

---

HYDERABAD – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and ccNSO  
Monday, November 07, 2016 – 08:30 to 09:30 IST  
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Good morning, everybody. This is the meeting of the ccNSO and the board. We're in a Steveless situation at the moment. I'm sure he'll arrive soon, but given that we only have the time we have, I thought we'd get started.

I'm guessing everybody knows who everybody is, so unless there's a reason to, I don't think we need to do a set of introductions. This is your meeting.

Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Chris.

Good morning, everyone. It's a pleasure to be here for another one-hour long discussion, and I don't know how we're going to proceed because -- well, maybe we could start by addressing your questions. Or we can start with ours, of course.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Whichever you want.

---

*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.*

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Then we'll start with our questions, because --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's probably much more sensible, yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI: -- they will take -- might take quite some time. Yes.

So the first question we raised -- and we informed you accordingly beforehand, so you had time to prepare for that. Well, the first question we wanted to discuss with the board is about location for ICANN meetings. And here I would like to ask my colleague from the council, Debbie, who will elaborate a little bit more on our position.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Thanks, Katrina.

Hi, Debbie Monahan, .NZ, ccNSO council. I'd like to understand more about the process and decision-making around selecting locations for ICANN meetings. Health and safety of delegates is an important aspect that should be considered, and I note that the meeting selection criteria states the meeting location must provide a safe and secure environment for all meeting attendees.

---

Abu Dhabi as a meeting location raises concerns for me, as a woman traveling alone. This is not from a cultural aspect, but rather, than from a personal safety position. Travel advisories from a number of countries highlight safety issues, particularly for women travelers. These include not walking alone and also around risks of taking a taxi alone. Attending ICANN meetings is part of my role. I want to perform all aspects of my role well, but I also need to take into account my personal safety and comfort when deciding whether to attend a meeting.

I'd be interested to know how ICANN made the decision to select Abu Dhabi as a location over other places in the region that do not have the same level of advisories for my safety as a woman delegate.

On another point, this year has seen two meetings moved from their original locations due to health concerns over the Zika virus, with the move not just being to a different country but to different regions over those originally planned.

The move to Hyderabad raised questions as to how it was selected, especially given the complex visa process that travel to India involved.

For many years, we've heard from citizens of countries in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia over the difficulty in obtaining visas for ICANN meetings. For the first time, those of us from other

---

countries have had similar experiences, and I hope this is finally going to lead to some action to address this issue.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Debbie. Can we split that into two discussions? There's the visa issue and then there's the first one.

Does -- Nick -- Nick, would you like to come up -- if you wouldn't mind coming up, that would be cool.

Goran, are you going to --

KATRINA SATAKI: Actually, yeah, well, of course it would be nice --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Come to the table, Nick.

KATRINA SATAKI: But maybe the board wouldn't mind to --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, I'd like Nick to explain something first --

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Okay.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: -- and then the board can respond to.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just come here, Nick. Okay. Cool.

Do you want to just start -- just address the -- or start to talk about the Abu Dhabi -- choice of Abu Dhabi and the issues around that and then we can have a discussion?

I just thought it would be useful to have you talk about, you know, why we chose Abu Dhabi and how -- what we -- what we used as the criteria.

NICK TOMASSO: Sure. Thank you. I'd be happy to make a few comments about Abu Dhabi.

First comment is that the TRA in the UAE submitted a proposal to host us in Abu Dhabi, which is one of the criteria that we use in selecting locations.

---

They actually offered to host us in Dubai, but we did not find the Dubai facilities to be conducive.

So as we looked at Abu Dhabi, we looked at safety and security in general, and considering how we do risk analysis and risk mitigation, we feel that we provide a -- a safe environment or cocoon, if you will, for our delegates from transportation in from the airport to make sure people get in the right transportation, to safe, quality hotels, to a convention center that is conducive to running our meetings.

So the choice of Abu Dhabi was made on those criteria, and perhaps the most important one is we have never held a meeting in the Middle East before, so it was -- we decided as a team to bring the meeting to the Middle East.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

So just to -- thanks, Nick.

Just to make it clear to everybody, in general terms there -- first of all, there is a meeting criteria policy and I -- it's published on the Web site. I'm not sure where, but it's there.

Secondly, this is a meeting -- choice of meeting venue is actually a staff function and an ICANN organizational function and an ICANN org decision, not a board decision, although the board is asked to endorse the budget that it might be.

---

Nick, I think, has set out that we do take into account all the things that you've -- you've asked for or you've -- you've mentioned, and I acknowledge that you have an issue -- you think there's an issue with Abu Dhabi. I acknowledge that.

So what else -- on that particular topic, as opposed to the Hyderabad visa project, let's have a -- let's have a dialogue. So what do you -- what else do you want to ask and what do you want to know?

DEBBIE MONAHAN:

So from what you said, Nick, as long as I arrive in Abu Dhabi, get picked up by transport, get taken to the venue, and stay in the hotel and then go home again, everything is safe and secure, and I'll accept that. But I also think a part of an ICANN meeting is the social aspect, the going out, the having the dinners, and then being able to walk back after a couple of drinks, or whatever, and actually go back to your hotel.

So it's that whole sense of the social side and the linkage, and actually being able to get out and see more than just the hotel and the conference venue.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Sally?

---

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Debbie. Thanks for the question. I think it's a good one.

One of the things that we just -- and I know this a question about where we pick city-wise, as opposed to region-wise comes up quite regularly, and there's just a couple of things I wanted to say.

As you probably know, the meeting -- there is no community policy at the moment about the basis on which we should select a city. There is -- the rotation model is in the meeting strategy working group's policy. It is now policy about how we run meetings, which was, as you know, a two-year process, community-wide, bottom-up, very much examined by the board, public comment, the whole process.

Now, had the community wanted to review that at the time, I guess that could have happened, but it chose not to. So there is -- that's just something to think about. And depending on, you know, how the future rolls out, that -- you know, potentially that could change. That's up to the community to decide. If it wants to change the policy, then it obviously can do that, and there's a process to do that.



---

The reason I mention that is partly to just remind people that that is, in fact, the case, because I think there is quite a lot of confusion about this point.

So staff are directed to find a location within a region and within the regional rotational model, and they discuss that with the board and they evaluate it on the basis that Nick's described and which we've published.

One of the things that -- the other thing we have to factor in, which is why I'm saying, you know, the community might want to think about whether it wants to change the policy, is the world -- you know, the world is getting to be an increasingly complex place and specifically the issue you're describing here of, you know, personal security and so forth, you know, it's -- it can be -- you know, in many cities in the world, for different reasons, it can be challenging.

So that's -- that's just -- I just wanted to put that thought out there because I do understand that people feel strongly about not just Abu Dhabi, but many -- lots of different people feel strongly about almost everywhere we go.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Okay. Yeah, I mean, Cherine's up next but just before that, I -- I -- Bruce is -- Bruce and I will both probably say to you that if you

---

were in Melbourne, if you -- if you're out at night, you probably -- we'd -- you know, we'd suggest to you that you don't get in a taxi unless you booked it.

So I'm not suggesting that that -- I'm not -- that's not an excuse. I'm just saying I think there are issues pretty much everywhere that you go. Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY:

Yes. So I was chairman of an investment bank in Dubai for about seven years and I traveled a lot to Abu Dhabi, so let me just give you a perspective on the social life.

In both of these two places, the local community is very, very small. We're talking about maybe a hundred thousand people to a hundred thousand people [sic], whereas the majority are foreign community which could go up to two million in each case.

So these two hubs are -- the model there is to attract an international business community that settles there and lives in a very open international manner.

So the only thing you just have to is follow some local customs, but other than that, I think you'll find it very open, international, and you will enjoy the social life there very much, I would say, whether you want to go to the beach or go to the souk or have

---

dinner somewhere and then go back to your hotel or go to a play or attend a concert. It's a very, very international place.

The only thing we have to watch is not to fall on the months -- their holy months of Ramadan, because they put restriction on certain behaviors, but I don't think that meeting falls in the middle of Ramadan. Other than that, you should be fine, frankly.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And after that message from the Abu Dhabi tourist board...

[ Laughter ]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: The question was about social, socializing, so –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: You're absolutely right.

Debbie, do you want to come back on anything? Does anybody else want to say anything? Let's just not make this about Debbie.

---

(Off microphone.)

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Not just about Debbie.

[ Laughter ]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So do you want -- let's just move on -- I know we need to make sure get -- have enough time for everything, but just to move on to the visa thing, what are you looking for from us in respect to that? Just a comment or...

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Well, I think, I mean, it's the comment that many from other regions actually raised in the past visas, and I know it's an ongoing issue and I think it did come to the fore to India because all of a sudden a whole lot more people were impacted by that --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.

---

DEBBIE MONAHAN: -- and I think it was just all of a sudden Hyderabad just appeared and then the complexities of the Indian visa process were rather interesting.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And also the fact that we shifted the meetings, so yes.

So I just want to say something about visas. Having spent two years -- I think it was two years, Sally, I've lost all track of time -- two years in the meeting strategy working group, it would be extraordinary if I was to sit here and say, "Yes, it's -- we shouldn't -- we should never come to a place that has a visa," because the stance that we took in the meeting strategy working group was it's important, it's -- obviously you're not going to go somewhere where it's impossible for a whole -- impossible for a whole group of ICANN community to go to. You know, everyone from -- from Australia or the U.K. is banned from going to this place. Obviously we wouldn't go there.

But if -- if it's a visa situation, you need a visa, that shouldn't be a barrier.

We acknowledge that it's complicated for some people -- more complicated for some than others. For some it's always complicated. For some of us we're lucky it's not. But I think we -  
- I think to be fair to everybody, I think ICANN org put in an

---

extraordinary amount of work and effort to help people with their -- with their visas. I know it didn't go smoothly for everybody, but I think, you know, a lot of effort was made to make it as easy as possible in the circumstances.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Well, thank you very much. Thank you for addressing our concerns. Probably just one more comment. We at the ccNSO council, during our meeting -- prep meeting, we discussed the possibility to opt out from Abu Dhabi meeting. Thank you.

So the next agenda item we have, that's about the use of country and territory names in future gTLD rounds, that's about a working group -- cross-community working group on these issues, and I would like to ask Annabeth, who is our co-chair on this cross-community working group to give an update and raise some issues. Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANG:

Good morning, everybody. Annabeth Lang here, .NO, and a co-chair in the cross-community working group for how to use country and territory names in the future rounds.

I've been co-chairing this with CC -- GNSO -- two from GNSO, and one more from ccNSO. He's not here now.

---

What we started out with was a study group after the first round. So we had a study group preparing for this working group, and their recommendations was to establish a working group, cross-community, to find out what we should do in the future, with the representations based on ISO 3166.

Only on the first level, what we should do was to review an existing framework, and we started with the AGB Model 2, 2.2.14 that we ended up with in the first round. That was a certain amount of protection, and in this protection, then ISO 3166 was taken out for this round. But it was only for this round and then it was decided that we should try to find out for the next round what to do.

Could we develop a deficient -- a definitional framework for all stakeholders that they could agree on, and if that would be the impossible, we should provide detailed advice as to the content of the framework.

We have had teleconferences very often. We have had face-to-face meetings at all the ICANN meetings, and it's important to see that this is not a PDP. It's only a help to reach consensus if we possibly could do that and give advice to further treatments.

So it's -- where we started then with two-letter strings, we should discuss three-letter strings and then country and

---

territory names in long form and short form, Latin letters, and IDN.

The two-letter strings seem to be the easiest one, and we reached a preliminary recommendation, and it's finished in the working group for now. We ended up with that so far the working group recommends that the existing ICANN policy of reserving two-letter codes for ccTLDs should be maintained and that is not only those in the ISO list 3166 now but all two-letter combinations because the reliance of this policy is consistent with RFC-1591 and it's a standard established and maintained independently of and external to ICANN. It's not ICANN deciding what is a country and what is not. So it's widely adopted in context outside of the DNS. It would be quite sad if a new country were established -- and in this world that's not -- well, we'll see what happened in the world. There could easily be new countries in the future. They should have their two-letter combination as well.

But then we went on to discuss three-letter strings, and that seemed to be much more difficult. And that's not surprising because traditionally it had been two-letter codes for ccTLDs and three letters and more will be the rest for gTLDs.

So what have we done so far? We have developed options. We have engaged the community through a questionnaire. We have



---

analyzed the results. And where do we stand now? The responses revealed huge differences in opinion, extremes on both sides. GNSO responses allow everything, no restrictions, all three-letter combinations on ISO 3166 or not should be allowed as gTLDs. ccTLD and GAC responses, very diversified.

What the discussions have shown is also that the lines between the differences is not only between the stakeholder groups but also within the stakeholder groups.

So we sent out a lot of questions to the community. But I won't go into detail here, because what we ended up with was that it was three camps, in a way, that the one camp said no more future three-letter gTLDs, only three-letter ccTLDs based on ISO 3166-1; and, two, to maintain the status quo, the applicant guidebook as it is today. And the third option, open all three-letter codes including ISO 3166 list as gTLDs.

So is it possible to find a compromise? So far we have found that actually we can't find a compromise. We have not ended up with a common framework that all can agree on. So what we have decided now in the working group meeting we had yesterday -- no -- the day before, that both groups will send it back to the chartering organizations after first having sent out the interim report for publication and comments.

---

And then it will be up to the different chartering organizations to decide what to do in the future.

And it's obvious for me that the Gs are not what they were. In the beginning when we started this, a generic name was a generic name but now it's much more than that and that has created problems. We know that from the last round with the brands, that's not exactly a generic term. It creates special problems. And, also, we see in the community here a lot of discussions of geographic names, not only the content territory names but also what's going on in the GAC about all the other geographic controls, terms.

So then what will happen now? Will it all be treated in the GNSO PDP for subsequent rounds? Or should -- what we know is that these names are of huge interest for other stakeholder groups as well.

So I think it's important for the board to really note that it's not as easy as it was before, that everything that is not a ccTLD don't have interest for other communities.

I think I will stop there. And if you have questions, I'm happy to ask -- to answer them.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Annebeth.

---

Can I, just so I'm clear, you think where you've got to is that in respect to two letters, they're obviously reserved for ccTLDs and that any two-letter combination is protected and you think there's pretty much consensus around that.

ANNEBETH LANGE: At least I will say it's a preliminary consensus. Actually, in the working group yesterday, Heather Forrest opened up for new discussion of the two-letter codes. But I really think that at least those two letters that's out there and that has also to do with confusion because we are used to having CCs as two-letter codes. So that would be really confusing.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, okay. So then if I go -- if I leap to the other end of the scale, that's the actual names. Those would be allowed but presumably under the control of the government or the ccTLD manager of a territory. There's also consensus on that presumably.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. So what we're really talking about is the three-letter --

---

ANNEBETH LANGE: three-letter. And then since we didn't arrive to a common framework on three letters, we saw that going on to discuss short form and long form of country names that would create even more trouble.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Right.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Because then there the IDN question will be even more present. It's about the meaningful representation. There will be a lot of overlap. So this is a really very difficult area.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. You're not actually -- this is a briefing for us, but do we have any questions? Is that right? Because you haven't come to -- we have nothing to operate off of right now, right?

ANNEBETH LANGE: No. I think it's difficult to pose a question on this because then you have to think through is it -- it's still in the bylaws that everything that's not a CC should be a GNSO area. And that's what create problems.

---

So what we hope this time is to avoid what happened last time, that we had something presented, the board accepted it, and then we had three years, four years of discussion. So it's very important now for the board to know that this is a controversial area. And if we could do it some other way to get in these meanings from the other stakeholder groups instead of -- the GNSO are saying that we can attend their working group. But we know -- we are welcome, but we know in the end it will be the GNSO Council that decides what will be in that policy.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I'm just going to ask for questions or comments.

So, Becky, you're first. Anyone else wants to make a question or comment, let me know.

Becky, go ahead.

BECKY BURR:

You mentioned there seem to be a lot of diverse groups even within the stakeholder groups. Do you think it would be -- I mean, at some level, that means there's going to be a serious discussion about this.

---

But do you think that there could be a ccNSO position on this, or is there so much diversity even within the ccNSO that that couldn't be?

ANNEBETH LANGE:

My impression so far is that you couldn't say that it's all three options in these groups. It's more like what I know from the GAC so far, is that they have two alternatives: Reserve everything as it is today, status quo. Or if it's open, it should be the same way as for capitals and cities to have support and non-objection. These are the two views I have so far got from the GAC.

As for the ccNSO, I know that a lot of CCs actually want to have the three-letter code open but for under certain conditions because they have problems with their two-letter codes CC and want to do it better with the three-letter code but representing the country, not as a G -- the ordinary gTLD.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I have a couple of suggestions. But any other questions before I -  
- Okay.

So three things, I think. One, you could -- understanding that this is a cross-community working group, so you could produce a document that explains to us and to the rest of the community

---

where the -- what the issues are and where the disagreements lie, and I think that would be very helpful.

In respect to the two-letter codes, there is nothing whatsoever from stopping the ccNSO from holding its own PDP to -- in respect to two-letter codes and to come to a conclusion about what should happen in respect to two-letter codes.

It's -- two letters are quite clearly currently within the purview of the ccTLDs, the ISO list. We all know the ISO list exists and gets expanded when new countries come along. So something from the ccNSO around the protection of future two letters for ccTLDs is well within the purview of the ccNSO, in my view.

In respect to the three-letter country codes or three letter representations of countries, I can see the challenges. They are not dissimilar to the challenges with the IGO acronym list, which is some of those -- far more of those three-letter codes would be actual -- could be actual words than they are with two-letter codes, so there are challenges there.

But I would argue that if you can find ways of representing -- if you can find ways of tying them back to representations of territory, then whilst I don't think you could do the same as you do with two-letter codes, I think you could -- you do have a right to be involved in that. And I would argue -- I'm talking personally here obviously. I would argue that a joint -- if you

---

want to get to a firm position, that you would have a stance to say it should be a joint PDP in respect to those three letters rather than in the GNSO with the ccNSO's input.

As for country names, I think that's different. I think that's in purview of governments and that's for them to decide. So that's my personal view.

Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: And while you're at it, you might take a shot at trying to anticipate confusability with Greek and Russian versions.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, I deliberately decided that wasn't -- but, yeah. We didn't even talk about the IDNs, which is even more complicated.

Anyone else want to say anything before we move on?

Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. And thank you, Annebeth, for delivering our views on this.

So, the last issue that was brought by the ccNSO is about the work of the EPSRP working group. As you may remember, you,



---

the board, requested the ccNSO to provide guidance on very specific issues following this the third review of fast-track process. So the request was to consult community and in particular the GAC and SSAC on these issues.

With that, I will give the floor to Giovanni Seppia who is the chair of working group.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Katrina. This is Giovanni Seppia, chair of the working group of the ccNSO on the refinement of the extended process similarity review panel guidelines. So it's EPSRP just in case we are missing some shorts today.

So just to -- for those of you -- and I apologize in advance to my ccNSO colleagues because I believe this is the third time in two days they hear this. So it's like a lullaby, bedtime story, of these past two days.

So what is the EPSRP? Back in 2012, the -- in one of the reviews of the IDN ccTLD fast-track process, the community thought that it was necessary to foresee an appeal process for those IDN ccTLD strings applied for that were not approved by the DNS and security and stability panel. That is one of the panels that are involved in the approval process of IDN ccTLD strings.

---

And, therefore, the outcome of that review process was the setting up of a panel made of linguist experts who were supposed and are supposed to provide a more scientific background to confusing similarity.

And as I said yesterday, I think during the GAC meeting and also during other meetings, I didn't know anything about confusing similarity. And I had developed this skill to know anything about confusing similarity and how, you know, I may confuse things when I wake up, when I go to bed because there is a process between our eyes and our brain. And it works differently when a human being is exposed to different factors. So there is a real science behind this.

So there was the creation, as I said, of this EPSRP panel that started to be operational in late 2014. And there were three strings that request for being reviewed, re-assessed. And what happened is that at the end of the reassessment of the three strings, the panel came up with an issue for one of the strings because according to their test, again quite scientific test, the string was looking at confusingly similar -- possibly confusingly similarity with other ISO strings in the uppercase but not in the lowercase.

---

So in this case, this linguist panel was not able to make a decision because of these split results of this quite scientific assessment.

So what happened is, as Katrina was saying, that there was a request to be provided further guidance because the guidelines that the panel was following were not addressed in this issue. So in June 2015, the ICANN board requested the ccNSO to start the process with other actors of the community including the GAC and SSAC to refine the guidelines and address the interpretation of split recommendation.

So in mid 2015, there was a working group which was created by the ccNSO and the working group included four ccTLD representatives, and two GAC representatives participated very proactively in the work of the working group. There was also one ICANN expert that was appointed by ICANN to follow the work of the working group. The working group met once during the Marrakech meeting. But most of the work was done via conference calls and email exchanges.

The working group discussed a lot the confusingly similarities issues in the top-level domain environment. And we decided that it would have been preferable to have a small refinement of the guidelines because we thought the guidelines were okay

---

apart from these case of confusing similarity against upper or lowercase.

But for the rest, we thought the guidelines were fine. And for the rest of the thoughts, considerations that we went through, we decided to collect all these thoughts in a separate document that we submitted as well to the ccNSO Council. So the work of this working group finished at the end of September with a submission to the ccNSO Council of two documents. One is a proposal for refining the guidelines, and one is a set of recommendations.

And concerning the guidelines, the working group reiterated importance of ensuring always the security and stability of the DNS. The working group reiterated that possible mitigation measures to avoid confusing similarity should be decided by the ccTLD manager and that in case of split outcome of the assessment that the possible confusingly similarity with the lowercase should prevail against similarity with the uppercase.

At the same time, as I said, the working group provided the ccNSO council with another document which includes several recommendations, the main one being that what we have seen is that in the current TLD policies decided by ICANN and our community, there are different approaches to confusing similarity and therefore the main recommendation to ICANN and

---

to this community and to all of us is to try to work together in the future to ensure that confusing similarity is treated the same no matter if there is a ccTLD, gTLDs, IDN ccTLDs because at the end the end users are the same.

So again, we submitted those two documents. The documents received the support of ALAC, the support of GAC, and also a statement of VeriSign that was also underlining the need to ensure consistency of confusingly similar approach in the TLD space. And then we also received a comment -- well, it was not again a comment by -- directly to us but it's SSAC advice to the board, the ICANN board, saying that the recommendation of the working group should be basically rejected. And this is what we have done so far.

KATRINA SATAKI:

So thank you very much, Giovanni. You were right, I almost fell to sleep.

[ Laughter ]

So thank you very much. So thank you for this update. I just wanted to add some more news to inform the board that we have -- so it wasn't yesterday -- the day before yesterday we had a meeting with SSAC and we exchanged our views on the advice they provided and we also tried to explain our position and our

---

understanding of the work we were supposed to deliver. Yeah. And the outcome is that they will provide -- they will review our comments and will provide more input to them within four weeks.

(Off microphone).

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, four.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks very much, Katrina. There was a meeting the other day, Ram and I went along with Patrik and SSAC people and Katrina and ccNSO people to try and figure out a way through. So I suppose the situation, Katrina, is that you -- you can wait a few weeks to see what the SSAC says and then either you -- it's sorted out and an understanding is reached we get a report from the recommendation from you, which we'd asked for, endorsed by a number of the other SOs and ACs in ICANN about whether an objection from SSAC, is that basically correct?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Today have a ccNSO council meeting and during this meeting we will decide first whether we close the working group, most probably we will close the working group, and we'll see

---

what we do with -- Bart disagrees because he's working on resolutions at the moment, draft resolutions, but we're going to discuss it today during the meeting.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So from my personal point of view, I would request and encourage you to allow a little bit more time, if you can, and not put the report forward today but let the SSAC consider again, which it's undertaken to do and come back. If that hasn't -- if nothing changes, well nothing changes and two weeks are gone. But if something significant changes, it may well make the path resolution to this a lot easier. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Chris, for this advice.  
  
(Off microphone).

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Not advice. More of a plea.

KATRINA SATAKI: Plea, okay. Thank you very much for the plea. We will consider it. Thank you.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. We have a little bit of time left, so would you like to move on to talk about the questions that we -- unless -- did anybody want to ask a question about the EPSRP that Katrina just -- nope? Okay. Giovanni thank you very much. You could say that with your eyes shut, that whole thing. You don't need to think about it. Thanks, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. So now you see in front of you the two questions the board asked -- I assume every SO/AC.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, just you.

KATRINA SATAKI: In that case, we're very pleased to answer them. Here I would like to ask my colleagues to help me. Byron, would you answer the first question?

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Katrina. Certainly. In terms of question number 1, I would like to say in part from my personal capacity also with Katrina on the ccNSO but also as a member of the CSC, I think thus far the experience has been relatively positive and the comments I'll make are within the context of ensuring a



---

successful outcome for item number 2, which is trust and transparency. The issues under item number 1 will only work effectively if we continue to build on and solidify trust and transparency between the organization and the community.

So within that construct, my comments regarding number 1 are making sure that each of these groups are adequately resourced. Without a doubt the members of the groups will be doing a fair amount of the heavy lifting, but we can only be effective if we have the support of ICANN the organization and the resources that ICANN can put towards the groups. And in the very early going, my dialogue with ICANN senior management about those resources has been very positive, and I think that speaks well of -- of the potential going forward. But I would say that is absolutely critical to each of these groups and certainly the CSC going forward.

One of the issues that I see potentially where ICANN can continue to help as well is in a sense the connective tissue between these discrete groups. We all have a function to play within a greater whole, but right now it's still a little bit unclear in the early days in terms of how each of these groups is going to interact with each other. And I would say it's important just to keep an eye on that and make sure that ICANN the organization is doing everything it can to facilitate and to foster that

---

connective tissue to enable the results to be achieved between all of these discrete groups.

So from -- again, from my perspective, it's very, very early days, particularly in the work of the CSC which has its first face-to-face meeting tomorrow morning which everyone's welcome to. But thus far, so far so good.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Byron.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Any other comments or questions?

STEVE CROCKER: Is there -- has the CSC formed an agenda or set of activities that it's going to plunge into?

BYRON HOLLAND: So as you well know, we came into official existence just on October 1. We had a first teleconference October 6 where some very early forming conversations were had. We -- the agenda for the meeting tomorrow is published, and certainly one of the key elements of that agenda is the work plan where we're looking -- where we'll be looking at what are the immediate, midterm, and longer term activities that are going to be required and really

---

talking about, you know, what's urgent versus important and unpacking those issues. So do we have a crisp work plan going forward? Not yet, but that's one of the key items for tomorrow's first face-to-face.

STEVE CROCKER: We've -- we've detoured off of ccNSO -- ccNSO issues, obviously, but it occurs to me that we probably don't yet have a natural slot in our meeting schedule, looking ahead, for interactions between the board and this new collection of activities. Might that be something that would be helpful in the collective tissue discussion?

BYRON HOLLAND: I think it would be. The meeting tomorrow morning was requested ad hoc and we found a space and a time, but, you know, clearly it was an ad hoc schedule. I think it's my sense that if we want to build the interaction and also continue to educate the broader community on where we're at and what's happening, it would certainly make -- your suggestion would make sense to me.

STEVE CROCKER: I can't make a specific commitment on the fly here, but certainly can take it up and think about it. I think it makes sense.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Steve. Thank you, Byron. I think it's probably a good thing that both Nick and Sally have left because they would probably be falling out with the thought they have to find yet another slot for yet another meeting. Anything else before we wrap up? Anyone, any comments in the floor? Any questions? Oh, I'm so sorry. Did I miss -- I apologize. Sorry.

KATRINA SATAKI: If you're not interested.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, I'm very interested. I'm sorry. Carry on.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Stephen, may I ask you to do a little bit of work?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: First, I'd like to preface my remarks by saying this is directed to the institution and not the individuals. The question I've been asked to address is what can the board and the ICANN organization have to do to make -- need to do to advance trust and confidence in what we do. I had a different answer to that question before I sat down here this morning, and I think we really need to address the pachyderm in the room. The short answer to this question is that ICANN the institution needs to

---

stop bullshitting the community. Clearly you have no regard for geographic rotation of the meeting. I heard that oh, we have to put this meeting here because we rotate. You pulled the meeting out of Panama, you insulted our colleagues from Latin America, you pulled a meeting out of North America, you cost a lot of money to the local host in doing so. Yet you have staff that comes up here and says we have to go to this location in the Middle East because we have to adhere to the geographic location. That's nonsense. That is absolute nonsense that you can come up here and say we have to do this because we have to adhere to geographic location when you only do so when it's to your convenience.

Next item is you label this as a meeting between the -- the ccTLD -- ccNSO and the board and yet where's the board? Our board members are here, but they know our issues.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry. Excuse me, Stephen, the board is all over there, sitting in the audience.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: How many?

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Pretty much all of them. Sitting in the audience watching. We don't generally sit up here together because that doesn't leave enough space for you to sit here. So those of us who chose to sit up here, we rotate. So, for example, when we meet with the ALAC after this, I won't be sitting up here, I'll be sitting down there. Somebody else will be sitting up here. So I can assure you that pretty much every member of the board is in this room right now.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I withdraw that remark then.

MIKE SILBER: And sorry to interject, Stephen. It might be worthwhile just introducing you to the new board members because I don't think we did that formally and I think that is a miss of us. If I could just interject for just a minute, Becky I think is well-known to you. Akinori on her left. Then we have Maarten Botterman is standing up. He didn't need to. We would have noticed him sitting down as well.

[ Laughter ]

I'm not sure who else is in the room. Kaveh, I think, is at an RSEP meeting.

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Lastly, and to my most important thought on this, is I really think the way Debbie's concerns were handled just now was rather poor. We have a fairly good female representation within our community, as evidenced by the people sitting up here, as evidenced by our chair, for example. These are -- our secretariat staff is -- we have two females on our staff, and just simply dismiss the concerns that Debbie expressed as oh, we have to do this for geographic rotation, that doesn't -- I'm not happy with that. I'm not comfortable with that at all. I really think you guys need to sit back and take a long look at this. I was curious as to why that meeting location showed up on the schedule as early as it did when meetings that were to occur before it were not locked in with regards to location. But I -- I just felt that it was a nice pat on the head to Debbie and oh, we'll just go and do this anyway. Think about what you're doing here. I mean, look at the -- the public forum was 90 minutes, beautiful clock management by the board. By the time everybody was done saying what they said and opened up the microphones, there was only 30 minutes left.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So Stephen, you know there's another public forum tomorrow morning, right?

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I know there's another public forum tomorrow and I'm sure VeriSign will step up and answer what Afiliias -- the unanswered question from that. But, you know, it's just -- I just don't get the sense that you guys understand the importance of leveling with this community and taking concerns, such as what Debbie expressed, seriously.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Let me respond specifically on the Debbie point, and then others might have something to say. Two things. So I'm sorry if you don't feel that that was a proper response or an embracing response. One thing I will take issue with is that actually Nick did not say we had to go to Abu Dhabi because of geographic rotation. What he actually said is, this is the first time we've ever had a meeting in the Middle East and we think that is a good thing. There is nothing -- the meetings policy clearly states, clearly states, and it was fought for tooth and nail in the Meeting Strategy Working Group by this community amongst others, against hubbing, we should not hub. We should -- we should move around and we should continue to maintain the geographic rotation that we do.

It is incredibly unfortunate that this -- in the last year we have had to move two meetings. It's -- no question, it's an awful thing to have happened and we're not comfortable about it and we're



---

not happy about it. And you and I and this whole community can argue backwards and forwards for days about whether it was the right decision or the wrong decision but it was a decision. And we moved the location for the reasons that you already know.

Now, that is -- all of that is simply for me to say, I want to make sure we've got the facts on the table. None of that addresses the point about whether or not the answer to Debbie was a satisfactory answer or not. I can't deal with that because I don't know what it is you would have us do. So if you could -- if you're prepared to just briefly say, rather than you guys need to get your act together and stop bullshitting, what is it you would have us actually do? Because I'm unclear about the -- the steps you would like us to take. Are you talking about specifics of the meeting where you say do not go to any location unless the following? Are you saying that we -- I mean, let me be clear, I have personally acknowledged to Debbie and I continue to do so, and I know everybody else does, the issue that she raised. I'm not dismissing it. It's a perfectly valid issue. So what is it you would have us do?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: With regards to this meeting schedule, don't have staff come up here and say oh, we have to adhere to geographic location when

---

clearly you don't. You do what's convenient. You ran away from Panama. I don't understand why. You ran away from Puerto Rico. I don't understand why. This has caused impact to our constituencies in those regions. Explain -- I guess the short answer is, explain what you're doing, because the -- the rationale for both of those meeting movements doesn't make any sense to me whatsoever.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: And it doesn't make sense to our community.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Now that we can correct from because that is a -- a piece of -- a feedback that we can use to say communicate better, explain what you're doing better. And I acknowledge that, and I accept that feedback personally and I'm sure that other board members would -- do too. Steve, your hand is up.

STEVE CROCKER: With respect to rotation and, quote, running away from Panama and running away from Puerto Rico, the decision process, if you will, is we try to adhere to the rotation. We take extremely

---

seriously, very, very seriously, a decision about undoing a prior decision about a commitment to go to a place. So changing the location away from Panama and changing the location away from Puerto Rico were very painful decisions. I can tell you from having sat through multiple years of comparable kinds of discussions that there are two kinds of threats that we are concerned about and have been concerned about over time. One are physical threats, terrorism and unrest sort of things and the other are health threats. I can also tell you that in a number of different cases we evaluated the physical threat, the terrorism or unrest, and said it's not so bad that we have to move. And other people criticized us and said, we can't send our people there and -- but it all worked out.

So there was a lot of judgment involved and a lot of care. In the case of the Zika virus and in the case of Morocco, same thing for Ebola the year previously, our evaluation came out the other way and we said, "We're responsible, ultimately, for the health and welfare of a couple thousand people in a contained environment and if there were to be an outbreak, the results would be quite severe and difficult to manage," and we made the decision the other way.

And so it wasn't just -- actually, it wasn't just Panama and it wasn't just Puerto Rico. It was also Morocco and there was a relatively heavy price of dissatisfaction and cost and so forth.

---

These are not lightly made and they are made as exceptions to the rotation. So the basic structure is just as we said. And further, as Chris emphasized, all of this went through a rather extensive meetings planning process working group, and we're trying to execute on that.

Now, I think we all understand that there could be differences in judgment and differences in what decisions that we might have made individually, and it's very, very hard. I'm happy to swap places with you and you can -- you can take the crap from everybody if you don't get it right to satisfy everybody. I'm not suggesting your position is crap, but I mean it's -- it comes -- it's just part of the cost of trying to make decisions and be sensible.

Another element, which I think is perfectly fair, is how well we communicate. We really do strive not to shovel bullshit, and apologize if it comes across that way. We try to be much more straightforward than that.

And I'll just say with respect to Abu Dhabi, I haven't been there. I've been to Dubai. It's a slightly different environment, but that's what you get from going around the world, but it's very safe and should be actually quite a pleasant experience, as opposed to a difficult one.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So thank you, Steve. We're running -- we're over time. However, I know Byron wants to say something but Andreas, you go first.

ANDREAS PIEZZA: Well, thank you very much, Chris, for allowing me to jump in this point.

The Latin American organization is not only -- the ccTLDs and organizations have already raised our voice on this matter. I believe ICANN has processed our concerns and has come with several meaningful responses. I believe next time there will be a more clear process. This is my -- at least my take after those discussions.

And I also want to acknowledge -- because we have been very loud on that and a little less loud on our take from the response from ICANN. There was a mitigation plan displayed and I really want to acknowledge that and to say that that was also helpful, and I'm sure in the next process, some other concerns will be more taken in account in order to take a meeting out for the original venue or I don't know how the process will be but I'm sure there will be more consideration.

So we are satisfied somehow with the response that ICANN gave us at the end, and that is fair to say here. Thanks.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. Two hopefully quick comments.

The first is just picking up on Debbie's statements, and I think, you know, to use a Canadian colloquialism, I'm skating out onto thin ice when I talk about these issues, the tension between cultural and gender issues, as a white, western, English-speaking male, but I'll dare to tread on the thin ice.

The board who gets to make the final decision on location really needs to take that in- -- take those issues into account, and seriously.

And I've worked with Nick and his team putting on the Toronto ICANN meeting. I know how complicated it is. There's a million moving parts, and the last thing they need to do is add another layer of complexity. I recognize that. They do a great job. But on this issue in particular, given that roughly half the ICANN community is female, I think that the board really needs to take it into account when they're making those final decisions. Both real or even perceived threats. And when you -- when you heard Debbie talk, I think it's important that we don't need to codify it in policy, right? Common sense surely does not need to be codified on an issue like this.

---

It's a filter. It's a lens through which this decision process should be viewed when it comes to the board, and I think that's all that my colleagues are asking and that I would support.

In terms of trust and transparency, this is an issue that could help build on trust and transparency, and I want to recognize some of the initial steps that the board is doing that I think you can do more of, and that -- for example, having some elements of the board meeting open.

The subject matter, I mean, it was a bit of a tepid first step, but I think it bears recognition. The fact that ICANN legal is going to be up on stage in a hot topic is another example of what can be done to build on those.

Those are first steps, but I would encourage you, as a broader principle -- and I'm sure this has been said before, but -- make everything open unless it needs to be closed instead of ICANN's more consistent behavior of making it closed and then occasionally open.

We all recognize that the board and management needs to have private conversations from time to time, and that's fine, but by and large, if we make everything open unless it needs to be closed, I think we'll significantly improve the trust and transparency that we're all looking for.

---

And I want to call out those two -- two issues about the open board meeting and about legal on stage and say: That's great. More of that would be very helpful.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Byron.

I think on that note, we're over time and we should wrap up. Last word goes to you, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Thank you very much for having us. Sorry that we run out of time. I'd say that the last part definitely didn't sound as a lullaby, and I think it really advances trust and confidence in what we do. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**