
JOHANNESBURG – ccNSO Members Day 2 (part 1)

Wednesday, June 28, 2017 – 09:00 to 10:15 JNB

ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

KATRINA SATAKI: Good morning. Hello. Good morning, everyone. I'm pretty happy to see so many of you here in the room after everything we've been through yesterday, and here I would like to thank a lot first of all our host for helping us to organize the cocktail, and then of course again have to thank all our wonderful sponsors. Thank you very much again.

At least yesterday, we had balloons attached to every mic, but Mike is not here with us today, we cannot attach a balloon to him.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Becky is Mike – no, just so everyone knows, Mike has been involved in a really large transaction with the company that he works for, which was announced in the papers yesterday, and last night at 10:00 he was off to do some work. So, might be Mike I imagine he'll be running late, if at all.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. So, today with us we have our wonderful Board members. Even though ccNSO was not the community

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.

that nominated Becky, Becky is still ours, and we're always very happy to see Becky with us. We're even happier to have three Board members on the Board.

It's great to have this session again. Are there any questions you'd like to ask our Board members? While you think, I will ask about the approval [action]. What's your feeling? First about the actually first community forum ever, and second, what do you think, did this exercise work? And what are lessons learned?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Wow. That's a big question. I think it went quite well yesterday. Stephen did a great job pulling it all together, and I want to acknowledge actually that Stephen probably did most of that work on his own, because I suspect that the rest of the community wasn't quite as enrolled in this process as perhaps they should have been.

I think it was important to do it because it was important to do it anyway from the point of view of changing the Bylaw, but leaving the need to do it from the point of view of changing the Bylaw aside, I think it's great that we were able to run it in a way that was a small change that was easy to understand, and I think it's pointed to some problems.

So, I think you and a number of the other SOs have an issue with the 21-day thing, and the community wrote that Bylaw and the community decided on 21 days. So, we need to figure out a way around that. If this was a big issue that involved lots of discussion, there is no way that you would make that 21-day timeline, even if your internal procedures allowed you to, because you just wouldn't have enough time to discuss it. So, I think that needs to be thought about, and I'd encourage us all to sort of set a deadline of a year or so to circle back – not in a formal process like a CCWG, but circle back as a group and just look at what logistical changes need to happen in the Bylaws to – now that we've had the practice of this stuff, and I'll give you – it's exactly what the ccNSO did at the very beginning.

When we set the ccNSO up, we had a Bylaw and we had a charter, and we had our four members from each region and we did all of that stuff. And within a year, the first year we actually did as an organization was to review ourselves. That led to some changes in the original Bylaws and so on. So, I think that's something that needs to happen with this. I'm not suggesting another CCWG to do it, I think that would be a failure of process, but we do need to do it. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Becky, anything you'd like to add?

BECKY BURR: What he said.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. I still don't see any questions. You can use both mics, or you can raise your hand and we'll get the mic delivered to you if you're too shy to go to them.

Next question then about Empowered Community. Our impression is that the Empowered Community is not treated as it should be treated. What is your feeling about the Empowered Community? And in this case, I probably would concentrate on the EC administration.

We had some issues with scheduling the community forum. It's scheduled at 8:00. I was very glad to see so many people attending, which means that people are interested in. But still, we would have preferred to have it for example at 9:00, probably on the first day of the meeting. But unfortunately, there was no possibility to accommodate the request from the EC administration.

Our feeling was that EC administration is treated as one of the SO/ACs that needs to submit its request for cross-community sessions, but that shouldn't be the case.

BECKY BURR: I'm just a little confused. The ccNSO submitted the request but we didn't get the –

KATRINA SATAKI: Stephen, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Let me give you a brief rundown on what transpired in the run-up to this. Yes, early on, it was apparent that we're going to have to have an approval form at this meeting. And in this first iteration, ICANN staff did not appreciate – the meeting planning staff did not appreciate there is this new creature that sits beside the SO/ACs called the Empowered Community administration.

As a result, the ECA did not have a “seat at the table” when it came to the meeting planning process. Therefore, they were scheduling us as another “cross-community activity,” and I was arguing of the sake of precedent – even though I do not have a seat at the table – first through Katrina and then once I had some e-mail addresses and contacts directly with them, that the ECA should not be treated as regular cross-community session but should, A, be treated coequal with AC/SO structure, and B, have a seat at the planning table, and C, the community forum

needed to be afforded the same level of gravitas that Board public forums have. In other words, ideally nothing scheduled beside it, the same set of facilities available to Board forums, such as translation services, the mic setup, blah, blah.

And what we ended up with – and I fought really hard on this, and I got a lot of pushback and we ended up not on Monday at the beginning like I asked, but on Tuesday. Not during a normal time period beginning at 9:00, but at 8:00. But at the end of the day, it worked. But it was not a satisfactory process from the ECA standpoint because they don't – maybe now they have a better appreciation, but they certainly didn't, in the planning process running for this meeting, understand what we were. So, that's the issue.

BECKY BURR:

I think that's a really interesting issue, and clearly, the 8:00 in the morning, all that stuff, I think that's probably – this was a very important exercise. It was the first time we were using this new power. It's critically important. Yes, we lucked out and got something that was somewhat noncontroversial in order to give this a dry run, but it's a very important landmark for us in this path.

In terms of the seat at the table, coequal with the Board meeting, all that stuff, I think it would be really good to develop

a sort of common position with the rest of the input into the Empowered Community so that we can get that established, written down, if that's what the community wants. I don't have an objection to it, I just think we need to make sure that all of the other organizations that are part of it have a unified position on it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: If I understand you correctly, Becky, what you're asking me is to poll the other ECA representatives to see if they're onboard with what I was proposing?

BECKY BURR: No, I think that –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think the answer is that – Stephen, I'll be blunt. I don't think the ECA should have a seat on the organizing committee, because the ECA may not appear again for another two years. So, I think that's a waste of time. What I think is important –

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Well, I don't want to be there unless we have something to do.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I get it. That's exactly right, and I knew you were going to say that, which is why I said it. But my point is that I think what you need to get is you need to enroll the standing members of the Scheduling Committee in the importance of the ECA so that when an ECA thing comes up, they're clear of what its standing is. So, you don't actually have to do anything, it just automatically happens.

BECKY BURR: I never disagree with Chris, but I am going to just disagree with you on this. I actually do think – this is just we haven't talked about it, right? We don't know what the protocol is.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It's completely uncharted territory.

BECKY BURR: Right.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We had no idea going into it.

BECKY BURR: Yes. Right. So, I think it actually would be useful to have a sort of – in general when there’s an Empowered Community meeting, these are the things that we should expect.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes. No, I agree.

BECKY BURR: And so I don’t know if it’s polling or just having the group come together to say – and go back to the chartering organizations to get support for it, but I do think it’s a piece of protocol that we don’t have and we need to have.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I agree completely.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So actually, I think we agree. I don’t think Becky did disagree with me. But I think if you look at it on a step by step basis, the ECA administration should put a term sheet down that says when we have one of these, this is what we expect.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I’m happy to do that

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Then that needs to then go to the SO/AC leaders, right?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Which are the other members of the ECA.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, and B, signed off, embraced, – whatever you want to call it – by everybody. And then that needs to trickle down to the Scheduling Group, whoever the heck they are. And that needs to be there in the filing cabinet so that in the same way that – we know if we have X happening, we do Y. When we have an ECA happening, we do this. That just needs to be set into a process.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I couldn't agree more.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: And since I'm the one doing the heavy lifting on the ECA, I'll just write this up and get the other guys to sign off on it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: He who holds the pen has the ink stains on his hand.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. What is your view on rejection actions then? Do you expect any?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm used to being rejected, so I'm expecting it to happen almost every day. I'm not sure what context you're talking about. Do you mean are we expecting that something will be rejected?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. That's [inaudible]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. But we're ready if it is.

KATRINA SATAKI: But you're ready. Okay. So, any questions from the audience? Maybe [anybody] got some?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can I say [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: No.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I can't? Okay, I won't then.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, please, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I just wanted to give you a brief overview of where we are at the moment, sort of post-transition and in the whole new world. At the end of the transition, everybody – including the Board – breathed a huge sigh and went into that sort of hiatus thing you go into for a little while after something big has happened. But now that we're in a post-transition world – and we keep telling ourselves we're in a post-transition world – we actually are doing a whole heap of things that we haven't really been able to do for the last couple of years because we've been so wrapped up in the transition.

Some of those things are internal Board things which might not seem like they matter and might sound like a waste of time, but actually are incredibly important to making an efficient and effective and serving on a Board that serves this community. So,

we are working at the moment on formalizing and improving the way that we set our Board's priorities. Not ICANN's priorities, our Board's priorities. We are working on improving the interface between the Board and ICANN organization so that the priorities of the Board and the priorities of org are aligned. We are improving our Board performance review systems to try to make those things more meaningful and more valuable to individual Board members.

To give you an example, we've now introduced a new process which is that new Board members will have a performance review at the end of their first year so that at the end of their first year, they actually have got some feedback. These performance reviews are done by an independent organization that takes the input from all of the other Board members – anonymously, obviously – and then sort of summarizes all of that input, interviews the Board members who have given feedback so that it's not just in writing, it's actual interviews, and then creates a report on the Board member which goes to that Board member and also goes to the Chair, and then they have a discussion about that feedback. That's quite a laborious process, and it's important for new Board members especially that that happens in their first year. And then it happens after another 18 months. So, if you think about it, that's six months before the end of their three-year terms, so if they want to stand again, they can see

how much progress they've made. And if they choose to do so, they can actually provide – they can show their SO or AC or the NomCom the feedback that they've had. They don't have to, but they can show that. So, we're doing a lot of that stuff at the moment because we now have an opportunity to do that, to actually [do it].

I want to say one more thing about where the Board sits right now. From the end of next year, assuming that Asha who's currently up for renomination is in fact renominated, at the end of next year, the only Board members on the Board who will have more than five years' experience will be me and Cherine. That's it. Asha will be entering her fifth year, and everyone else will have fewer than three years' experience.

That's just the way it is and we have to handle that, we have to deal with it, but it's a function of the way this model works that generally speaking, ccNSO values consistency with its Board members. The contracted parties house or the GNSO values consistency, but the noncontracted parties house doesn't. The NomCom has up until now it seems worked on the principle that change for the sake of change is a good thing.

I'm not advocating that you shouldn't roll Board members and turn them over and all that sort of stuff at all. But I am saying that organizations that decide who goes on this Board need to

feed those bits of information in. In other words, it shouldn't just be someone is a really good Board candidate so we're going to put them on instead of someone else who's already on the Board. They need to look at how the Board can manage consistency and knowledge and corporate history. So, we're dealing with that right now. We'll put some processes in place internally on the Board to try and make it better, but it is an issue that ICANN going forwards is going to need to deal with. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Chris. As you know, soon we'll be launching a call for volunteers. We need to find a candidate to replace Mike when his term expires next year. Any perhaps encouragements, advice from you?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I'd encourage anyone who thinks they have the time and some of the requisite skills to think about it. I think that no one has a complete set of the required smorgasbord of skills to be on the Board, but when you get on the Board, you get help to get those. And I think I might have said this last time, I'd also encourage you to think outside the box and say, "Does it actually have to be a ccTLD manager? Could it be for example one of my Board members?" One of your Board members. Do you have a Board

member of your ccTLD that you think has the time and the ability?

And let me remind you that that's where Mike came from. Mike was not a ccTLD manager. Mike was on the Board of .za [DA] here in South Africa. And the ccNSO put him forwards because when we asked the Board, "What do you want?" The Board said, "What we want is somebody with Board experience." That was a much younger Board then, ICANN was a different organization. But I think I could say our skillset gaps include audit – which they do. We have a skill gap in people with experience of audit. I could tell you that we have lots of lawyers, which is either good or bad depending on which side of the fence you sit on. We have good technical people. Maybe finance people would be good, etc., but fundamentally, the people who hit the ground running the best are people who have experience of being on boards. People who understand what boards do, understand the difference between management and being a Board member. Those are the people who hit the ground running fastest, and so I'd encourage you to think about that and think about whether or not you know existing Board members in your organizations that you might want to put forward.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Becky?

BECKY BURR:

I agree with all of those things. I think the other thing about your existing Board members looking at that and people from the ccNSO directly is that it is valuable to understand the ICANN creature. I think that actually does bring a lot of value to the table. It's clear that it's a confusing thing, and for people who come in entirely from the outside, there's a steeper learning curve. So, I wouldn't just randomly look to any Board of Directors, but people with this orientation also who understand the place of CCs in the organization, in the ecosystem, the relationship with government and so forth.

I think as we're seeing in some of the discussions regarding geo names and the like, those issues about who decides what about CCs, there could potentially be more discussion about it. So, I think that's important. I just want to echo one thing that Chris said. It's clear to me that the ccNSO has been very well served by having people who are willing to serve for the long term on the Board, and the noncontracted parties house of the GNSO has tended over the years to – partially because they're trying to find a compromise candidate among some competing interest, they rotate people out every term, so they're three years there and they're gone. That does not serve them well. So, I would take that into consideration as well.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. So, still no questions from – yes, Stephen, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I have my Nigel hat on. To the both of you, what do you see as the three biggest challenges to ICANN at this point in time, and what do you see as the three biggest risks to the organization?

BECKY BURR: I think the first challenge is making sure that we implement the new Bylaws and actually sort of embed the new Bylaws in our culture. I think that we have had a mission statement that was sort of by example. Now we have a mission statement that is iterated, and anything that's not iterated is excluded. So, I think that it's a critical discipline that we're encouraging the Board to do, and I hope that the Board will actually encourage the community to do, to think about sort of every time you take an action, ask yourself, articulate clearly why do we think this is within ICANN's mission so that we can have a dialog across the community about a sort of clear context for dealing with issues, and I'm hoping that that's going to be very much self conscious. And I'm also hoping that the Board is going to get into the habit of saying to Advisory Committees or SOs when we get policy

proposals or advice, “Tell us why you think that’s within ICANN’s mission.” So, I think that’s one thing.

I think that the transition from a new gTLD, lots of application money, lots of growth to deal with those issues, that transition into a more steady state operation where the domain name market is changing, we’re probably not going to see the same kind of growth that we’ve seen. Those are going to require us to understand the organization going forward from a financial discipline point of view, getting into a place where we really are making choices about priorities about what we do.

The third thing I think is that there’s an enormous amount of volunteer burnout. People have been working really hard, and people are really tired. There are still lots of issues to take on, lots of important work to do. So, we have to get into a place where we wrap up. Let’s wrap up Work Stream 2, and then let’s carefully think about how we prioritize the work that we – because we are completely dependent on volunteers. And if you get people so burned out, the risk of capture in any one of these processes seems to me to go up astronomically because people don’t hang out if they’re just too burned out to do it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I agree with most of that, if not all of it. Especially on the Work Stream 2 thing, I can see there are now Work Stream 2 groups

where there are like three people on calls, and they're going to be the ones who have the most passion, but also the most entrenched view, because passion tends to be entrenched. So, I think that is extremely dangerous. I'm not saying there's anything we can necessarily do about it, although I do think that it's going to be critically important that the work that comes up from Work Stream 2 is held closely to the fire by the CCWG to make sure that it is actually acceptable to the rest of the community.

I don't think we can say as we did with Work Stream 1 that stuff that comes to the plenary was pretty much baked. I think in Work Stream 2, there's going to be stuff coming to the plenary that is not even remotely baked, and we need to make sure that we don't lose track of that.

I think one of our challenges is going to be continuing to improve the way that we work with government, with the GAC. The GAC is going through its own set of changes. It's larger, there are more governments. There are higher level people who [want the best work putting it]. We have a real challenge there, because – again, this is my personal view and I'm speaking perhaps slightly incorrectly, but I think there is currently an attempt to muddy the waters in the GAC so that there is a lack of clarity between GAC advice and GAC positions and [indeed] positions of individual governments.

And I think governments are beginning to try and use the GAC as a lobbying tool for their own individual purposes rather than an advisory council for ICANN, and I think that's actually quite something we're going to have to deal with. I'll stop there. Thanks, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Thanks a lot to our guests today, Becky/Mike and Chris. Thank you very much.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, of course. Yes, you can stay. So, we're moving to the next agenda item we have today, how does ICANN select meeting venues. May I ask our guests to join us here in front of the room? And meanwhile, Kim – yes, okay, thanks. Okay, so great.

Please welcome the bravest people I know. I'm sure it wasn't easy for them to decide to come to this horrible community that's never happy with whatever ICANN is doing.

Basically, we wanted to talk today about the strategy, how does ICANN select meeting venues? I'll briefly explain to you why we're talking about that now, as soon as I make this remote

work. Okay, thank you, sorry, I'll have to use my human remote, Kim. Thank you.

In Hyderabad, the ccNSO Council had some concerns regarding the venue for ICANN60 that's in Abu Dhabi. We discussed these concerns and decided that we need to discuss them with the ICANN Board.

We did that, but the ccNSO Council decided that we need to postpone the final decision on our participation in that particular meeting, and therefore today we would like to ask for your advice. What's your feeling? How do you as a community feel about this? So, Eberhard, anything you want to say?

EBERHARD LISSE: Yes. Can you just restate the concerns? Because I'm not really too –

KATRINA SATAKI: I will get into that, yes, but now I wanted to just say what the background of this meeting is. The meeting will be structured in the following way. First, we'll talk about the general principles, how meeting venues are selected, then I will talk about some concerns we had, and finally, we'll explain what are implications of our decisions, in case we decide that we do not want to participate in the next meeting. Finally, yes, ask for your advice.

MIKE SILBER: Before you do that, can I just apologize for my tardiness? Unfortunately, being at home means that I'm also on call for the office. I do apologize.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Thank you. Chris already apologized on your behalf. By the way, we had Becky/Mike with us.

MIKE SILBER: Yes, I understood Becky was channeling me, I just think she needs to grow a lot more hair to be successful at that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, not so sure she's going to be successful at that, but yes, as you can see, we attached balloons to mics, so you can expect one momentarily.

So, why do we hold meetings in different places? As you know, the main mission of the ICANN is to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems. The idea is that it has to be for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole and process should be also open and transparent.

It also says that seeking and supporting broad and informed participation reflecting the functional geographic and cultural

diversity. We go to all possible places to ensure that everyone's covered, everyone has the opportunity to participate, to show how open we are and how inclusive ICANN is.

Then we have some guiding principles. They are described in the current meeting strategy. As you know, we had this meeting strategy working group and they came up with the strategy, that's why now we have meetings A, B and C. and in that strategy, we have several guiding principles. The strategy actually says that, yes, we have to continue with three meetings annually. We have to rotate them regionally. We balance global coverage and multi-year cycle, and so on. Of course, it also says that we should not restrict rotation to specific locations and need enough time to do the work.

So, those are the ones that I was able to find. However, I would like to ask our guests, what is the current process? What are the criteria when you decide on a meeting venue? And does the process meet all the principles that were stated in the Bylaws, guiding principles and the meeting strategy? Nick?

NICK TOMASSO:

Thank you, Katrina. I'll go through the process that we'll use for selecting ICANN meeting locations. A couple years before a meeting, we post an announcement on the ICANN website alerting our community members who were interested in

receiving their proposals to host a meeting. They're asked to complete an expression of interest form in response to that. In addition, we do get some proposals in from other organizations, mostly convention and visitors bureaus around the world who search the web looking for the opportunities to send proposals for meetings.

If we've received viable proposals from the community, we give them preference over other proposals. So now, what we are left with is a number of proposals that we need to evaluate. We then turn to our meeting location selection criteria, which is published on the ICANN website, and we look at things such as cost, convenience of air travel, local transportation, hotel accommodations, meeting facilities, meeting space requirements, the network infrastructure for our Wi-Fi, safety and security. We then in the meeting location selection criteria outline some responsibilities of the host organization, and we follow these criteria in selecting the meeting location.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Any questions so far? Speaking about for example hotels, do you also look at the price?

NICK TOMASSO: One of the elements that I mentioned was cost, and that is cost to both ICANN and the ICANN community. Yes, we do look at the price of hotels to make sure that we make available a selection of hotels for varying budgets for our community members.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. No questions so far. Then let's move to the next... Understand the principles. Actually, I did expect some questions on that one, but okay. If no question, then let's move forward. And that's about the particular meeting in Abu Dhabi.

What were the main concerns? The main concerns were expressed by women on our council, and basically, they are afraid to go – at least some of them. I'm not saying that all of them – to Abu Dhabi because apparently, those women are not used to being treated differently from men in different respects.

Unfortunately, Debbie is not here today, but Debbie and I tried to summarize some of our concerns. We went through different resources on the Internet and tried to present some of the things that worried women [to you] today.

First of all, please note that in our times when we have facts and alternative facts and different opinions on the Internet, of course, you cannot take everything at face value. You have to be critical when you read different articles, because yes, on the

Internet, you can find a lot of testimonials when people say they're happy, they feel safe in Abu Dhabi, and absolutely no problem whatsoever.

At the same time, again, let's be fair, there's a share of comments that are not so positive. Apparently, people who had problems there, they share their experience, and it's not always particularly good.

Here, I'd like to say one thing. In my country, we have probably the best plastic surgeon, and in an interview when he was asked by the interviewer what are the odds of successful plastic surgery, his response I think was very good and very applicable to many situations. He said, "Statistically, 98% of operations (plastic surgeries) go very good. Really, the results are perfect. But for customers, for clients, it's always either 100% or 0%."

And when you think of it, yes, that's true. Therefore, probably when you share your experience later when we'll have discussions, maybe don't say, "I was there, nothing happened to me, therefore nothing [will] ever happen to you." That's probably not what people who are worried like to hear. They would like to hear that they will be taken care of and everything will be fine, even if something goes wrong.

I saw that Stephen had a question or a comment or something.
Yes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: A couple of questions, actually. You mentioned that you look for proposals from the community. You also mentioned that you get external proposals from people running convention centers and so on. Did I understand that correctly?

NICK TOMASSO: Yes. Certainly, you did.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. With regards to Abu Dhabi, did that proposal come from the community, or did that come from external to the community? And if so, where did it come from?

NICK TOMASSO: It came from the community. It came from the TRA in the United Arab Emirates. One of your colleagues, [inaudible].

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. I think the crux of this issue here is the perception that is rather widely held that this is a rather hostile working environment for women, both for ICANN staff members who are female and also for community members who are female. So, my next question is, was that a coefficient in your equation as you considered this location?

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you for the question, and it provides me with an opportunity. Sally Costerton for the record, and I lead stakeholder engagement at ICANN. I'm also responsible on the Executive Team for ICANN meetings.

It is within the context of the other criteria, so access, availability, security, transport, these kinds of issues, yes. But we wouldn't distinguish between women and men. But obviously, women are part of that process.

So, clearly, when we are looking at the security aspects of any venue, yes, it does get considered. But I think the real question that you're asking is, do we use gender specific issues or considerations – I don't know of another way of putting it – as a specific criteria to look at meetings. Is that right? Yes, and therefore, would we have done it for this meeting?

The answer to that is no, in the sense of if you go on the website and you look at the criteria, you won't find that broken out as a separate issue. Now, I do want the group to know, be aware that Göran Marby has been in discussion with the SO/AC leadership group, asking the group whether or not the community would like to have a consultation, a discussion with us, would they like to structure a consultation around the basis, the criteria – on

reviewing the criteria or probably adding, I would think, to the criteria by which we choose cities.

That is a request that he's made, he's had discussions with probably some of you already in this room, and many other people across the community. And we will talk to the group that are helping us – we being the organization, particularly David Olive and I who will meet with that group I think tomorrow to discuss the plans for Abu Dhabi.

So, one of the questions that we will ask is, “Would the community like to do this? And if so, how?” So, that is a live discussion. I just wanted to make that clear because I think it's important, because I suspect this question may come up again. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. With that, let's move to some specifics of – I see that we have apparently remote question or comment, but let's move through some examples first, because apparently we already moved into the phase of discussions, but I really would like you to understand the main concerns.

First of all, yes, there are quotes from advisories. Again, in many cases, those advisories are probably too – I don't know, for lack of a better term – panicky.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Panicky is a word, yes.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, okay, it works. Okay, so of course, you have to be critical when you read them, because governments – we know what government advice can be. For example, “Travelers and residents alike may be asked to prove their marital status when checking in to a hotel room together.” Well, it’s not a common practice for ICANNers to check into the same room, at least that’s what I think. But in case you want to do it, better get married before you do that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I’d like to offer my services as a marriage celebrant to anyone who’d like to take advantage.

KATRINA SATAKI: Actually, thank you very much, Chris. I was thinking that probably, it would be tricky for me to find a worthy candidate on such a short notice. But since you volunteered –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, I was offering to run the ceremony by which you get married, not actually marry you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. I'm glad to hear –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I have a vast experience of marriage, and you can't be married to someone as many times as I have.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, I've heard about that. We've heard about that, therefore, you're not the worthy candidate I was referring to.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Touché.

KATRINA SATAKI: But we still love you. We voted for you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, not that much. So, the use of bad language, rude gestures, and public displays of affection – we just experienced them – behavior that –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Mike's in real trouble if bad language is an issue.

KATRINA SATAKI: Disrespects the Government, local culture or Islam – which I'm sure that wouldn't be the case, but bad language and rude gestures at ICANN environment, that's a normal thing. So, be careful. Okay, drug trafficking. Yes, I hope that that's normal pretty understood – well, apart from the death penalty. But what you should remember – and here in our community when we're obsessed with making pictures, remember that you should not photograph people without their permission, as this can lead to arrest.

Don't post on social media. Yes, and of course, again, that's from U.S. advisory. U.S. citizens, especially women, should take precautions against the possibility of verbal and physical harassment or sexual assault when walking alone – so don't walk alone.

So, here are some examples with had from the Internet. For example, a couple, they were engaged but were not married, they went to have a nice vacation in Abu Dhabi. Unfortunately, the girl felt ill, went to the doctor, doctor discovered that she

was pregnant, and since they were not married, she was put to jail.

The best part of this article is that, frankly, I was convinced that women in case of extramarital affairs, women are put to jail. I was wrong. I'm happy to tell you, the guy was put to jail as well. Yes, so they both ended up in jail. It's not that one sided. Let's be fair on that. I really thought that it's just against women. No, it's not. Men are also facing prison term.

Then of course, again, another woman who ended up in jail for something that she could not – well, in her country she would never have been punished for that action. Another woman, she made a picture of a car, and even though she blurred the license plate, she was arrested for posting the picture on Facebook. Another woman – again, she made some critical comments about government of United Arab Emirates, and she also was jailed. Apparently didn't read advisories.

We have many other links. If you're interested, you could read, but please note that, again, you have to be critical when you're reading these articles. For example, one says that a woman was arrested in Abu Dhabi airport because she refused to talk to two men. No details whatsoever. Probably those two men were policemen or they were customs officers, they just wanted to

check her luggage. She refused to talk. Of course that ended up like – well, imprisonment.

So, if we read an article without any details, of course, you have to be critical. Again, don't buy everything that's written on the Internet. As you know, it's full of alternative facts. I see that Chris wants to add something.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Are you finished with the slides?

KATRINA SATAKI: No.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Then I'll wait for you to finish with the slides. My apologies for interrupting you.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, that's okay. We have more links. Again, if you're interested, you can read. Then there are some key facts by Lonely Planet. Again, there are some urban myths that should be made clear. For example, women don't have to wear burka head scarf. No, that's not the case. And it's not that women will be harassed, no. It's safe in taxis and it's safe to stay alone in hotels. But at the same time, it's likely to receive unwanted male attention and

long stares on public beaches. But since apparently ICANN is not going to have a beach party, that wouldn't be a problem.

Nevertheless, there are some tips. One of them is that we have to wear a wedding ring. And if unmarried traveling in male company, it's better to say that you're married. We're a big, happy ICANN family anyway, so it shouldn't be a problem. Avoid direct eye contact with men. Dark sunglasses help. And so on.

Some more tips. Again, you can read them. The Internet is full of different tips. So, it's not over yet, but that's only about women. There are some other issues. For example, as we've heard that if you have a stamp from crossing border in Israel, you may not be allowed into Abu Dhabi. So, I'd like to hear some comments on that as well if that's true. If it is true, then perhaps we need to change passports if we want to go there, in case we have those stamps.

What happens to our community members who are Jewish, who have Jewish names? Are they safe? So, it's not only about women, it's more global than that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I also think you're forgetting people who don't necessarily fit into a heteronormative definition of relationships and relationship status.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, exactly. So, I see green balloon questions. Eberhard, please.

EBERHARD LISSE: It is correct that they will not allow anybody with an Israeli stamp into any Arab country, but Israel doesn't stamp passports anymore, for 20 years already or something. I think this is overdoing it a little bit like these childish games yesterday at the ccNSO cocktail which led to an exodus of a large number of participants. We should be a little bit realistic. Whether some country is extremely conservative and has different moral values than the others is mainly a matter for that country. Not necessarily all of it, but mainly. If you don't want to go there, don't go there. If you don't want to go to Panama when there is Zika, don't go there.

We have to have a rotation. The Arab countries, whether I particularly like their way of doing things – which I don't – are part of this community. We have to go to them eventually, and to be really honest, I've just looked it up again, the German foreign ministry says general advice on behavior is no specific advice for women. The Dutch website of the Dutch foreign ministry has the same advice. The United States website – especially now that there is a little bit of trouble going on with

Qatar – has no specific advice. I think we're overdoing this a little bit.

That said, if the ccNSO Council decides not to go there, I will abide and I will also not go there.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Eberhard. Pierre.

PIERRE BONIS: Hello. Pierre Bonis from AFNIC, .fr. I'd just like to – because maybe I missed the beginning. Are we trying to discuss if we want to go there or not as a ccNSO, if we want to convince the Board to change the location, or if we are just sharing good tips for women and other people?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you very much. No, we're not trying to convince the Board to change. Absolutely not. It's decided, and apparently, ICANN is going there because of different reasons also mentioned by Eberhard. The ccNSO Council will have to decide, because it decided that it will decide. But the main idea of today's discussion is to understand the concerns, address the concerns, and make an informed decision whether to go or not.

PIERRE BONIS: Okay, thank you very much. So, just a very quick and general statement about that. ICANN has been through a lot of countries already with different legislations. Some countries ICANN has been to were for instance not allowing homosexual activities. We went there already. Some other treat women not exactly the way that in other countries that would be treated. This is known that the Abu Dhabi legislation is somehow conservative. It's an understatement. But this is not news, and to me, once it has been decided, it's good to give advice to people, but telling that ccNSO would not go there would be – to me – a sign that is given to a part of the world that is not a good sign, and in that case, I would be totally in line with what Eberhard said. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Pierre. I see Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, thanks. So, it seems to me that there are three issues here. The first issue is, do we want to – how do you want to respond to Göran's request for having a discussion about this generally as a policy? Right now, we have a whole set of meeting criteria. Nick's explained some of those. What we don't have is any criteria about what must a country – apart from security and stability – what must a country's rules be in order for us to go there. Should we have those? Should we not? A decision needs

to be made about whether that discussion should take place in a cross-community way. That's the first thing.

The second thing is that we're being asked, should we go to Abu Dhabi? And I want to get back to that in a second. The third thing we're being asked is if we do go to Abu Dhabi, can you give us lots of information so that we're clear and we understand what needs to happen in Abu Dhabi? Because there are some concerns being expressed that whilst they're not unique to Abu Dhabi, it would be useful to know about them now rather than when we turn up, because I might decide not to go. So, again I want to leave that one aside for a second and just concentrate for a moment on the middle one.

The middle one is, should we go to Abu Dhabi? Look, I could produce a set of slides with articles from the newspapers and the Internet that are scary for pretty much any country on the planet, except of course for the UK, because we're perfect. I could certainly do it for India or I could do it for China. I could do it for places in Africa. I could do it here, as I think Mike would acknowledge. And yet, we are here.

So, I think the security stuff is one thing, and that's something that I think is the case everywhere. We have to take care of security. So, I would put the security issues to one side and say they're the same. What that leaves us with is the – if I can put it

this way – the moral issues, and that really is a matter for – absent a policy, which we currently don't have, it is a matter for anyone to decide what to do.

Now, I think you can make a choice. You can say, "I'm not going to go. As an individual, I'm not going to go because I choose not to do that." You can say, "I am going to go, but I'm going to operate in a way that reduces any risk to me because of the fact that I'm gay or because of the fact that I'm not married." That's no different in my view than wearing a headscarf if you enter a temple in Thailand, or understanding that in Thailand if you insult the king or you're deemed to have insulted the king, or if you damage the currency in any way, you're going to end up in jail.

I get it. It's a bigger picture because it's a gender thing. I understand that, but I think for the purposes of making this decision, it's important to look at it that way. I want to finish by just telling you a story. At an ICANN meeting in 2003 and 2004 – I won't tell you where – I went to the meeting with Jill. Many of you know Jill. We weren't married, and we checked into a very nice hotel. And when we checked in, we gave our passports across. We were then escorted to our room by a concierge, a butler or whatever, who completely ignored Jill. Didn't even acknowledge her existence.

When we walked into the room, the gentleman turned to me and said, “Mr. Disspain, what side of the bed will you be sleeping on?” And I said, “Why do you need to know?” And he said, “Because that’s the side we’ll leave the slippers and the bottle of water for you.” And every night we came back to that room, one pair of slippers and one bottle of water. Because as far as they were concerned, Jill did not exist because she wasn’t married to me.

Now, that’s just the way it is, and we lived with that. I spoke to Jill last night as I knew I was going to be coming here this morning, and I said, “Do you remember that?” She said, “I do remember that. And I said, “What was the outcome of all of that?” She said, “Well, frankly, I’m still angry about it.” And that’s 13 years later. But that’s just the way it is. So, I’d like to encourage us to understand all of that and think about this carefully, because doing a boycott or not going en masse is a very serious step to take. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. First, green balloon, remote question, and then Mike.

SALLY COSTERTON: I have a question and a comment. A question from Nigel Roberts: “What advice are you giving to LGBTQ community members, and

indeed staff, for this meeting?” And a comment from Philip Du Bois: “Israel does stamp international passports, in contradiction to what Eberhard mentioned. So, the issue raised by Katrina remains valid. I was in Israel in 2011 and I found the stamps in my old passport.”

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, I have them too. Yes.

SIMON GARSIDE: Hello, everybody. My name is Simon Garside, I’m the Vice President of Security Operations at ICANN. Our approach for Abu Dhabi really is no different to any other meeting, be it in Johannesburg, Copenhagen, Hyderabad. Very consistent. And I can understand your concerns. And what we do at every meeting is we push out key information for you. Tips on being safe and this type of thing.

Now, given Abu Dhabi and the concerns that have already been voiced at this stage, we will be pushing out a fact sheet next month to answer a lot of these questions around female safety, LGBT issues, and everything else, the sort of full gambit. I just wanted to put that out there.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Mike, and then Jordan.

SIMON GARSIDE: Sorry. This will also cover – as it normally does – sort of visa issues, passport issues and all those types of things. It'll be very specific to Abu Dhabi and very specific to you.

MIKE SILBER: I think Pierre covered it exactly in terms of the purpose of the discussion. And if we're looking at preselection criteria, then this is the wrong place to do it. There is a forum, and if that's not the correct forum, then [as an SO], the ccNSO can actually insist on a different forum. But if these issues are issues of concern – and I think they are – I think we can push to the Meetings Team to say we would like the following issues considered and addressed.

That doesn't mean that every venue is going to have a perfect score on every issue that we're looking at. But we need to understand what are disqualifying criteria as well as qualifying criteria. And I think that's something that the community needs to [derive].

The second thing, just building on what Simon has said, South Africa – to my great embarrassment and shame – is a country that has some of the highest levels of violence, and particularly sexual violence against women. We are a mess. But for the

purposes of this meeting, that's been treated as a security issue, and I think it's entirely appropriate that it's been dealt with as a security issue rather than as a gender issue.

Now, the context in Abu Dhabi may be different, because there it may not be a security issue. It may be more gender related. And what I'm hearing is we need information which is not purely security information, but goes beyond that. I think that as an organization, we have a responsibility to provide that. Building on what Simon says, I think we need to go beyond just [inaudible] to give some real advisories or at least reference to some credible external advisories. But what I'd encourage you not to do is stage some sort of protest and boycott Abu Dhabi. I think it buys into a level of prejudice that is incredibly unfortunate. I think that the way in which it is intended is not going to be the way in which it is perceived outside of this organization, and I think it would be very damaging to the ccNSO if we are [inaudible] with a brush which ignores the incredibly diverse community that we have in this room.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Mike. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Katrina. It had to occur to me that I shouldn't actually [inaudible] say anything as a gay man who is probably planning to come to the Abu Dhabi meeting. I want to say that that isn't a moral issue. It's a personal safety and integrity and rights issue. So, let's not cast this as a moral thing.

The second thing I want to say is that it's always disappointing to hear men saying to women and other people that that's just the way it is. Especially in 2017, I would hope that we could be an organization that doesn't just accept the world as it is. And we should be standing up insofar as we can for looking after and being a truly inclusive community. It's not about buying into prejudice, it's about standing up against it.

The third point I'd like to make is that in terms of the policy debate, I think it would be quite helpful to launch the kind of cross-community conversation so that there's a chance for people to reflect on the recent meetings that we have had, and maybe to propose some additional criteria for meeting selection. I don't know if that is what would come from it, but I think having an open dialog about that would be a good thing to do.

The fourth thing is I don't think that the ccNSO should boycott this meeting, because we do go to places where there are safety issues. We all got told – our GAC rep for New Zealand wasn't

allowed to leave the hotel complex in Hyderabad. There's no, I think, reason to specifically look at Abu Dhabi and say, of all of the places, of all of the challenges, this is the straw that breaks the camel's back. I don't think that would be appropriate for us as a group. And that's my four points. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thanks very much. Chris wanted to respond. Chris, you wanted to respond?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: [No.]

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, he's fine. Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: I wanted to support Mike Silber. As you know, I'm a gynecologist, and I have serious professional expertise with gender-based violence, especially violence against women. I would also treat this not as a safety, but as a security issue, and it can be handled.

With regards to the Israeli thing, you don't get an Israeli stamp in your passport if you don't want one, and Abu Dhabi accepts Israeli stamps from what I've read on the webpage.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, that's good. But actually, about the stamps, I asked not to stamp yet I got a stamp. So, it's not always the case. Yes, Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I just wanted to reiterate what's been said about providing information, because that was the third leg of my sort of three legs that I set out. I think, yes, we are treating this meeting the same way as we're treating others, but I think it's important to understand that we recognize, that ICANN org recognizes that there are specific issues. There are in every place. Every place has its own specific issues. And I think the key here is that we get information out to you early. So, it's not that you arrive on the day and find on the back of your name badge a heap of information, but that you actually get that information as soon as – I know it normally comes out before the meeting, I acknowledge that. But I think we're going to make an effort to bring it out earlier because of the concerns that have been expressed, to make it as specific as possible so that everybody understands where they sit [inaudible] rules. Is that right?

SIMON GARSIDE:

That is right, Chris. The fact sheet will – as I mentioned earlier – run the full gambit. It will inform you of how to behave sort of culturally, socially, as well as whether you can drink the water, is it safe to take an Uber? All the questions that you’re going to have in order to make your experience in Abu Dhabi an enjoyable one. We will push that out next month, so you’ll have lots of time then to prepare yourselves and know what to expect when you arrive in Abu Dhabi.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Okay. Thank you. I think, yes, we are a very diverse community, and I think we – at least at ccNSO, we always celebrated this diversity, and everyone is welcome in our community. And I think we watch each other’s back, and if something happens to one of our members, hopefully we’ll stand for that particular member or whatever.

But now for we’re for example in the country with – as Mike mentioned – a long history – I’m not talking about sexual, but violence particularly in women. But in terms of fighting for their rights, and not far from this venue, we have a monument to a person who went to jail for his beliefs. And, well, personally I’m also not afraid and ready to go to jail for my beliefs, but if something happens to somebody from our community, I want to be sure that everything that can be possibly done will be done.

And this is something I really would like to hear from our guests today.

SIMON GARSIDE:

Sure. As I mentioned earlier, the approach is consistent for Johannesburg, for Hyderabad, for every meeting. We have the capability in place, the response mechanisms in place to be able to assist you. Chris mentioned a moment ago the advice we provide will be early enough that it gives you plenty of warning, but you also have on the back of your badges the number of the HSC. Should you have any issues here or in Abu Dhabi or at any other meeting, you immediately call the HSC, and that will come through to my team, the Security Operations team or the Health and Safety Team as we call them locally.

We will have in Abu Dhabi the mechanisms in place to be able to respond to the specific risks that we identify in Abu Dhabi, such as being arrested for something that may not have occurred in Johannesburg or anywhere else. We will ensure that we have appropriate legal counsel on the ground, we have solid and sound relationships with local embassies, and we'll be there and ready to assist you in any which way that we can.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Patricio.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Patricio Poblete from NIC Chile. We've been to many countries. We've been to a country that censors the Internet heavily and puts political opponents in jail. On the other hand, we probably would not have come to South Africa during the apartheid. How does ICANN make that decision? Where does ICANN draw the line?

BECKY BURR: Thank you for the question. That is indeed what I was referring to at the beginning of the session. I think if the community would like to – at Göran's invitation – open up a cross-community dialog around exactly that point, sort of where does ICANN draw the line, what are the criteria, what are the edges? Whether it's apartheid issues or gender issues or religious holidays, there are many different types of issues. And depending on who you are, where you live, you may – hopefully, if the community wants to have that discussion, all of those voices will be able to be heard, and the community can then decide whether or not it does want to change, to ask the staff to change the criteria by which those venues are selected. So, I would certainly say you obviously have your ccNSO representative in this room who's part of that discussion. And as rep from the [inaudible] perspective, we're absolutely ready and

waiting to facilitate that community discussion as soon as everybody is ready, if that's the decision that's made.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Our time is coming to an end, so therefore I would really like you to make now a well-educated, well informed decision. And for that, I here summarize some areas in case ccNSO decides – you now decide to opt out. Affected areas would be there would be no ccNSO meeting days, no ccNSO Council face-to-face meeting. Still had call. No ccNSO supported proposal for cross-community sessions, no official ccNSO updates given during public forum or any other session, no bilateral meetings between ccNSO and other SO/ACs, ICANN Board. No ccNSO cocktail. That brings me actually to one interesting question. Alcohol?

SIMON GARSIDE:

I can take this if you want. In the hotels, yes. Hotel bars, drinking alcohol is absolutely fine. To give you the other side of the coin, to take a drink from the bar to your room for example is not acceptable. You could go to your room and then the barperson would drink up to your room and that's acceptable. So, this is the type of advice I'll be putting in the fact sheet, but yes, you can drink in the hotel bars, etc.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. So, not affected areas: still, ccTLDs would be welcome to participate in other sessions. It's really up to you. You go, you do not go. That's your individual decision. And ccTLDs would be welcome to propose cross-community sessions individually or collectively. What is not clear – at least it wasn't clear to me, for example Tech Day. Would it affect Tech Day?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: I know, but –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. You clarified it during your first intervention, I just did not know that. Working group meetings, also not clear. Travel funding, would travel funding be available to ccTLDs who would want to participate is also not clear. Also, the high-level impact also not entirely clear, but I think some of the speakers, like Mike for example, already gave some perspective on that as well.

So, these are affected areas, not affected areas, unclear areas, a summary for you to understand what's at stake. We heard already some people saying it would be wrong for ccNSO to not participate, and I think that's a very valid point. We heard different arguments in support of that, so therefore, I really would like to know what others who have not spoken think. So, basically, the question is, do you support that despite of everything, we go to the Abu Dhabi meeting? We support all members, all diverse members of our community, and we stand by them. And if something happens, we all together go and save them.

So, who is in favor of going and participating in Abu Dhabi? Please raise your green card. Thank you very much. Visually, it looks like majority. Yet, who is against? Who is abstaining? We have two abstentions. Thank you very much. So apparently, we see each other in Abu Dhabi, and we'll be strong and supportive and a caring community. Thank you very much for that, and now we break for coffee.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]