
ABU DHABI – ccNSO Council Preparatory Meeting
Sunday, October 29, 2017 – 12:15 to 13:15 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

KATRINA SATAKI: ...if you haven't taken any hot lunch or a bag with some other cold food supplies, please do so. And I think we can start our prep meeting. We do not need a quorum for prep meeting which is a good part because apparently, we're not quorate. So we cannot –

BART BOSWINKEL: We're getting cold now.

KATRINA SATAKI: True. Excellent. So please get your hot lunch and cold bag.

So here in front of us, we see agenda for the prep meeting. We'll start with the discussion on the specific reviews. I'll give you a brief update on what's on our plate, what we have here. Then we'll go through the overview of all the meetings we have during this week, starting from today.

Then I'd like to share with you a presentation on Council priorities. We were asked in the feedback for a previous meeting,

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.

we were asked for some suggestions and this was one of the suggestion. Actually I think it was triggered by the discussion on who sets ICANN priorities. So community wants to know the Council priorities. We have a presentation on that so I would like to hear your feedback so that you're not surprised yourselves. It would be not a good thing for our Councilors to be surprised about Council priorities.

And the last one, going to discuss what agenda items you would like to see on Council agenda for our meeting on Wednesday. We have already a draft but if there's something else you'd like to see added to agenda, just this will be the moment in time when to do so.

So let's go back to the specific reviews. I won't ask who knows what specific reviews are. I'll just tell you what they are. According to the Bylaws, ICANN community has to carry out specific reviews. Those are SSR, Security, Stability, and Resilience review. It's ATRT Accountability, Transparency, and everything related to that. Then there is RDS, Registry Directory Service or previously known as WHOIS review. And one on the consumer trust and something. This consumer trust has to be carried out in relation to gTLD applications, all these rounds and introductions of new gTLDs. So it is – the Bylaws are not specific about when some specific periodicity of those reviews. But other reviews, they have to be carried out every five years and

having those specific reviews was one of the requirements brought forward by NTIA for a successful IANA stewardship transition.

So we are the community – so we will do those reviews. According to the Bylaws, these reviews must be carried out, guided by operating standards. And each of the seven SO/ACs that may point up to three members to this group and those three must be – if we appoint three, for example, they’re all going to the team. Of course first it’s not an obligation to participate, and second it’s not an obligation to appoint three. We can appoint less. We can appoint, suggest – in this case we can suggest to have more. And if other SO/AC’s appoint less than three, so then SO/AC Chairs according to the Bylaws may decide whether they want to have a full slate of 21 member on their Review Team or they just have whatever number is appointed. And if they decide to have more than those appointed ones, then if somebody appoints more than three so they can look at those people and add some more to the team to ensure diversity of skills and skillset and everything.

Again, as you remember, we were not happy with the way it all developed because again according to the Bylaws, this must be run according to operating standards. But the standards were not developed yet at the time when calls for volunteers to these review teams were issued by ICANN.

So SSR2 Team was formed. Still without operating standards. There was another call for participation on this RDS review. And at that time, the Council decided that we want to postpone our participation because the scope was not clear and therefore as we stated in our letter, we cannot appoint volunteers to do the work which is actually not clear. It had not been clarified. There were some views submitted by GNSO on what they believe should be in scope of the review. And then the GAC had a different view on the scope.

So we decided to defer our participation in this review. This RDS Review Team, the Chair of the team is Alan Greenberg so he's very experienced and he has managed to hold the team together. And currently, they have come up with something that they believe is very close to the actual scope. So they have submitted Terms of Reference and Scope as part of the Terms of the Reference. They have submitted it to the Board and now they are waiting for a response.

So this is one of the questions that we have to answer. Are we happy with the work they've done? Can we appoint people now, now that we know the scope? And if we decide that yes, scope is more or less clear now, we're happy with the scope. First, whether we want to participate, and second, if we want to participate then I should appoint people. Again, perhaps we should reach out to those who expressed they wished to

participate on the team. And specifically seek for our endorsement, if they're still available, they're still willing to do the job.

So logistics is perhaps not entirely clear yet but if we decide to participate, this is something that the detail that we can actually work on. I forwarded the letter I received from Alan to the Council so their scope and they can see this question from Alan.

Operating standards the first draft has been published. Earlier today we had this Guidelines Review Committee meeting and we discussed. We had Lars and Larisa from MSSI Department of ICANN. They are the ones responsible for a development of operating standards. They presented their views. We had some very brief exchange on that. And yeah, basically now operating standards are published and waiting for public comments.

Clearly, I think we would like to submit our comments because we were the ones who were insisting on having operating standards in place. One of the things that operating standards try to address is definition of the scope. When we started all the process of specific reviews with SSR2 and RDS, this was something that was discussed and there was a general agreement.

Let's try and give the – okay, I cannot say it was a general agreement because we clearly disagreed with that. Okay, let's

give the Review Team an opportunity to define the scope. Personally, I think it's not a good idea because if I was on the Review Team and had to define scope, I would limit it to almost nothing and be done with that very quickly. But some people want to have really very large scope and dive into details and maybe finish the review by 2025 or something. But we have to have them every 5 years so they have to finish it – I don't know – in some reasonable timeframe.

And actually, in case of RDS Team I think mostly I really think that Alan did a very good job. I was added as observant to the mailing list. I think they managed to have this scope defined. Let's see what the Board says. But in case of SSR2, clearly they struggle with definition of the scope. And again as you could see from the letter that SSAC sends to the Board, SSAC was very concerned about the development on this Review Team. And on Friday, we also had a discussion with OAC Board Committee that is responsible for taking care of these specific reviews. They actually decided to put this review on hold. And they tried to – the idea is to try to help them to identify the scope.

I cannot say that team members are happy with this decision. They were not happy with the way this team was trying to work because there was clearly no common understanding on the scope. Nevertheless they came up with something. They

submitted it to the Board but the Board was not happy with the result.

Currently, it has been put on hold. The operating standards, the current draft, they tried to address the issue of the scope. But having a separate group of people maximum two representatives from SO/AC, and they come together and try to come up with the scope, they need to start working a year, 12 months before the actual specific review has to take place. So they have 6 months to come up with a scope and then another 6 months for public comments and all the iterations that they need to go through according to ICANN standards.

So this is just something that operating standards try to address. There are many other things that we could actually contribute to maybe changing maybe adding some more detail.

Speaking about the ways how can we comment on operating standards, we have a proposal. We have this wonderful Guidelines Review Committee that works with our guidelines. The one that developed guidelines for specific reviews within our internal procedure.

Of course I have to tell you that that guidelines need revisiting. Because in the guideline we expected that we had the season so we issue a call for volunteers to those who want to participate in the Review Teams. But as it later turned out, it's ICANN that

issued the call for all constituencies. And probably it's better way just to do it once, not each and every SO/AC do it separately.

So the guidelines need some updating. Anyway, clearly Guidelines Review Committee is the one that could look and provide some comments on operating standards. But Guidelines Review Committee, its charter and mandate does not say that they can comment on any documents issued by coming out from operating standards.

So this is something that we would like to add to Council agenda so if you have no problems with that, we can just ask Guidelines Review Committee to do the work and send it to the Council for the review.

Comments on operating standards, yes. That's another thing. I think that's more or less all about specific reviews. Are there any questions or maybe any comments, any additions? Yes, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Just one quick one. I noticed for SSR2, they're meeting with essentially every constituency group in ICANN except us. Is there any particular reason? Should I keep talking while you finish? So I notice – anyway, I was just curious that they do appear to meet with every single constituency but us over the course of this

meeting and I was wondering if there was any particular reason for that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you. I spoke to our representatives on – our members, that ones that we appointed, two of the three. I don't know how it happened, to be honest. Actually, they proposed a presentation for Tech Day, but they got rescheduled and minus then I guess at the end they didn't get any slot on the Tech Day. Why they didn't have any slot on Members Day, that's a very good question and I'm not sure I remember the answer. Joke, if you can comment.

JOKE BRAEKEN: We received an invitation but decided to defer them to Tech Day because that would be the most appropriate slot for them to brief the community. That was the idea at the time.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, and maybe Stephen or Nigel as members of Tech Program Working Group know why they didn't get a slot. Maybe it wasn't for Tech Day either.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was a cursory participant in the agenda and I don't have an answer to that and I was not at the Tech Working Group meeting this morning because of the conflict with the GRC.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was at the Tech Working Group meeting this morning and likewise I have nothing to add because it wasn't mentioned.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, it just happened, yes. But still I have spoken to them and apparently SO/AC Chairs wanted to meet with the whole group to understand what's going on. But actually, our members on the team, they are ready to provide us with any update if we wish to, we can actually invite them to do so at the Council meeting.

Is that the wish? I can probably speak to the guys and they will be glad to provide us with a feedback. Okay. Good. Thank you. Any other comments? Anything?

No? Then session meeting overview. We all have printed agendas in front of us. And we have this overview of joint session. First joint session will be today from 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. with ALAC in their room. It's actually across our room.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think it's Hall A, and number B, C something, yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI: If you know where our room is, it's on the first floor next to Customer Service or something.

BART BOSWINKEL: That's Hall B.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, that's Hall B. And then opposite of our room, there's ALAC room. Yes, day before yesterday it was very cold in there so take something warm with you.

Okay. I think the agenda is more or less clear.

BART BOSWINKEL: So what you see in front of you is the topics of the meeting with ALAC. And also HUMD is a proposed lead from the ccNSO side on the topic. And then say messages to get across. So maybe that's probably important to look at, whether you want to change the messages and/or direction of travel around these topics. And whether you propose another lead on it and that's why Annebeth is invited as well, together with Nick. And Nick, apologies for misspelling your family name.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, Nick is Annebeth’s voice in the moment because Annebeth is not allowed to speak.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So yeah, I’m speaking for Annebeth but she couldn’t kick me if I say something wrong.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just to run through each of these sessions so you can have your lunch and then say if you have any comments, please raise your hand etc. and want to change.

So first one is again on the specific reviews, the point that Katrina raised and also on the operating standards. I’ve also included Stephen because it’s a little bit broader. It’s probably also around redaction action stuff that’s been ongoing. So let’s allude to the letters etc. of the Council.

The second topic is around the CCWG Internet Governance Charter Review. ALAC is probably very interested. This was one of the topics, say your name is that together with Katrina. And it will be a recurring topic so you will see in a meeting with the GNSO Council as well. So the question is, where is the CCWG

Internet Governance and what should be the message on that topic? Young?

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Yes, I just sent to the Council list the CCWIG report or update. It's not focused on the charter itself because we haven't yet come up with a charter but we have basically agreed on a framework for the group in terms of how to interact with the Board Working Group and how to consistently update the SOs. And also how to get some help from the ICANN staff. So that's only a part of it. Most of the report deals with all the details of what the group has been doing the past year. So you can just look at the document. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Just one question maybe because that will come up with the meeting with the GNSO Council. Does the CCWG IG intend to review its charter and propose an updated version turning this more into maybe a Standing Committee or anything else? And if so, by when? Because I think this Council needs to know in their interaction with the GNSO Council. Because the GNSO Council has already taken a decision to retract from the current working group, the CCWG.

YOUNG EUM LEE:

And I think it was agreed last time that this was not going to be a working group. It was going to adopt a different framework. It is going to be a cross-community sort of effort but it won't be the usual ICANN working group structure because the things that this group has been doing is actually very different from other types of working groups within ICANN because other working groups deal with the internal sort of processes and internal mechanisms of ICANN. But this working group is involved in just to make sure that communities outside of ICANN understands the role of ICANN and gives the appropriate recognition and due respect to this group. And so those are the activities that this group has been involved in and will continue to be involved in.

One of the concerns of the GNSO was that this group may be drawing too much of a resource from ICANN but in terms of funding, this group actually gets no funding from ICANN. The members are part of other sort of organizations within ICANN and they get either personal funding or other funding. But what we do need is to cooperate with the ICANN staff.

And that work that the ICANN staff actually needs to be doing but because it is not going to be easy for the ICANN staff by themselves to be engaged in such activities of informing and engaging with the external community, this group is aiming to just cooperate or collaborate with the ICANN staff. And so it's a very different structure. And so I think that it would be perfectly

okay for ccNSO to retract the support as a chartering group or chartering organization for the working group because this group does not intend to exist as a working group.

BART BOSWINKEL:

So that could be your message with the GNSO Council as well based on say the feedback from you that said the ccNSO will at some point retract its support for the Cross-Community Working Group, not for the effort itself but for the format or structure itself.

Any questions around this topic? Concerns? Shall we move on to Work Track 5, new Subsequent Procedures PDP?

So that's the GNSO and this topic will be recurring at different events, not just with the ALAC so that's this afternoon. Again, just for the background and for your information again, there was a letter from the ccNSO Council to the GNSO Council with a copy to ALAC with a copy to the ICANN Board raising some concerns.

There is also a GAC letter to or at least documentation I would call it, I don't know to whom it was sent but also it alludes to the same concerns. And also the same direction of travel and that is the need for safeguards that at one point, the GAC and the ccNSO needs to be able as a whole to express its views on the

output of this Subsequent Procedure Work Track 5. So there's no need at one point for everybody to be participating in the work track. So that's one concern that was raised in the letter.

The second one was that the participation of the ccNSO would not prevent the ccNSO from launching its own PDP on say the use of country and territory names if time is needed because one of the reasons is and one of the deep concerns that say came out of the CCWG and why it failed is there is an overlap in definitions used by the gTLD people and the ccNSO and specifically in the realm of the IDN ccTLDs.

So the definition used in the Fast Track and overall policy is meaningful representation of the name of a country and that is not limited to any list and could be there are some caveats to it. But it is a very broad, probably not properly defined listed definition. And that will overlap with the definitions under the new gTLD did in the past and it may in the future. Go ahead, Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Just a brief intervention. Yes you're right that it doesn't correspond to anything on the list. But it does correspond to an entry on the list. So it has to be a meaningful representation of the country who has an entry on the list.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. That's the basic condition but then you go into the language etc. and it could be an abbreviation. But it doesn't matter. But there is potentially the need and extension of a ccPDP in this area on meaningful representation and participation doesn't prevent it.

So I think to date, the GNSO has not responded to the letter of the ccNSO. So that's something to raise as well with the GNSO Council, and their views on how to build in these safeguards, and for this afternoon is with ALAC, their view on the safeguards. Because they do have the experience in participating in GNSO Policy Development Processes.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, and the process is very heavy and time-consuming. Nevertheless, Annebeth raised this issue that we need to raise awareness on the ccNSO community and invite them proactively, invite them to participate, to put their names forward and participate in this working group.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I was just going to say they're already on the volunteer list for work Track 5, we've got about 20 people. And there's only I think three of us from the ccNSO. So you can sort of see the weight of

the very strongly held views of the intellectual property constituency of the GNSO.

For example, very heavily dominated by people who are not shy about expressing their strong opinions which are not the same as the policy from the center group or from their Asia Pacific TLD in the sent statement and the ccNSO statement from last time as well. So we need a bit more, please.

KATRINA SATAKI:

So the plan is that we have a meeting with GNSO tomorrow. So we ask specifically what is their position on the concerns and our requirements we put forward. And actually, now GAC has also prepared their stance on this one and it's even more strict than ours. They have even more conditions to this effort.

So when we have a clear answer from the GNSO Council, if everything looks acceptable to us, we'll issue a notation of a [sent], a notation to ccNSO members to a larger ccTLD community to participate, to put their names forward and participate in this work track. Of course, yes, we are not used to the pace and all those heavy time-consuming processes that GNSO guys are really comfortable with. So they are probably people who can contribute their time to the work on policy development. If the voice of Annebeth would like to say something else to add to the discussion...

ANNEBETH LANGE: I'll give it a try. My voice is not good but it's better with a microphone. One thing that we should raise as well is they list a lot of people. It's 58 on the list today. And it's quite a lot that register as individual. They don't flag their affiliation. And that makes it very difficult to find a balance. The GNSO has promised that it should be a balanced group. On the other hand, it's open for everyone. And that makes a problem. So we should try to figure out how we can do that [if] that's possible.

BART BOSWINKEL: May I ask to maybe this is helpful. Say on the informal feedback I had from GNSO Support Staff is a clarification on the type of safeguards the ccNSO Council and the ccNSO would like to see in such a charter. I can think of a few.

The second question is because I think that's important in doing this meeting is what if they can't be provided by the GNSO? Because their argument is we do not allow for the safeguards in our PDP manual.

An example is the CCWG always has – so that's the strength effectively of the CCWG is that the participating organizations however defined have the ultimate voting power. You could insert something like this between the output of the working

group and the moment that the GNSO Council according to the PDP would need to take a vote. This is the experience of the FOI the ccNSO had so there is always say the ccNSO voluntarily allowed the GAC to at least express its objection or non-objection. And you could argue say something like this needs to be inserted. But there is no way and probably the feedback on the side from the GNSO is that manual doesn't allow us to do so. But it's a voluntary thing.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: That's an interesting point but what the geographic communities were promised was a balanced working group and a balanced representation. And the problem with the GNSO is that they have this rough consensus. And if there's only three of us out of 50 who are all the people from our constituency or in one view, and it's a minority view because it's very strongly dominated by the other lot, then that might according to the current definitions be consensus. And we don't agree with that.

BART BOSWINKEL: And this allows you to at least flag it to your fellow ccTLDs and say this is – it also alleviates the pressure for a lot of people to participate. At the end of the day, the work is done within the working group like in the CCWG. You have rough consensus, that's it. But ultimately like if you recall say with the stewardship

and with the accountability who is a fair and long discussion within the community, ccTLD community, were it to support the output. So not everybody has to participate all the time because you got this safeguard. That is probably the strength of the CCWG model.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any more questions or comments? Yes, Ching.

CHING CHIAO: Thank you, Katrina. Maybe just a point of clarification needed is that when we talk about safeguard here, are we talking about the bottom line that's being put in our letter saying that if there's – I mean the ccNSO's bottom line is that whatever is in the 2012 – I mean the mechanism in the New gTLD Program itself or are we talking about something new beyond or something more stricter than the 2012? So maybe just – I probably just myself would need a point of clarification. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: My understanding of the discussions at the time at the Council level was if there is no consensus within the working group and/or one of the I will call it participating organizations disagrees, then you fall back on the current situation. There is no

new policy in the area of use of country and territory names. And the current situation is what is in the AGB.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: That is what we're fighting for. I mean I actually want to tap and embedded in Terms of Reference for that working group.

KATRINA SATAKI: So the idea is to try to find a better solution but if all the attempts fail, we go back to AGM.

BART BOSWINKEL: Next topic, any other questions, remarks around this particular topic? Because this is going through the whole week. And be aware this is uncharted waters, having something like this under a PDP. So that's the result of this build on best practices.

Next topic, meetings, strategy, general SO/AC, proposed leads are Katrina and Margarita because you participate in the ccNSO Internal Meetings Review Team. And Margarita was also part of the new ICANN Meeting Strategy Working Group. Just the ccNSO Internal Review as topic, why and what the intention is. And the current format, what is standard and something around the general meeting strategy maybe you want to allude to it.

KATRINA SATAKI:

We had one of the calls where the SO/AC leadership, when we discussed future meeting strategy. As you know, we're now on almost four years. We are on this new meeting format. Meetings A, B, C. And the question that we received from ICANN was first about meeting venues, should they have any additional requirements, any additional criteria when evaluating where we should meet, where we should go for a meeting.

And the second question was about how happy we are with the current kind of format. And yes, well first majority on the call for the – there's no need for some any additional criteria. I must say that I was in minority. But second question apparently it looks like Meeting B Policy Forum seems one day too short. And Meeting C seems one day too long. So maybe at some point, yes, we will go back to where we were but currently it's not clear yet. But I think I forwarded to you the summary document of the discussion that we had.

With respect to cross-community sessions and meeting planning, it's really difficult and well Alejandra is not here but if she was here, she would have nodded in agreement. It's really very difficult. It looks like it's getting even more difficult. Some things are clearer and easier, some things are still unclear. But if you wish anything to be raised during the process of planning of the next meeting in Puerto Rico, then just let me know and I

think on Thursday there's the meeting for when we start to plan for the first meeting of the year, which is in Puerto Rico. Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Just to be in the safe side, this was all around the ccNSO, ALAC meeting which is this afternoon from 5:00 to 6:00. I'll now turn to the Board ccNSO meeting which is on Wednesday. Your order is a bit strange but that was – I didn't have to turn to you, adjust it. Again, the topics, one is say these are just topics raised by the ccNSO Council.

One of them and this is just as an informational for with the Board is the scheduling of the ccNSO Board meetings. They have changed over the last two years dramatically going from Tuesday around say the second session to this time Wednesday after lunch. And it's the Program Working Group is informed about a month ahead of the meeting and the ccNSO schedule needs to be readjusted again for that purpose. And the ccNSO is not the only one that's concerned. That's Katrina.

ccNSO concerns related to the latest NomCom appointment and the process around it. Again, Katrina the lead, I haven't included any comments, messages I think the message is clear and given the letters, etc. to the NomCom I don't know if you want to add anything.

Then again the next one and again Annebeth and Nick, that's the ccNSO participation in Work Track 5, probably here it's more around the institutional issues around participation that and the safeguards. And it's not just a ccNSO problem as we discussed. You got the same kind of arguments there.

The nice thing about it, this is on Wednesday so you will have had the meeting with ALAC. You will have had the meeting with the GAC. You will have had the meeting with the GNSO. So this is a concluding meeting. And so to give a sense of the responses received etc.

Then the final one and again this is just a follow-up is the joint ccNSO-SSAC response to the Board on its letter on the EPO. So [peak] guidelines, what are the next steps. It's not just the next steps around the [inaudible] but also around the adoption of the overall policy. To date that policy was submitted in 2013 and it's still on the Board agenda. Knowingly, just to test and experiment with the current say Fast Track and that's why there was the ability to resolve. So any questions around this part, the meetings with the Board at this stage? I'll move on.

ccNSO-GAC meeting. That's on Tuesday. Hall 3, that's in this side of the building. So we have to cross from that side. It's about a 5 to 10 minutes' walk, depending on your walking speed. So we need to take that into account. It's only three quarters of an

hour. ISO 3166 use of three letter codes as TLDs, that was the GAC topic. Yeah, you could refer to the suggestion to the CCWG proposal of what's included. Second one is next steps. Again this is the participation in Work Track 5. This is the moment and opportunity to build a coalition with the GAC.

PDP retirement update, Nigel, that's... And then the FAQ and delegation transfer revocation is on the agenda as well. And that's more question around the context as discussed on the previous Council call. Meeting strategy again as an update. And then final, this came in from the GAC, is a final question lowering the barriers to participation. Again with the suggestion and, Katrina, it's most of you, mostly it's you on these topics.

Any questions around the topics listed here? Comments? Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: This is somewhat [proofing] but since we PDP was mentioned, that means the FOI was implicitly mentioned and as you know, we have been in discussions with IANA for ensuring that the FOI policies are integrated within the IANA and day-to-day procedures. And I've been in touch with Elise and she's informed me that there's been some progress on that front since ICANN59

and I'll be meeting with her hopefully this afternoon if not sometime tomorrow.

She further informs me that when the IANA presentation is done at the Members Meeting, the presenters will touch on what's been updated. I just wanted to give Council a heads up that there is some progress being made. I don't yet have details.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Next topic. And that's the final one, it's quite extensive I would say. ccNSO, GNSO Council meetings. So that's tomorrow lunch meeting. And that's in I believe opposite the ccNSO meeting room as well. You got ALAC and then the GNSO Councils or GNSO meeting. So the topic is ccNSO, GNSO decisional participant and easy procedures process updates.

My suggestion is to inform them about the – and I've asked Giovanni to participate in that session around the update of the SOP Charter. It's on your agenda – will be on your agenda – and allude to the reasons why it needed to be updated in the context of the decisional participant. And for your information, the GNSO is working on a similar group as the SOP. And so this is an opportunity to create a link between the SOP and that group as well. And it's going to be at the level of GNSO Council as far as I understand. But that was in Ben's update as well. So that's the first topic.

The second topic is again I haven't included your names, Annebeth and Nick. But it's on the follow-up on the letter of Work Track 5 maybe together with you. Then follow-up CCWG IG Charter. Again, I think it's Katrina, Young I've put your name there as well as a suggestion. Then the CSC related topics and that's Byron and Katrina. Formerly Byron, a little bit of EURALO's Chair but also [inaudible] of the CSC but also as Council members. The role of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils because it's relatively high on the ccNSO Council's agenda, what needs to happen it's not on the GNSO Council. On the side from the GNSO side, Donna will assist in clarifying. So the results of the CSC Charter what will happen, and maybe the SLA procedures a little bit. And the upcoming CSC related previews because there is a role for both GNSO and ccNSO Council in that area. So it's on their agenda.

Finally, the reviews and that's again Katrina and maybe that's just as a suggestion for when you think about it, say based on the discussions I've heard to date is it might be an idea to start thinking about reducing the number of reviews if you think about it. The way to do this is through a Bylaw change and it needs to come from the SOs and ACs.

This is the time I think if you just take the CSC as an example, the CSC is subject to three reviews within one year. And then in a couple of years, when this one is done, there will be a second

round maybe in two or three years, you need to start thinking about it. Then together with the [ccNSO] – that was my proposal.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Thank you. Any other ideas, comments, questions? I have one question. We are preparing the present for Steve. First of all, all who have brought their postcards, please give them to me, Bart, Joke, or Kim so that we can compile them together. Second question is when shall we give it to Steve? During our meeting with the Board? One option. Or during Steve’s farewell party, that’s another option. Please know that our meeting with the Board is after the cocktail farewell party.

Yes, Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

I think the farewell party is likely to be busy and confusing and we will have his dedicated attention at our own meeting so that even though it’s later it’s probably a good idea to do it when we meet with him directly. But we can just do it the other way.

KATRINA SATAKI:

But maybe we can have it just in case with us on Tuesday evening. If everybody starts bringing presents and saying thank

you, it would be a little bit strange for us to pretend that we don't know him, especially.

BART BOSWINKEL: You always remember the present you get last, the best.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's true. That is true. Okay. We actually have only two minutes left. Therefore can we please quickly go through our Council priorities? Can you all open the presentation? I'll go around through it.

Actually, taking pictures when people eat should be forbidden.

BART BOSWINKEL: In the meantime while you wait for the presentation, any additional topics for Wednesday's Council meeting? I've sent you the – so the main topics are on the final page so that's mandate GRC to look at the ccNSO Internal Review and the operating standards approval of the SOP Working Group change of charter to the SOP Standing Committee participation in the RDS review and updates of the weeks so that's a major brink of the –

KATRINA SATAKI: One of these we'll try to invite SSR2.

BART BOSWINKEL: You want to invite them in person or visit?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. In person. It's better that we can ask questions and everything.

Okay, so on Tuesday morning right after the opening, we have the ccNSO Council priorities. Next slide please.

First and then the hottest one is of course – well, we work for members. I can't believe we have 162 members. Next slide please.

The most important one is apparently PDP retirement of ccTLDs. Update will be given on Tuesday later the day. Next slide.

Customer Standing Committee Charter review. It's something that we have to work on, it's a joint effort. Next one.

Use of country and territory names very briefly update on that. Next one.

ccNSO review. Our organizational review, not a specific review, it's organizational review. It was deferred to 2018. And we had to do self-evaluation. This is actually something that also I think would be really pragmatic way to ask Guidelines Review Committee to do the self-evaluation and present result, report

to the Council so that Council can review and add. And then we could also publish it for ccNSO community to comment so they can add something to this self-evaluation. So probably it's helping us to identify the gaps, identify problems with the processes so that we could show independent examiners that we take things very seriously and we're ready and willing to improve ourselves. And yeah, GRC currently is working already. Go forward.

There's a need to update guideline on the nomination to the Board. And after the elections the Nominations Manager will come up with a report and some recommendations and those recommendations will need to be implemented. I think that's it. Next one.

Just briefly, we definitely need more people on board because five regions we have uncontested elections. I can't say I'm not happy but nevertheless something needs to be done. We're working on this onboarding document thanks to Alejandra who together with Elena they really worked contributed a lot to this document. Next one.

I think that's it. Any other priorities that I missed need to be mentioned? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's not a missed priority. We've got a contested election for the Board position. And uncontested Council positions in these two sessions. Now we've already changed the contested Board nominees at the 45-minute slot earlier. And then the Council nominees, they've got 30 minutes in the afternoon. You've already seen the questions that I've posed to start the discussion going for the Board nominees. And for the Council people I was just going to ask them essentially, what was the value of this Council that made them want to do another two? But I was just wondering if the community has still got questions after the 45-minute session, how would the Council nominees feel if we take the start of that 30-minute session to continue questioning the Board nominees? I'm just wanting to make sure that everyone feels comfortable they've got enough time to question the Board nominees.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, while I still believe that the community has the right to ask questions to Council nominees even though there will be no elections there, I think if there are still questions after 45 minutes of grilling and if there are still any volunteers to stand for the Board and there are still questions from the community, I think we could have 10 minutes for Councilors and – okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I agree with you Katrina. The community still needs to put questions to the Council as well. But I was thinking 10, 15 minutes at max. Now it might be not and I'm not sure and it might be a real struggle to fill the 45 minutes. But I've already put five questions. And I plan to give them each two minutes for each question.

And so I'm looking to Margarita's – I know it will be Alejandra's little device of counting down the time and making sure those two minutes are adhered to. But that basically already takes up 20 minutes of those 45 minutes. And then there's a lot of questions. And I would like to think the community wants to ask of [inaudible] of those candidates.

KATRINA SATAKI: Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: If I recall on that conference call, we have a discussion about your question regarding RFC 1591 and the trust issue aspect of that. Are you still planning to go open that can of worms?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The question is actually just quite specific about what they see the role of the CC and the local Internet community. And I do

think it's a relevant question for ccNSO. I'm not expecting it to go down a red hole. They've got two minutes. But I do think referencing 1591 is actually a relevant question to ask.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay if we can just keep into the two minutes, I'll leave that to you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I need a timer. I will literally the first one that goes over we'll show that it will be two minutes.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, so no objections to grilling them longer.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: The longer, the merrier.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's true. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I will warn them. It might be all over in 45 minutes but I just want everyone to be comfortable if I take that approach if necessary.

KATRINA SATAKI: Clearly, if there are still questions, we just need to have them answered by the candidates.

So with that, thank you very much. I think we're more or less done with preparations for our meeting on Wednesday. If anything else pops up, please feel free to send any ideas to Council. We still can add something to our agenda.

BART BOSWINKEL: And see you at 5:00 this afternoon.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah that's true. Don't forget at 5:00 we have a meeting with ALAC. See you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]