs. We've had ccTLDs wanting to talk to someone and no one seems to respond, and we've had ALSes wanting to talk to their ccTLD and didn't particularly get an interesting reception. So just having

the information available may make things a little bit easier.
Dave?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Alan. What I attempted to do with this tool was to try to track the different multi-stakeholders at ICANN that form a particular country.

Often the information is scattered all over ICANN and I wanted to try to consolidate this information. So if you look on the screen there, you see what I've tried to do and right now it shows what's the country stats for India. 26 persons have had fellowships and on the left side you see all of the different fellows that have attended ICANN meetings. And with regard with the ccNSO, there's a yes showing that yes there is a ccNSO representative from India. If one was to hover over the link, you would see that it would go to the ccNSO's website to get the contact details for that ccNSO member.

Also similarly for the GAC representative, it indicates yes, which is in green. You can then see that you can also click on that to get the actual GAC representative for the country.

And for us At-Large, we have seven At-Large Structures and you would see on the right hand side underneath the seven At-Large Structures and also hyperlinked to the websites.

So with this tool, you can see very quickly at a glance for a country the different stakeholders in a country. If you move the cursor over to India there and click on it, a dropdown occurs and you can then—or you could just type a country. Any particular country anyone wants to suggest?

Guatemala, okay. As you type it, it auto fills and, yes, that's it. You can see that there's been six fellowships, a person that came from Guatemala and the names. There is a GAC rep, a ccNSO rep, but there are no At-Large Structures. So what we can do is look at ways we can cooperate to see, "Well, are there possible end-user organizations in that country? And if there were At-Large structures you now have a basis for which to easily start contacting them and reaching out to them if you want them to get involved in your ccTLD policy discussions.

Perhaps just as an example, let's just go to another country very quickly. Let's pick Aland Islands, just as an example, which is the third one. Yes, that one.

As you can see, what happens then is that the dashboard shows red and indicates that those are stakeholder gaps that possibly need to be alleviated. There's no GAC representative there and so forth and no ccNSO representative from that territory.

I think that's the general idea of the tool. I don't need to go into specifics of how I did it. I'm happy to answer those questions offline. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Dev. Do we want to have any further discussion on other than the tool, how we can actually get people working together. I think it's a crucial area. As I said, we've been talking about it for years. There have been occasional linkups but not many.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Alan. Congratulations. I think that you've put a lot of effort into this database. Now I'm thinking how we can help this database to remain up-to-date because creating is one thing. We all know that maintaining is something else.

You just mentioned there's a link to the ccNSO website so therefore I would like to ask Secretariats to know that we need to go to revisit the list and make sure that our data there is really up to date. And yes, I think that you—

ALAN GREENBERG: I was simply going to say I've suggested to our At-Large staff that they socialize this tool around ICANN and get staff to be responsible for updating it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Just one more thing. We have new members from time to time so probably our liaisons could keep an eye on that. So if there's a new member—I said liaisons, okay now we have one in—but yes, we'll keep an eye on it.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Actually, what I've tried to do is to make that much easier. What happens is that it passes the ccNSO's website and I can detect when there's a change. So when you update your ccNSO website, I would see that there's been an addition and I know then to make sure that it's there.

Part of the challenges with this multi-stakeholder tool has been the problems that different AC and SOs use different country names for their country names. That's been one of the challenges to normalize those country names to one consistent country name in this tool.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, it's good to know that we're been watched. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I find it fascinating that we can't even agree on country names. Anyone else have any thoughts on either the tool or the concept of how do we get ALSs and ccTLDs to talk to each other and perhaps do productive things with each other?

Holly, is that an old—no, that's just a card that you have up to confuse me, thank you. Humberto, is there a Humberto here? I don't see him. No, so we assume his card is not valid. Phantom card speakers.

The next item is Work Stream 2 activities. The CCWG accountability with a focus on SO/AC accountability, unless we also have AOs, which I don't think we do.

Certainly accountability is one of the issues that we on an ongoing basis are concerned with. We're told we represent three and a half billion people or—

KATRINA SATAKI: Fair enough.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fair enough, yes. We send them e-mails every week and read all of the responses so we're sure we're doing a good job. No, seriously, a number of years ago we changed the terminology to

say we represent the interests of because people were asking us, “How do we contact them all.”

But nevertheless, no matter how few there are, and we have about 200 regional groups ALSes (At-Large Structures), it’s exceedingly difficult communicating with them and getting feedback and finding out if indeed we are representing them fairly or not.

So we certainly have questions about how can we do it better. I’m wondering to what extent you can provide us any insight as to what the ccNSO does and how you really make sure that your people are alive out there.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Oh, they’re very much alive, yes. Thank you, Alan. Actually, we’re taking accountability very seriously and we look at the accountability from different perspectives. One is on the Council level, so how to ensure that the ccNSO Council is accountable to members and how to ensure that members are happy with the transparency and openness that we can ensure.

Before the Helsinki meeting, we ran a survey. We thought that the easiest way is to ask our members, “What do you expect from the Council?” So we ran a survey and we also asked if they

feel that they are well informed about Council activities. Luckily, there were not so many not informed at all responses but we would definitely be happy to see much more very well-informed responses to this survey, the questions on the survey.

This was the first step. Then recently we also had some discussion on the mailing list and it turned out that even though all materials that we discussed on the Council are always published on the website, people do not check the websites regularly.

We realized that there was a need for more proactive communication with the communities so we just decided that we need to inform that, for example, the agenda for the next upcoming Council meeting has been published on the website so that people can go to have a look at the materials.

We promised to publish them a week before the meeting so that people can actually see what the Council is going to discuss and probably provide some input to this, not [postpectum] when we already published some resolutions but prior to the meeting.

That's one thing. Another thing is that we also realized that people would like to be more involved in the development of internal procedures. Currently we have a working group that works on internal documents like guidelines and charters.

Again, during our ccNSO meeting days—that would be on Monday—when the Guidelines Review Committee gives an update on its work, we will propose different levels for community involvement so from our members, how can they follow the work of the guidelines development process and how they can contribute to this work. This is from Council perspective.

Then of course another, I think, is working group accountability. How our working groups report back to the community on what they are doing, how they gather input and basically, yes, all these things that we expect from our people who participate in the work of policy development or just any other work to give meaningful reports back to the people who selected them to serve on these working groups.

Actually, where we call it, we were building or paving accountability highway and just to make sure that it's wide enough to accommodate all the drivers on this highway and just to make sure that every ccNSO member feels needed for the community so that they can provide input and make sure that this input is well received and at least considered.

So thank you. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to take them. If not, then let's move to the next agenda item, which is CCWG and use of country and territory names so current state of

plan. Here I'd like to ask my colleague Annebeth who is one of the co-Chairs on this working group to provide you with a—not a [inaudible]. Update perhaps but, yes, things are as they are. Annebeth, please.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Thank you. Well, many have heard about this before and we have members from ALAC as well. Hi, Cheryl. What you know is that we have been discussing country and territory names originating from ISO 3166 but on the first level, only first level. That's an important distinction to make.

It's a continuation of the study group that ended with a final report in July 2013, so this has been going on for quite a long time.

We have the most participants from the GNSO and the ccNSO, understandably enough, but all the stakeholder groups are represented in one way or other.

We have had face-to-face meetings for many years now and also teleconferences between the meetings, quite a lot of them nightly. Most of you know how that works.

It is a working group, not a PDP. So what we could end up with of results should be fed into a later PDP. That's what we hoped.

So the status now is that during these years, we have managed to come to a kind of, I would say, consensus of the two-letter strings. Not only those on ISO 3166 but also other two-letter combinations out there in the alphabet to leave them alone.

It's up to United Nations and not us to decide what is and what is not a country. So if in the future, and that might easily be, new countries in the world, they will also have their two-letter codes as a ccTLD. And now we're talking ASCII. When we get to IDN, it's even more complicated.

And then we started to discuss three-letter and that was more difficult. Also understandably enough, because three-letter codes have historically been the g regime and two letters the cc regime, but things have changed and a generic name is not what it used to be. A lot of things have gone in to the g space like brands and geographic names which aren't really generic. Not in my legal terms, at least. That raised a lot of questions with interests from other stakeholder groups.

We should also discuss content territory names short and long form but we haven't arrived there. We have stopped now at three-letter codes and the discussions have showed that it's very, very difficult to come to a consensus there.

In our mandate, we should try to find feasible framework that we could all agree on and that has proved to be impossible. So

the progress report and the draft interim report that we have sent out is there so you can find it and it will be presented when discussed further on the working group tomorrow at 3:00, I think. But so far it seems what we can give away is just the conclusion that it's impossible to come to a common framework.

The question now is the third thing that the ccNSO gave us as a mandate was if we can't... The study group ended up with three recommendations and the third recommendation was to the ccNSO Council that if we couldn't arrive to anything, the ccNSO Council should send a letter to the ICANN Board and ask if we could keep the protection that's in the Applicant Guidebook today until further discussions if we possibly in the future can find a way forward.

I think this would make it easier for the g side to get what they want and to get the process going on other names because it's very obvious, at least for me and I'm sure for the others in that working group, that this is a very controversial field and it will create a lot of problems. If not legally, it will be a lot of political problems and even inside both ccNSO or the ccs and in the GAC members, they have different opinions.

But what we see is that so far the main reactions from the g side is open everything up, but in the GAC and in the ccTLD side it's

different. Some want to open it up but with restrictions, some want to make a cc out of it and that's not very likely we'll have that solution, and others we'll completely stop it and keep the protection that's in the Applicant Guidebook today.

So that's where we stand today. If you're interested in this, please come to the Working Group meeting tomorrow. It's open for everyone and we need everyone's opinions to see how we can go forward.

It's now in many ways concluded this section of the work but we don't want to just give it up. Could we find a way forward to discuss it together? This is a cross-community field that everyone is interested in and I don't think it's a good solution to give it into a GNSO PDP and then afterwards we should comment on that when they have decided.

That was all from me. Peter, do you have anything to add?

PETER VERGOTE:

No, I just wanted to reaffirm what you have been saying about the PDP which is going on and the GNSO. It puts us in a difficult spot. It's quite impossible to see where it will lead to.

GNSO on the one hand could be very reluctant to take that route because they could face the risk that a new version of the Applicant Guidebook is completely unacceptable for other SOs

or other ACs and they try then to influence the ICANN Board to reject it and to force GNSO to come up with new versions of that Applicant Guidebook.

But if we want to play on that card, we are equally taking an awful lot of risk, so therefore, I would support Annebeth's plea for preferring to continue to work, whether in this working group or through other mechanisms but not put it in the hands of a GNSO PDP. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much Annebeth and Peter. Are there any other questions and comments? Yes, Wafa.

Wafa DAHMANI: SOI, Wafa. I may have missed something since I'm running the .tn registry. You were saying that if you want to have—you didn't open already the three characters ccTLD. I think there was a survey about this and I responded to this. No outburst about the survey?

ANNEBETH LANGE: The results of this survey will be included in the report that's come.

What I said about the ccs is that the distinction two-letter codes and three-letter codes for ASCII is there but of course if it's opening up for the three letters of the ISO 3166, it will probably be a gTLD. But it could be run of course as a national kind of thing anyway, but under other conditions and then the traditional historical ccTLD.

WAFDA DAHMANI: Just a little follow-up. For example, for the .tn, there will be, for example, .tun and the long one .tunisia. .tun and .tunisia could become generic top-level domain?

ANNEBETH LANGE: If they are opened up, in my opinion they will be gTLDs.

WAFDA DAHMANI: Will they be reserved for the countries?

ANNEBETH LANGE: That's what we don't know.

WAFDA DAHMANI: Will we pay for them?

ANNEBETH LANGE: I can't answer these questions but I know that the governments in the GAC, there are certain amounts of the countries that want it to be the same conditions as for capitals and some of the cities today. Like if they are opening up, it should be with support or non-objection in one way or another from the government or relevant public authority.

A lot of the governmental representatives think that's the best solution because some countries really want to do something with it, but it should be in a kind of controlled way. At least from our side as a cc and I'm sure for the governments, they don't want anyone to run .norway or .nor or .tunisia and do whatever they want under that domain.

It is a kind of identification and even if it's no legal rights of a country to have a special right in their names, sadly it's not because they haven't agreed on that in WIPO or International Law but still it's political and it's a kind of serenity question, in my view.

WAFDA DAHMANI: Yes. We are developing countries and we have already some problems with the two characters ccTLDs to run them. If you add for us problems with the three characters and the long version, we have to pay and we'll have... I think you should consider these problems for these countries.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Absolutely.

PETER VERGOTE: If I can just add one thing. What I learned this afternoon is that one position that gets more and more attention within the GNSO is to plead for release of a country name short or long version or a three-letter code on the condition that the national government of the country and the local ccTLD sign off on and agree that they do not object the release. So maybe that's something interesting for us as well as a kind of compromise.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, quite interesting. Thank you very much. I see that Sheryl wants to add something.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just on that last [inaudible], I still think we need to have a full frank and fearless discussion about that because of course, as we know, gTLDs can change ownership hands and operational procedures and so a sign-off with a great deal of endurance to that sign-off would make some countries much more nervous than others I'm sure, because some countries have greater power in getting back what they would see as their

rights and responsibilities. But it's not going to be a uniform situation for all of the particularly emerging and developing economies so I think we need to try and act in best interests here.

So, Wafa, can I just say that your input now even at this stage and if you can get other inputs is really important because if we do not surrender this process – and as many of us who do not wish to surrender this process yet – we need to have good reason why and inputs from opinion that are case-based, I guess, would be very valuable instead of us having to work in the more hypothetical.

WAFDAHMANI:

Just to follow up, Alan, may I attend this Working Group tomorrow? It's a question to Alan. May I attend this Working Group tomorrow?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't think we have anything that's formally ALAC tomorrow, but I may be wrong. There's a number of public sessions and I think the others are all sessions that we haven't made any rules about.

Just a thought, and it's a very pragmatic thought, the three-letter codes were protective in the first round of gTLDs. One can

argue whether that was a reasonable thing, an unreasonable thing, or whatever, but they were. That puts the GAC at whose request it was done and the ccNSO in a really strong position to negotiate how they might be released because whoever's in control at the moment is in a strong position to make sure there weren't any changes.

I can't imagine a GNSO PDP recommending that it be opened and that not being questioned by others. That's just a purely pragmatic statement not having any power to enact it.

KATRINA SATAKI:

May I just comment on that. That's true but it's a footnote in that Applicant Guide book for 2012 that it says that this is only for the first round so it should be re-discussed.

But I agree with you that since we have a lot of geographical names out there like the cities like .paris, .berlin, which had to have conditions attached to them, then in the hierarchy, countries and country codes are higher up in the hierarchy so to release them completely would be kind of contradictory for the system in many ways. So I agree and I hope you're right. You shouldn't leave them out of control completely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just as an aside, until I came to ICANN, I didn't realize three-letter country codes were used for anything except plaques on a back of a car.

KATRINA SATAKI: Any more comments or questions on this? If not, let's move to the next agenda item. Now we have a different agenda on the screen so the order is different, but if I'm not mistaken then we should talk about implementation of new Bylaws and experiences and shared experiences that you have at ALAC and experiences we have at the ccNSO. Who would like to open? Yes, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: We did put some raw changes into our rules of procedure which are effectively our Bylaws to enable us to act with the Empowered Community. They are about as short and concise as one could imagine.

There are two new sections, one of which is really just definitions and the other one sets the threshold under which we can take Empowered Community action, which is a super majority at two-thirds of all sitting members.

Most of our things, if there's a two-thirds, it's two-thirds of those voting with a quorum rule but here it has to be at least two-thirds of the ALAC.

We had to appoint who the representative to the Empowered Community administration is and we decided to make that the Chair or the Chair's representative should the Chair not be able to serve largely because there has been concern all the way through the CCWG accountability of, "But what if our representative doesn't do what we want?"

And we already have a large set of rules of how to dismiss a Chair so it was convenient to simply say the Chair is it and we know how to get rid of a Chair if the Chair doesn't do our bidding.

And that's about all. There are a few other words and we can easily provide you with the text but we chose to take a very simple process. We did not go into details for each of the actions and say exactly what steps we would take. It's not highly likely we're going to be exercising a lot of these powers and if we do, I don't think we can predict the exact circumstances around it. So to start putting in place detailed rules for exercising each of the powers just didn't seem to be a very pragmatic thing to do at this point and we have chosen not to.

We may live to regret that some time in the future but, as I said, we've taken a very simple process to begin with and should we

choose to augment it in the future based on either what we learn or what other organizations do, we might.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Well, we haven't been as pragmatic as ALAC because—

ALAN GREENBERG: We're lazy.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, you can put it that way, lazy, but we're very hardworking people at the ccNSO. Luckily, even before all this transition thing started, we had Guidelines Review Committee which was tasked to review existing guidelines and procedures and update them just to make sure that they match our current practice.

And we had to develop some documents, internal procedures, for example, for appointing our members to the Customers Standing Committee or appointing our representative on the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee.

We also chartered this group to work on these documents and this group is very productive and not lazy at all. We have come up with quite a list of documents and maybe I can ask Stephen,

who is an active member of the Guidelines Review Committee to elaborate more on the work we're doing.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: With regards to the Guidelines Review Committee, we're basically going over old stuff and coming up with new stuff as required. And as Katrina said, that group is quite busy and we're going through Council procedures, and so on and so forth.

With respect to the Empowered Community, we have an appointee from the ccNSO, who happens to be me, and we had our first discussion today with regards to coming up with, I believe, what's going to be similar to what Alan's described which is some very lightweight procedures/guidelines with respect to how the cc would exercise that Empowered Community action and coordinate its decisions with the other SO/ACs, which brings me to a couple of questions for Alan.

One is how long before the transition did you guys start thinking about what you were going to put into place, or did you just do this in the last month?

The second question is with respect to what you have put in place, which I'd love to take a look at, what kind of decision timeframe do you have in place? If you get something that comes on your plate and you've got to figure out a) are we

dealing with it and b) if we are dealing with it, how long will it be before we get a decision?

Because that was something that came up in our discussions earlier today was you're now looking at four groups that are going to have to start looking at whatever it is that is brought to our attention. It was emphasized that we all have to go our own way but at the end of the day come up and say here's our decision and try to say it all in a reasonably concise timeframe. So I was just curious if you could address that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sure. Our rules were approved in time before the transition and in accordance with our processes, they had to be put out 21 days ahead of time and give people opportunities, so we started working on it about two and a half months before. I won't say much earlier than we talked about it way before that and pretty much decided that unless there was strong objection from within the ALAC, we would take a simple—a clean path.

We were fortunate in that we rewrote our complete set of rules of procedure about three years ago so a lot of the things that might have been done in an ad hoc way are already established. We already have processes for appointing people to any committee or to any position so we're just using our standard processes for that.

We've actually recently augmented it but within the provision of our Rules of Procedure so we have what is now called an Appointee Selection Committee that we use to do triage of the applicants that come in. But we had provision for that within our original Rules of Procedure anyway. We were in pretty good shape.

In terms of the timeframe, the timeframes of course laid out in the new Bylaws for taking action are very short by normal ICANN standards.

We are fortunate the GNSO for instance only takes action at Council meetings and although they on rare occasions will schedule an ad hoc counsel meeting, they generally don't like doing that so their meetings are once a month or whatever they are in any given period. They, I think, are going to have a really interesting time in reacting to these things with a few weeks between decision points and my understanding is they have a committee that is looking at that in great detail.

The ALAC has well-established procedures that we can vote during an ALAC meeting but more likely we vote online. For less important things, we'll simply make a decision by consensus but we do use formal voting on a regular basis and we can do that on a pretty well, a moment's notice if we need to.

So following the timelines in the new Bylaws is going to be ridiculous but there's nothing within our processes which will stop us from doing that. How much we will get good, active discussion in the very short timeframes, interesting question.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Okay, thank you. I just wanted to add that if we talk about pragmatic approach then probably our decision to have clear procedures, clear guidelines was also to some extent very pragmatic because it's easier to follow a guideline than answer nasty questions of, "How did you come up with this brilliant decision?"

We saw that clear procedures are something that could help us to enhance our accountability, accountability of the Council and the way the community can follow up the process. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

As a follow-up to that, it is our intention within the ccNSO to put together a fairly, if not really lightweight, procedural approach to handling anything that comes along this time path. And we like ALAC are in a position to initiate discussions online and vote online, etc, etc, so we're not constrained nearly as much time-wise as the GNSO is by the procedures that they've adopted.

So I concur with Alan it's going to be interesting to see how they handle this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a question and we have one request to speak. My recollections with the ccNSO is the council can make decisions but it can essentially be second guessed or questioned by your overall membership and the timeline for that I think makes things interesting if they can reverse a decision. Is there actually time to reverse the decision given the timelines in the process?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. According to our rules, and the rules can be changed only by two-thirds of all the members, yes, there is a seven-day period during which our members may reverse any decision taken by the Council.

That's another reason why it's really wise to have clear procedures in advance so that probably lowers the risk of this decision being reversed by the community. Seun?

SEUN ODEDEJI: Thank you. Just two questions. The first one is in relation to the review of your processes that you're doing. Do you have a timeline? Do you have a projected completion timeline for it?

And Steve just said he's the one that has been appointed to the EC. Is that a temporary thing pending the development of the actual guideline? And then do you have any backup plan in case the community has a need to exercise one of the powers tomorrow, for instance? Of course it may not happen in ten years time.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you for the question. First, everything in this life is temporary but the point—we developed a guideline. That guideline was adopted by the Council, seven-day period passed and then the Council selected the representative to the EC administration. So it's not a temporary appointment in that respect.

Speaking about backup plans, no, we do not have a plan yet. If the need comes, we'll have to deal with it at that moment taking into account the request and the particular need.

Stephen, you want to elaborate?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

With regard to the question what happens if have to take action tomorrow, the short answer to that is we've got a problem but I do expect by the time this conference concludes, that myself and several other ccNSO community members will have made

significant progress on sorting out something that can quickly go to the Guidelines Review Committee for polishing, approval, and then on to the Council for review period and approval as well. So I would think that we will have things well in hand from that standpoint within a month.

SEUN ODEDEJI: Just a follow-up. May I? In terms of for ALAC, we actually did an appointment to position so if I get what ccNSO has done is you are appointing a person and not necessarily the position, right? Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, because by default it's the Chair but the Council may decide otherwise.

ALAN GREENBERG: Preparing for Copenhagen.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, that's true. How do you feel about high interest topics?

ALAN GREENBERG: We spent more time scheduling this meeting with more problems later than I have ever done in my career as Chair and

it's gotten worse progressively. I've now been Chair for two years and it's gotten progressively worse each meeting.

It's interesting at one point we had seven or eight high interest topics. If you look at the agenda right now, we don't. Some of the ones that were described as high interest topics suddenly between two weeks and now are no longer high interest topics. The topic may still be there but it's not high interest any more apparently. I'm not quite sure how those decisions were made.

We found that although this was nominally the longest meeting ICANN has ever held, when you start chopping out the days we can't do certain things and the days we have to do certain things, and the high interest topics which indeed some of them were high interest, most of them were high interest, we had a very hard time figuring out where our meetings would be and then we found out surprise, other people had scheduled other important things against them.

We arbitrarily decide—not arbitrarily. We carefully considered some of the high interest topics and said they are not high interest from our point of view and we will hold scheduled things against them. And yes, maybe one or two people would leave and go somewhere else and so be it.

I did complain in one of the organizing meetings that when we went from one high interest topic on what used to Monday to

seven or eight, it significantly confused our scheduling or increased our scheduling problems. The answer that came back is we've always had seven or eight high interest topics. We just didn't label them that way.

So what can I say? I think it's important to have the important issues discussed. I considered what was done in Helsinki of saying, "This is a high interest topic and you are not allowed to schedule against it. By the way, the room will only hold 10% of our attendees but you can't schedule anything against it," was completely ridiculous.

So I think it has to be cleaned up and I think the ACs and SOs should have a large say in it and I personally felt that this was too much staff-driven without our control but then telling us to work around it. That's Greenberg's position. Other people may have different ones.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Maybe just before we go to Tijani, Alejandra says the Chair of our Meetings Program Working Group and she took this really heavy lifting dealing with all those high interest topics and other really funny scheduling things. So Alejandra, if you have any comment on the process?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. I have the same troubles understanding the process because I do get the block schedule. We have to work around it. Okay, that's the rule, we can follow it, but when it comes to the high interest topics, we don't know who can vote for high interest topics as in one person per organization or AC or all the people that are involved in it? How many votes count per organization?

And also what trouble in this particular meeting is it that not all of the ACs and SOs were aware of the block scheduling in the first place and then they were trying to shift everything because they didn't consider it in the first place.

I really didn't understand why this happened. Did they not get informed? Because that happened to me at first, I was out of the loop for a while until I got back in and if this miscommunication would happen again then it will be an even bigger problem.

So as I can see, also in the meeting for Copenhagen, there is a slot for high interest topics in the format so I don't mind having them but just to have specific procedures on how to deal with them.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, not to do that in the last moment. Yes, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I agree with you that calling them high interest topic is not the right name we have to give them. There are topics of common interest of the community. Perhaps those who are chosen now are not but the experience of Helsinki was fruitful for me. I found it a good thing.

The whole community has interest in some topics, a common interest and we have to discuss them together. Not in silos but altogether. So I will not shoot the idea. It is a good idea. I will not call it a high interest topic, I will call it a common interest topic, and who chose them is the real point. I think that this is something that the community should agree on. Since it is a topic of common interest, the community should say what is the topic that is of common interest. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl's next then me then Sandra and then Seun.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I'm clearly biased on this matter. I think the concept of having topics of community interest is a very good thing. Those of you who've been around—[Bob] will be shaking his head shortly—as long as some of us will know we've tried this, I think, back to 2009—wasn't it [Bob]?—to get an afternoon

preferably the Monday where some mutually useful topics could be discussed.

So what we call it, don't care about but we have it in some way, shape or form. I do care about but I care deeply about the, "Oh, dear, this is on the record." How to find an Australian term that can go public.

Insert the dotted lines, performance of how it was managed certainly in this scheduling, I think it's essential that if we have to live with blocks that we know it well and truly in advance. And I have no problem with blocks but it's got to be an agreed process.

But I do think it's very important that the agreement on what such a topic or topics is comes from the AC and SOs. And there I don't mean just the leadership or Chairs. In whatever way they feel fit to delegate that, so in this case your job is clear Alejandra but Alan may choose to have it in some other way.

But I think we need to make sure that each of the component parts of the Empowered Community have the opportunity to agree on them. And then I really don't mind whether or not we have a few things put in competition with it but what I see out of this schedule is things where anyone with any sort of [nause] – I hope that goes into other languages as well. Any sort of deep thought process would think people who are interested in this

may very well be interested in this in an overlapping time. So I think we also need to move to smarter programming. It can only get better but I think we need to pursue.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. A couple of comments: I would think for the ccNSO, the situation is more interesting because so many of what were called high interest topics were focused on gTLD issues.

There are a number of issues of how they were selected this time. Number one, the question that was asked by staff and staff deciding the question was which of these sessions or subjects meet the criteria of general interest and they will be well organized talks.

They didn't actually ask the question which one do we want to hear. In my case, I went to my community and got input. In other cases, I don't know what people did. One of the potential problems was for some of the polls that staff did of the AC/SO leaders, it was one vote per AC/SO. In other cases, it was one vote for the AC/SO plus one vote for each GNSO stakeholder group or constituency, which meant they counted all of us and it was not consistently so. Life is interesting.

Next we have Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Alan. I just want to reflect on how the Meeting Strategy Working Group which I was part of came to this idea to have these community sessions and I indeed I recalled more community sessions and, I think, high interest topic might be a little bit misleading.

At the end the purpose is the same but I think we would be more clear to call them something else because we believe that it's of great importance that the communities actually more talking to each other so that we really have one day with no conflicting meeting so that we can all talk to each other sitting all in one room learning from each other.

I do remember the representative from the ccNSO—and I'm sorry I forgot his name—in this working group, in this Meeting Strategy Working Group, he was explaining that the ccNSO has a totally different type of schedule in terms of arrival, in terms of departure, in terms of what they are going to do during that meeting, and so on and so forth. So it might be challenging to find really or to identify sufficient topics where everyone says, "Yes, this is something I really want to talk about."

Still I think even if we're maybe not so much interested in this topic, I think it would be worthwhile for each stakeholder group, for each community to participate in these sessions just for the sake of learning what the others are considering important at

the moment, so to say. Even if for the ccNSO is over, for the ALAC we say, “Well, that’s actually nothing we’re dealing with,” or, “This is not so high on our agenda.” I think it would be a good thing if we just listened to what the others are discussing around us and where they see a problem with this and that. I think these sessions would be really important to elaborate.

How to choose the topics: Well, I think we need staff support to establish a process how to collect topics maybe do a poll or a vote or something. I think there are various opportunities of how to do this and maybe when the SO/AC Chairs are meeting regularly, they can discuss how to establish a procedure, how to find the right issues. Thank you.

SEUN ODEDEJI:

I just thought the last point Sandra just made about how to actually get which of the topics is of common interest amongst the entire SO/AC is simply a two-way thing. First, each of the SO/AC indicating what they feel is their own interest and then we do a poll. The second phase of doing a poll by all the SO/ACs, determining which of the ones will be the priority amongst the SO/AC.

From what I think was previously done is that I know Alan normally sends a mail to us asking for what are the topics. When the topics are sent, it looks like the staff normally determine

which one is common to the various SO/AC. But it should be good that that point it shouldn't be staff, it probably should be the same SO/AC that would now determine which one is more important.

The other thing is whenever there is a high interest topic to be discussed—I haven't checked the schedule yet. I don't know whether there are clashes so it may be good—it would really be helpful if there are no other sessions that are running at that time so that one can actually focus and be available for that particular high interest topic.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. It's good if you can go to a session and there is no conflict with other sessions but it's only if you're interested in that particular session. If you're not, it's really good to have some alternatives you can choose from.

I think in this case, it's totally agreed on the fact that it's really good to have a common interest topic when we can exchange information and talk about same topics and see different perspectives.

But talking about the process and process is really messy, to say the least, very messy. Of course, it's always good to consult your community but if for example you get a request to submit, for

example, your high interest topics by yesterday, it's quite tricky. It's not so easy to collect feedback from your community.

SO/AC Chairs need to work on the process and understand who participates and who makes decisions and when. Timeline is really important because one week before the meeting is not very helpful. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Thank you, Sandra, for reminding us what was the objective. I am sad that we didn't have an Implementation Working Group to take care of all that. I am sad to hear all you say about this meeting.

When the meeting started, we were hoping that it will be smooth running and maybe that cross-community interest topic will be of interest because we wanted to go outside of the silo and not spend the full week just with our colleagues but with other participants within ICANN. But I really feel that the implementation was not good. Thank you for the feedback.

ANNEBETH LANGE: I think that it's many aspects of this and the process is one thing that we can learn from how we did it and what was wrong and what we can make better.

We have worked for many years to get the different SOs and ACs and especially an AC that we all know out of their [realm] so to do that is a kind of a premium in itself.

We don't want to be silos, we have to work together. Later today when I went to the session between the GAC and the GNSO, they were talking about procedures in that working group, how to work better to get early input from the GAC into the PDPs that the GNSO had. And that is difficult. Of course it is, but one of the things at least you have to know what's going on and to force some of those sitting in their own silos all the time out, that is important and to listen to each other.

And I think that the session we had about country and territory names and geographical names in Helsinki went very well and I think it's given some development in some of the areas and a lot of the people that didn't know anything about it from before, they got more interested.

So it's absolutely a thing that we should do but perhaps not too many at the same time. I agree with those saying that it's not necessarily high interest. Isn't all we're doing high interest topics? It should be something that's a really common interest that we are interested in at the time and that we need to hear what the other communities mean about it before it's too late.

So I'm for it but I think we should have a better process. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Annebeth. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. I understand that the idea is not bad. Everyone agrees on it. Two problems: First, the process and I fully agree. The second, what Sandra and Sébastien said, we had new rules, for example, for the meetings but we didn't have implementation work.

I proposed when we finish our work at MSWG for the staff at least do a survey so that people tell you how they understand it, how they want it to be implemented. They said, "No," so the best is to have Working Group on Implementation but if they don't want or if it is not possible, at least do a survey. Listen to people. They didn't do so. I think this is the origin of the problem. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Now I'll give the floor to myself. Actually there's one risk that I see and that worries me. If your SO/AC comes up with an idea for a high interest topic, you are the one

who is responsible for organizing it and I'm afraid that this is the best way to kill any initiative.

I already promised my colleagues I will never, never come up with another idea on a high interest topic. It's really if you're topic is selected, you have to figure out how to do that. If it's one, two topics it's fine but if you come up with more topics, I'm afraid that's a risk. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We'll go to Cheryl next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I appreciate that. Thank you for making that point, Katrina, because it's actually a point not only did I make but we discussed in the very small but very—it was a good discussion with a small number of people in the meeting earlier today on how this Strategic Plan.5.0.2 on accountability, transparency, etc., could be operating.

One of the things we were looking at is the value of perhaps bringing some of that—of general interest of accountability and transparency into our interest topics and staff were saying, “But we're not allowed to just make them. The community has to make them.” And then the point was made, “And if you make them, you've got to run them so who would want to?” And so I

think it's a good time to raise that perhaps very formally and if we're talking about community-wide interest, then sharing the pain with other parts of the community seems perfectly reasonable. But it's timely because there was that discussion happening earlier today.

ALAN GREENBERG:

At this point we actually have plenty of time first time this week that I can say we may have time in our session. A couple of things: although there were lots and lots and of problems at this point, some of them I hope will not be repeated.

The concept of how many high interest topics and where they were going to be scattered was influx until just about two or three weeks ago, which was just ridiculous.

The situation was made much worse because very, very late in the process, and again about three weeks ago, the GNSO realized that they had completely ignored the block schedule that had been sent to them, had scheduled their constituency day on what would have been a Tuesday in a normal week, even though it was very clear on the block schedule it was scattered over two days in the morning. In the morning is giving them more hours and suddenly they were asking to reschedule the whole day therefore a whole week because of that and it took about two weeks to decide, "No, we weren't going to do that."

But the rest of us were sitting not knowing what to do at that point and even when the high end interest topics were locked in and the times were locked in, we weren't told where each one was so we didn't know which ones we were going to schedule against and which ones we weren't.

So hopefully just process on these purely on the staff side would be a lot cleaner this time and hopefully we'll get everyone to actually look at the block schedule we send out, not just assume it was the same as last year. So if we clean up those things, the process becomes a lot nicer.

We still have the issue of how many of them are there? Can you schedule against them? I think it would be hard to find seven or eight subjects that are truly of interest to everyone. Now maybe we should force you to sit through some GNSO topics that have nothing to do with you just so you have sympathy for the rest of us, but I'm not sure that's really productive use of your time. So I think we have to come to a common ground and, yes, we should decide ahead of time how we're going to make the decisions not decide it on the fly where the decision has to be made tomorrow.

I'm told the scheduling for Copenhagen has already started and maybe it'll be a bit early. But then the negative side of that is they may tell us we have to lock in all of our sessions three

months before the meeting and we're not prepared to do that. The world changes too much.

So it's going to be a challenge. I don't think we can fix that. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. First of all, I hope that somebody is taking notes of that or if not, we say to the meetings staff that they need to listen to the recording of this part. I think it's really very important all what you say and it needs to be taken into account and not lost. Because if it's just we talk together, that's great but that's not very useful. That's not useful enough, sorry.

The second point is Annebeth I agree with you. My comments after Helsinki were, "Hey, it was great." High interest topic of the cross-community topics were in the room of the GAC and therefore they were there and a lot of them stayed, because one of the problems is that they don't come to another room. I don't know why but if we come to their room, they stay and they participate in the discussion and it was quite illuminating for me then why we don't give them the large room and we go to them for the "high interest topics" as the common topics. It's just crazy but it's a good way to have them [in bulk].

And I really think that if you think that there are too many high interest topics, we need also to discuss if there are other ways to do something together. It's not just high interest topic. High interest topic or whatever as a name was to allow discussion without speaking to the Board. We're speaking amongst us as we're doing here but with all the stakeholders.

Maybe there are other things we want to do together and I am not coming with any idea on that but really maybe we need a small group to think about that. I don't know but it's important that we keep some places to be together not just by silo. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. French people say [inaudible], which means that if you want to kill your dog, you have to accuse him of an illness of dogs that makes them crazy and very dangerous.

If we start early, things will change. If we start late, we will not have time. We want it. That's all.

In the NSWG, I was one of those who pushed very hard for it. I believe in it and I think it is a very good thing for the community

to work together and I am sure that there are topics that are interesting for all the community or at least for the majority of the community. Of course, you will find people who are not interested, but if not, it's not very important since the majority of the community are interested.

I think that we have to be more productive, more positive and I am sure that we can find middle ground for everything to have those sessions. We will not call them high interest, we can call them whatever you want but topics that are interesting for the community and that we can discuss together because we need to discuss together. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

This week is going to be interesting because we're talking about how the process went for selecting the high interest topics. We haven't actually had any yet and it remains to be seen.

One of the challenges we have is we say the high interest topics should be not just someone lecturing us from the front of the room but a discussion, yet if we are very successful at finding a high interest topic that everyone wants to talk about, then we have 2,000 people in the room and that speaker list queue is going to really long but the bottom-line is only very few people ever get to speak.

So we're going to have to find a middle way to do these kinds of things that are both useful for achieving our purposes including breaking silos and making sure people are productively using their time. We're traveling very far at very great expense, both money and our time and we want to make sure that time is used effectively for many of us.

We've actually run out of the speaker queue?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Apparently, and we have seven minutes to go. We could actually break early. It's nothing we have ever done before. I'm not sure we would know what to do with the extra seven minutes but I don't see anyone speaking and I'll turn it over—oh, sorry. Annebeth will speak for seven minutes now.

ANNEBETH LANGE: No, no, but I remember one of the meetings we had, I don't remember where but we had a big room and a square like this and then some speakers from all constituencies together and a very, very funny and intelligent moderator and then all the people around with green cards and yellow cards.

We got the temperature in the room but it was not the public speaking and I didn't have to go to the mic but we felt the temperature and that was really quite fun. So you support that, Chair?

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought that was a lot of fun too. The overall reaction, I think, however was, "Don't ever do that again." I'm not quite sure why. Maybe Cheryl remembers. She was more in the group. Yes, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll speak after Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's exactly one of the major wordings of Meetings Strategy Working Group to organize those types of sessions and we get the answer off staff it's difficult to make a square in the middle of the room, to have everybody around, and so on and so forth. But never give up.

It was a good way and maybe we don't need to do all the same type of meetings, all the same type of organization of the room. We had also had some meeting where we split the participants in subgroups and we came back to discuss. I have the

impression that we just have this type of the U-shape or a big room as a classroom and we don't have the possibility to try other things.

I know it could be difficult for the meeting staff to organize but I am sure we need within this organization. We need some flexibility and some fun. Thank you. And that's what was fun in Sydney, the overall meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may, I believe the idea, which many of us enjoyed, and the AC/SO Chairs were supportive of and designed that was probably a good idea at the wrong time. There were a number of entrenched concerns and fears and considerations that people hadn't had enough time at that stage to digest.

We are an entirely different ICANN now. We are an Empowered Community. We're a post transition. We're all sorts of things. We are Cross-Community Working Groups beyond what then was the only one which is the Fast Track for ccTLD IDNs.

So I think that good ideas can be resuscitated from time to time and in terms of the logistics, with the video equipment and everything else, I think that we can manage in whatever shape room. Remember we're talking big rooms here for high interest or community interest topics. We will find a way to engage with

community effectively if we give it a good enough go and I think I'm hearing we should be giving it a good enough go.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's coming back to me now, and, Cheryl, confirm if I'm remembering right or maybe I dreamt it. I believe the negative reactions to it were whatever the subjects were at the time, it was perceived by some that if there were more reds than green, we had taken a vote and that that was not a well-designed way to take a vote of the community and make formal decisions based on it and therefore we will never do that again. That's what I'm remembering now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan it's not as clear as that. There were a number of people who were concerned about that and we learned through IANA transition and Work Stream 1 Accountability that there are great sensibilities in parts of our various communities about a vote as opposed to whatever else.

But ccNSO Council is comfortable with colored cards because they use it as indicators as well as tools in their work space. It's an odd thing for some communities. Not an odd thing for others. We can do it electronically. We can do it in a million ways but we have community that has gone through the fires of discussion

now on what we mean by temperature taking and what we mean by polling and what we mean by other things and we can capitalize on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: We've managed to get down to only three minutes left. Anyone? I'll turn it over to Katrina for our final sayonara.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much and I can truthfully say that at least for me this has been a very interesting discussion. So thank you very much for having us here, allocating a lot of time, enough time for all agenda items to be properly discussed and covered.

Thank you very much and looking forward to seeing you later this meeting. You're always welcome to participate in ccNSO meetings and of course please do not forget to come to high interest topics organized by the ccNSO. And though there are two of them, it's an outreach.

Also thanks to Cheryl and Sandra for helping us out to organize it. Another is on transparency of the legal advice given to ICANN. I'm sure at least these two will be very interesting topics. So thank you very much and see you.

ALAN GREENBERG: By the way that's no longer a high interest topic. That is now questions and answers with ICANN Legal Counsel. Thank you very much to the At-Large staff for managing this. Thank you very much the ccNSO for coming to join us. Thank you for our tech team and thank you very much for the interpreters. We've put you through horrible stuff. You get a whole minute off now. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]