

---

ABU DHABI – ccNSO/GNSO Joint Council meeting  
Monday, October 30, 2017 – 12:15 to 13:30 GST  
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It is Monday, October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017, at 12:00. This is 12:15. This is the ccNSO/GNSO Joint Council Meeting in Hall B, Section B/C.  
[AUDIO BREAK]

JAMES BLADEL: Good afternoon and welcome, and thanks for joining us. This is the joint GNSO and ccNSO Joint Council Lunch -- working lunch. So we have both the GNSO and ccNSO councilors at the table. Certainly, if you haven't had a chance to get something to eat, please grab a plate and come to the table. And the same for the folks in the audience.

We have an agenda. I think we've got at least one item of AOB that's probably going to be added as well. As far as welcome and opening statements, this is something that I think we've adopted since a couple of years now, is having this joint session away from the weekend sessions, and on a Monday, and over lunch; and I think, from my perspective, it's working well, and I think it's a nice way to get together and exchange views during something we were going to do anyway, which is eventually eat.

---

*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.*

---

So, with that, I'll turn it over to Katrina, the chair of the ccNSO. I'm getting -- this is a very hot mic, right now. I don't know if there's a speaker right behind me or that's -- okay. Go ahead, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, James. Good afternoon, everyone. Glad to see so many of you here around the table enjoying your lunch. One thing that I realized after yesterday's meeting where we had internal meetings, and also a working lunch; I think that picture taking during lunch must be forbidden. So, if an ICANN guy with camera comes -- I sense some community support on that. So, if you see somebody with camera coming in, just tell them to go away. Okay. Thank you.

And with that, I think we will move to our agenda item number two. It's about Empowered Community procedures and processes. We wanted to share some of our work, what we've done with respect to rejection actions. We're working on an internal guideline, and we have a pretty solid draft at the moment, where the procedures are clear procedures what the community should do if they want to submit a rejection action.

And for that, as you may know, we have this long-standing strategic and operational plan working group and with --

---

currently, we're updating the charter, and they will be promoted from a working group to a standing committee, and they will be given -- as they are the ones who prepare our comments on the budgets and all the plans, so they will be in the position to submit rejection-action petition to the ccNSO Council.

And as we know, you are also working on having a similar group that reviews all the documents, and budgets, and things, and I would like to hear what are your plans. And while you eat, maybe I can ask Stephen, who is our leading person on rejection actions to tell more about the way we decided to handle this really, very complex, complicated issue. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Stephen Deerhake for the record. We've completed the approval action guideline, and we are in, I believe, it's going to be draft number five of the rejection-action guideline. One of the things we've been up against with the rejection-actions guideline is the very tight time frames that are embodied in the bylaws, and I am assuming you guys probably have a similar issue that you're looking at.

Hang on a sec. There we go. I don't have a slide deck for you yet, I have a slide deck in preparation for a session in the ccNSO on Members Day 2; I don't remember the time, but you're all

---

welcome to come, where I will be discussing both the time frames that we're up against, and also how the guideline is coming along and being structured.

Highlights of the draft of the rejection guideline are that we -- and we did this with the approval guideline as well, we basically appoint what we would call a rejection-action manager; it's kind of like an issues manager.

We have -- one person is responsible for receipt of the paperwork that comes from JJ, and comes from the ECA, and manages the process of getting, in the case of a rejection guideline, getting the rejection petition from one of our community members and ensuring that our secretariat gets it, and council gets it, etc., etc.

Another aspect of the rejection guideline is that we also are going to have a small group of councilors who will evaluate any rejection-action guideline submitted and advise the rest of council as to whether the council should accept it and become a decisional participant, and then begin solicitation of support from another SO/AC.

We have -- just so you know, there are upcoming rejection actions, the draft PTI/IANA FY19 operating plans and budget is currently out; both of those are currently out for public

---

comment, which closes on the 26th of November, and it's likely -  
- well, I wouldn't say it's likely -- it's possible that there may be a  
displeasure with some aspect, which might result in a public  
comment, which might result in a rejection-action petition from  
one of the AC/SOs. So that part of the process is going to,  
probably, start up early December, potentially.

And the second upcoming rejection action that I'm aware of at  
this point is the draft ICANN FY19 Operating Plan and Budget. I  
expect the board will be adopting that in mid-January, which  
will open up a comment period, which will run from mid-July  
until early March, and so we may see -- and I have my ACA hat on  
at this point -- we may well see rejection petition surrounding  
the overall ICANN budget and/or operating plan.

The guideline -- now, back with my guideline-writing hat on -- is  
fairly complex. We're working draft five as a simplification effort  
from draft four, and the ccNSO is more than happy to share the  
fruits of our labor with regards to what we're doing with you  
guys, if you're at all interested. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thank you, Stephen. So, do you have any indication of which  
SOs and ACs are considering rejecting the budget? That's not a  
small undertaking; that could potentially be a very disruptive...

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, it could be very disruptive. I have no evidence. I think the best way to monitor what might be going on is conversations amongst the various SO/ACs, but also monitor the comments list because, in order for someone to submit a rejection-action petition, they will first have to submit a comment during the public comment period, expressing their displeasure with whatever it is they're displeased with.

In the absence of any comments, or in the absence of any comment that is strongly worded about something, I think it's probably safe to assume that we won't be seeing any follow-on rejection-action petitions during the rejection-action petition period, which follows on after the public comment period.

JAMES BLADEL: So, your earlier statement wasn't a cagey way of saying that the ccNSO --

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, no, no, not at all. I didn't mean it that way. No.

---

JAMES BLADEL:

Okay. Thank you. I thought I saw some people raising hands, but -- yes? No? Well, let me just give you kind of our side of the coin. Clearly, we're wrestling with some of the same issues. I do this, I don't speak into the microphone, and I apologize. Is this better?

Okay. So, we are struggling with some of the same issues. I believe it was about this time last year, we commissioned a bylaws drafting team to look at harmonizing the GNSO's bylaws and operating procedures to align them with our new roles and responsibilities as decisional participants.

That work was completed and presented back to the Council, and the Council -- the GNSO Council is -- we had a presentation on them this weekend in our Sunday session, yesterday. There is a planned GNSO Council workshop that will take place in January of next year, and the new bylaws will be front and center as part of that workshop.

The goal is -- well, I think first off, we should note that we're not rushing this process. We understand that we're tinkering fairly deeply under the hood of how the GNSO operates, and so we're taking a look at everything very closely. But we are trying to address some of the other issues, including the timelines that you mentioned, and that we have aligning the bylaws timelines with GNSO timelines is very challenging.

---

I think the same could be said for voting thresholds and ensuring that all of our different -- I think we currently have, I don't know, four or five different kinds of votes and voting thresholds, and I think the new bylaws will probably give us four or five more, depending on the situation. So, that's the status that we are currently in, and I mean, I won't be around, but I suspect this will be tackled in early part of 2018.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. So any other questions or comments?

JAMES BLADEL: I'm sorry. I'm sorry for the second intervention. You're second part of your question was asking about our new committee for a standing committee on budget. That's something that we have not decided to do. It's something that we are considering. We are looking at charter composition, but it is a reflection of our role in examining the budget and submitting comments.

So, that's what's behind this; getting earlier out in front of that, up until this point, it's been done, but in a very ad hoc -- the various stakeholder groups and constituencies might have formal processes, but the GNSO Council's process was very ad hoc, and we're looking at formalizing that. But it's not a



---

foregone conclusion yet, but that committee will be approved and will actually exist.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes, thank you. Actually, if you need any help or advice, maybe you'd like to participate in some meetings of our SOP working group, so you're welcome. I'm sure that they will gladly share their experience, their procedures, how they organize their work so that might be maybe helpful for you as well. Michele, you had a question.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Katrina. Michele for the record. On the topic of budgets, I assume you guys were also approached by ICANN about the Travel Support Budget, and they're looking for feedback on that, and they've asked a number of questions and things of that.

Now, I'm not an accountant. I wouldn't pretend to be an accountant. I have a very good accountant who works for me. But when you look at the expenditure in that area, the trend is very much in the upwards graph. However, if you look at ICANN's income, it isn't. So the expenditure, just looking at travel support, never mind anything else, is I would humbly suggest, slightly out of control.

---

And the question that maybe needs to be asked is, what kind of KPIs are they looking at when they assign some of this expenditure; how are they measuring the return of an investment? And I mean, for this particular budget -- I mean, we're only being asked a couple of specific questions, but some of this stuff will feed into the next budget-development process, and speaking personally, I know after having spoken to other people as well, some of us are really scratching our heads.

Being more specific, you see ICANN paying to bring a lot of people to ICANN meetings, yet they don't engage even in the ICANN meetings themselves, nor do we ever see them in ongoing policy-development processes, which I thought was part of ICANN's remit. So, maybe it's something for you guys to look at as well.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes. Thank you, Michele. Certainly, that's something that we should look into, and yes, we received requests for some feedback; haven't provided any yet, but yeah, we will work on that as well. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL:

So, Nigel and Stephen.

---

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, James; listened to what Michele had to say with great interest. Not being an accountant myself, either, I don't know what KPI is.

MICHELE NEYLON: Key performance indicators.

NIGEL HICKSON: Oh, yes.

MICHELE NEYLON: Or simply put, Nigel --

NIGEL HICKSON: Bang for the buck.

MICHELE NEYLON: I spent 10 Euro; what did I get?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thanks. The ccNSO Council, I think over a period of many years, has been doing its bit to keep costs down. It's probably not well-known that councilors don't get funded for, approximately, two-

---

thirds of the meetings they attend. We get funding one in three; sometimes, there's a little bit of wiggle room if other people don't come and so on.

You said a little bit out of control; I'd just comment that's like saying a little bit pregnant.

MICHELE NEYLON: A little bit what? Sorry.

NIGEL HICKSON: Pregnant. We'll do our bit to work with the GNSO to look for a new way forward because I don't think the existing system of seats that they've used, irrespective of cost, is quite the way it should be done.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think it's not just the seats assigned to SO/ACs. Travel funding also includes all the fellows, all newcomers, everyone who gets funding to come to meetings, so that's not just -- we're not talking here only about seats or SO/ACs --

NIGEL HICKSON: Or as Michele and I might put it, Uncle Tom Cobley and all.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Well you know, Nigel, sometimes I just will have to tell you, you're English is horrible.

JAMES BLADEL: Was that English? Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, if I could just give you guys a very, very brief overview of how the SOP working group, soon-to-be committee, has dealt with analyzing ICANN budget in the past is -- and Debbie can correct me here cause she's also in the group, and Giovanni can as well, if he's in the room -- is that we carve up various sections of what ICANN's produced and claimed to be the proposed budget, and we set up little working parties, and we go through it with a pretty fine-tooth comb.

Each little working party working on whatever section of the budget, writes a report about what they think is a problem, what they think is okay; it goes back to Giovanni, who collates. So we end up with a fairly substantial document, and I'm sure we're going to be looking at this travel stuff as well because there is -- as you rightly point out, Michele -- there's this growing trend between expenditures on the one side, and income on the other,

---

and given their -- yeah, given their emergency-reserve situation, it's doubly of concern. So, I'm sure we will be commenting on that as we get into the actual ICANN FY19 budget-analysis process. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. I think it's time for us to move to the next agenda item because we have only half an hour left for our meeting, and that's follow-up on the work of the Cross-Community Working Group on the country and territory names used as top-level domains.

Yes, as you know, now we have moved to this Work Track 5 under your PDP, and even though yes, we appointed our co-chair, co-leader to that Work Track, Annabeth, we still have some worries, and we tried to express them in our letter to you. So my understanding is that you are working on the answer -- no? Are you not going to provide any official feedback? Something to calm us down and to ensure that we have a very good collaboration?

JAMES BLADEL:

Sure. So just generally, and then I'll call on Heather to perhaps give some more context. First of all, thank you for sending us a co-chair, designating a co-chair, and thank you for sending us

---

Annabeth, in particular. I just would note that we are trying to -- so we had a very similar conversation with the GAC yesterday, which is folks are coming to a PDP, but they have kind of -- it's conditional. And the conditions seem to be that we want to participate in your PDP as long as it doesn't operate too much like a PDP.

And we're having -- so we're trying to reconcile that with our rules because our rules are not just arbitrary, they are what make the outcome of the PDP enforceable in contracts for registries and registrars and to make sure that we can then later go and get them overturned on appeal or something like that. So, we're trying to reconcile.

Some of the requests that were in your letter and are in the GAC's similar letter, and I think some statements made by the ALAC, some of those are compatible with the PDP, some of them are more restrictive, which I think what we're thinking is we can probably make it work with the PDP, but some of them are in opposition.

So we're trying to work through this because, obviously, we can't have the ccNSO co-chair working on ccNSO conditions and the GAC co-chair under GAC conditions, and then you know, we're trying to stitch it all together into a uniform, shared set of

---

expectations, because I think that's what going to foster some cooperation and work on this issue.

So that group is just now getting organized, is my understanding. We have, and the Council level have given the leadership of that work -- Jeff, and now Cheryl Langdon-Orr -- a fairly broad discretion to support, and organize, and manage that effort. And I think they're doing a fantastic job.

So, as far as a formal response, it is possible that we would have one. I think what we would probably put out is, instead of responding to each SO/AC co-chairs individually, we might put out sort of an overarching response of the framework or something as the Work Track 5 gets under way, something like that. But all of those are currently under consideration, and something that we would do if -- I guess, I would ask the question -- turn it around and ask the question, "Would the ccNSO take great offense if we responded to the GAC, the ccNSO, and the ALAC, jointly, in a single communication, as opposed to individually tailored response --?"

Okay. So, that might be one item that we would take away to do work on that. And then, I think -- Heather, whatever you'd like to add, go ahead.



---

HEATHER FORREST: No, you've said everything.

JAMES BLADEL: Okay. So, I don't know if that's helpful or -- I mean we want to, I think -- we want to make this work. We're excited about it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Are you?

JAMES BLADEL: Yes.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay.

JAMES BLADEL: You know, on some of these hard issues, I think we have to try new things. The next item is a CCWG-IG charter, and I note that Rafik had asked to speak to this, and we can essentially let him give an update on the effort to, essentially, re-charter the CCWG-IG. And I know you also have to leave very soon, so I think we'll give him the floor and just see if he can give us a briefing.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Sorry. Thanks, James. No, I'm not going to leave soon. I just was going to arrive late, but I think I'm on time. Anyway, so Rafik speaking. I think maybe the title can be misleading. There is some echo. I don't think it's about charter change, but --

JAMES BLADEL: Can I interrupt you for a second? Can we get the tech folks to take a look at the microphone or the speaker? Terry? Terry? Can we get the tech folks to take a look at the microphone and speaker? I think Rafik is getting quite a bit of feedback, and he's not able to speak into the microphone, and we can't hear him if he doesn't, and he's kind of...

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks. I will try this one.

JAMES BLADEL: Perfect. Thank you. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: So, I think maybe the title can be misleading a little bit. We were not tasked to -- it's not about charter change, but it's more about creating a new vehicle to replace the CCWG-IG. So, what we did after the GNSO resolution on that matter, we had a small

---

group and first we tried maybe to see if we can use any existing structure. We thought that's not -- maybe doesn't fit what we need, and so what we did is just we said, "Okay, we will have maybe a Cross-Community Engagement Group, and from that work on what is needed maybe until we work the charter."

So we tried, for example, to put some objectives and targets and several requirements to respond to the concern from our charting organization. So yes, we are kind of moving backward. We say we should have the Cross-Community Engagement Group, and then we try to put all the specifics that respond to the concerns. So we have kind of, for now, a first draft. It's really a zero draft, let's say that. And just to -- we are setting kind of a timeline for us because we are supposed as a group to make a proposal, I think, by February. And so, we have like a few months to do so.

So, this is kind of the current status for the work going on in term of making a proposal for our charting organization. And if there is any other input, will be really helpful for us because we are kind of listing several requirements because it's not just about creating a new structure -- we have so many in the ICANN space - - but we have the challenge in how we work with other groups because we have like the board working group on internet governance, how we should we work with the ICANN staff, but

---

also how we add more accountability and reporting mechanisms to our charting organization so we keep them informed about what we are doing, the different space.

And we are starting to do that more, and hopefully, we can create more let's say clear mechanisms. So we are now producing all this activities report. We don't know if they are matching the expectation, but we can do more on that area.

So, that's the kind of status -- it's the state of our work for the moment. But, I mean any input or guidance will be really helpful for us as to what the situation that we spend time to make a proposal, and then, kind of our charting organization maybe has some concerns. So, maybe we can try to share the draft as soon as possible, just a draft, so that can be consulted and we can get input on that matter.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Rafik. Young-Eum. [AUDIO BREAK]

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Thanks, Katrina. This is Young-Eum. We had a very similar discussion with the ALAC Council yesterday, and continuing on with what Rafik has just said, I would actually kind of like to clarify a bit more what this group is doing or has been doing.

---

Just because the name of this group has internet governance in it, it doesn't mean that we are concerned with things that govern the internet.

This purpose of this group is more to enhance the understanding of the internet governance and make the work of ICANN more recognized and more understood by organizations outside of ICANN. And as I think the GNSO Council also, and the ccNSO Council, just received our report on what we have been doing, and you will see that we have been mostly involved in activities outside of ICANN, like the ITU, the IGF, the UN -- in trying to help them understand basically the role of ICANN in this world of internet governance.

And so, this group is more -- it was appropriate that the GNSO did not like the word 'working group' because we weren't involved in anything having to do with any of the processes within ICANN. And I think the word 'engagement' is much more appropriate for what we have been doing because that is exactly what we have been doing, trying to engage groups outside of ICANN in activities that are occurring in ICANN. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, Young-Eum. James.

---

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks. So, a question for Rafik and the previous speaker would be, if this is not a cross-community working group, but a cross-community engagement group, does it still fall within the framework for cross-community working groups? Does it fall outside of it? I mean, how does it work? And maybe I'm getting ahead of myself and I should just wait for the draft charter.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, James. That's a fair question. So, I think first, the terminology seems that matter for many, I think, in GNSO that if we use the cross-community working group, it has some meaning; it means also that we will supposedly follow the framework and so on, so we tried to move from that. And also I think to emphasize that when we use like the engagement -- and in fact, we are taking kind of inspiration from existing groups.

There was a list kindly shared by GNSO policy staff, the different structure that was created for a specific reason within the GNSO, and we find like maybe should we need the standing committee; it can be an engagement group, and so on. I thought engagement, maybe that's something that's more close to what we are trying to achieve.

And so, as explained, we put that as the name. Said, "We will use this, and then list all the requirements that we have to

---

satisfy, like it should be cross-community because I think that's one of the needs and how we ensure that we are getting some resource because we don't have that, and ensuring that, for example, we get meeting and so on.

And we can reuse the revised charter to adjust it to our needs. So, to which extent that something that's still under discussion because, for example, we are trying to clarify our relation to the board working group and internet governance because they want to work with us, and so, how we can deal with that.

And also, we heard a lot about all the issues about accountability and reporting, so we need to do more. Maybe that's not -- it won't be like for the CCWG that's because it responds to different needs. But yeah, I mean you are going ahead of that issue. We are trying to work all the specifics but that's the kind of input that can help us just avoid a situation that, you know, we create something and oh, that's not what we need.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thank you, Rafik. I'm just noticing the time, and we have -- well, do I have my time here? Yeah. And we need to probably move on, we have a half an hour left. Would you be amenable to switching number five and number six? Because I don't think we

---

have a whole lot to discuss with agenda number item five, or at least from our side, we don't have a lot of useful stuff to contribute. But I think we want to leave that open, in case you have something you'd like to ask of us.

More concerning I think is item number six. As many of you are aware, in particular one of the review teams, SSR2, has been recommended for suspension, strongly recommended, or has been suspended by the board, pending some work from the SOs and the ACs to address some of the concerns that are associated with SSR2 to get it restarted.

I'll be as blunt as possible. If we can speak candidly, since we're on the record and being recorded, this came as a surprise to the GNSO. Certainly, we've had some discussions about how difficult and challenging it is to select individuals to participate in these groups and the scoping issues that we've discussed in the past; in many cases, those were I thought more broadly overarching concerns.

I was not aware that, for example, the SSAC was going to send a letter specifically on SSR2. I wasn't aware that the board was planning to suspend SSR2. So, a lot of these developments happened, I think, very quickly.



---

Having said that, I think what we need to do -- GNSO, ccNSO, SSAC, ALAC, GAC -- we need to figure out what's wrong with this group; what prompted the board to take this action; and how we can get it restarted as quickly as possible because it is important work, and it is somewhat overdue; and what needs to happen to get it back on track.

I think there is, particularly in the GNSO, there is a concern. We weren't even sure that the board could do this to a review team. If you recall, those were part of the AOC established as independent oversight mechanisms, and so it challenges the idea that these are independent. It may be exactly the right move and the right decision in this specific instance, but I think it creates a concerning precedent for future review teams that might be operating in a way that a future board doesn't like, and so, I think we're concerned about maybe setting a precedent that these independent review teams are, in fact, not independent; that they serve, essentially, at the pleasure of the board.

So, these are all the topics that we were discussing yesterday, Sunday, and a little bit last night, a little bit this morning, and I would be very curious as to -- from the ccNSO side, did you know this was coming; did you see this train coming down the tracks; were you able to jump out of the way; and what do you think,

---

more importantly perhaps, what do you think we need to do to get this restarted?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes. Thank you very much, James. First of all, yes, we saw SSAC's letter. I don't know -- they sent it in September, I guess. So we saw it. We knew about the board's intention to suspend the SSAC's review team because they told us that on Friday. Yeah. But we didn't know that before, but they certainly told that on Friday.

Yeah, well of course, it raises a lot of questions. At the same time, as you pointed out, the work has been overdue, already. So, something is definitely going wrong. Whether it's the board's responsibility or our responsibility to look at the review team and make sure that they are back on track, that's again another question.

The way I see it, of course, the whole process was a little bit out of track because, according to the bylaws, the specific review teams -- yes, they are independent, but they are guided by operating standards. And operating standards were not developed in time, let's say. We have a first draft only now, but the work on the review teams, on forming review teams had started already, probably a little bit less than a year ago.

---

So, according to the current draft of operating standards, a year before the actual review starts, we, as SO/ACs, we need to form a scope-drafting team. The only concern of this scope-drafting team is to come up with a scope for the review.

Then of course, it's much easier for us to select the right volunteers. It's much easier for volunteers to put their name forward to the particular review because first, they see what they're supposed to do. Second, skillset is more or less clear because you see what you have to do, and then, the time commitment that you have in front of you, again, is clear because you see what you have to do. And apparently, you know how much time you have for that.

So, we had nothing of that; yet, we started the reviews. We cannot go a year back when we started it all and do it properly. So apparently, we need to find a way to do it the right way now - - how to move forward, right?

Yeah, I think that probably it was the right decision, and by talking to different members on that review team, apparently that had to be done. We also learned our lessons -- at least, I certainly did -- we should have asked for feedback from our appointed members on the review team long ago. We didn't do that, so the blame, partly, lays on us as well. I assume you didn't pay much attention either.

---

JAMES BLADEL: We had the exact same discovery yesterday, so I don't know if you wanted to say some more -- Heather was in the queue, and then --

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, Heather.

JAMES BLADEL: Any others? Heather, go ahead.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, James. And thanks, Katrina. I think the concern, you know, the concern that we've expressed within Council is that somehow we've gone from general discussions, as you've just said, about scope and appointments and so on, to specifically talking about SSR RT2, and the board seems to think that that jump was logical and/or anticipated.

And, you know, much of the discussion that we had at the end of Friday was general around how do we deal with these things going forward? How do we, you know, how do we get ourselves out of a challenge where we're not sure that things fit right, and so on? So, I think -- yeah, I think we need to somehow either in

---

dealing with the general, deal with the specific, but not the other way around. Yeah.

SSR RT2 is one of our activities that's underway, and it's an activity that, no question, is related to all of these topics, but I think, you know, to go -- from my understanding, from James, that the discussions up to this point were at that fairly high level amongst SO and AC leaders. And now, suddenly, there's an assumption that the community has endorsed this action in relation to SSR RT2, and the community has been talking about, you know, higher-level principles, let's say. Thanks.

JAMES BLADEL: Would anyone else like to weigh in on this? Who are your appointed members to SSR2?

KATRINA SATAKI: They are not here.

JAMES BLADEL: They're not here?

KATRINA SATAKI: We have three.

---

JAMES BLADEL: Okay.

KATRINA SATAKI: Žarko, Boban, and Alain.

JAMES BLADEL: Okay. We have a few folks, as well. So -- oh, Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Hi, Susan Kawaguchi for the record. And I just want to take this just a step farther because I am a member of the RDS-WHOIS Review Team 2, and we are also defining scope, and in our discussions there's always been, you know -- and prior to the team being seated, there was coming from -- and I need to go back and figure out really what part of the community that came from, but there was a discussion -- someone had decided that the scope should be very narrow for the RDS review team, and actually the GNSO Council decided to push back a little bit and provided a list of suggested topics to review, which went beyond that initial scope that Alan Greenberg had provided.

And I didn't follow it enough, six months, nine months ago, to remember where those came from; was that a suggestion of the

---

board, and that's something I'll look into. But then, there was a perception when the team was formed that, oh, we have this narrow scope, and now the team is trying to broaden it. So, I think we have a chicken and the egg situation. Are we going to seat -- to figure out the scope and decide on the scope, you would have to seat a team of individuals that have the expertise needed for that subject matter, in my opinion, to understand what the scope should be.

So therefore, you've seated one team, and then you hand that off and say, "Review team members, we are now seating you, and this is your scope." That seems like a lot of individuals to request time from. Maybe there could be some overlap, but maybe not. And so, I think we definitely don't want scope creep. We want to be targeted in what we're doing, and we don't want review teams going for years upon years, but having been a member of the WHOIS review team 1, you know, I found it helpful at that time to define our own scope.

And on this review team, review team 2, I feel like we do have a good selection of informed and experienced people to do the work. We would love to have the ccNSO join us, but even then, we're about four or five months into our work;- how far down the road are we going to continue to accept new members? So,

---

the chicken and the egg, we've got to figure that out, and I'm not sure what the answer is.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you very much. Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Katrina. Keith Drazek for the transcript, Registry Stakeholder Group. So, I have a two-part I guess comment, question, or a question and comment; going back to the SSR2 review team conversation, I think we have, you know, some actions ahead of us, some discussions and debate in each of our respective groups ahead of us about the composition and scope of this review team.

The board letter from the 28th -- just a couple of days ago -- said that, and I'm quoting, "The board has received and carefully considered advice from SSAC, and feedback from a number of SO/AC chairs, expressing concern about the composition process and structure of the SSR2 review currently underway."

So, I think as James noted, and Heather noted, this letter from the board and this decision to pause the work of the SSR2 came as a surprise to us. We had seen the SSAC letter previously, but



---

you know, we knew that there was this conversation that took place on Friday, but this was essentially a surprise.

And so, my first -- I guess my question is, you know, did the ccNSO have concerns about this SSR2 group? Did your members, people that you had recommended for appointment raise any questions or concerns about these issues to you?

And then, my follow-up comment, while you ponder that, is I think what we're going to have to do, in fairly short order -- because, as James noted, this group has been at work for a while and is engaged in, you know, in work, and it's got a team of people who are now basically wondering what's going to happen -- is that we're going to have to look at the scope of the review team, as it was developed by the review team; because we heard from Rinalia, who's the chair of the board committee, focusing on managing these processes, that the scope was definitely one of the areas of concern for the board. And I think that was also highlighted by SSAC.

So, the question -- we're going to have to look at the scope and determine whether the scope of this review team, as it currently exists, as it was currently developed by the review team members, is consistent with the guidelines that are in the bylaws. And so, that's step number one, and then following on,

---

is that still in sync with the expectations of the SOs and ACs that sent these people to participate?

And so, I just want to put down a marker and say, these are the steps and the actions ahead of us, I think, in the fairly near future. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Keith. Your mic is on still.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sorry.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yep. Answering your first question, again, as I already mentioned, on Friday, OEC specifically told us that they are going to suspend the working group. So, I cannot say it came as a surprise because they warned us that the letter was coming. That's one thing.

Another thing, if we had any indications before this thing -- that's again, as I already mentioned, lesson learned. We did not ask for any feedback, and as you know, ignorance is bliss. So, we lived under the happy assumption that everything's going on very well.

---

After discussions with our members on the team, and some other members on the team, it turned out that, no, things were not going on well, and actually, I think the majority of the group thinks that things are not well on the group.

So yeah, again, lesson learned. We have to ask feedback from our appointed members, maybe from groups as such, much sooner than just when lightning hits, right? So no, we did not know, but yes, now we know that things were not good.

JAMES BLADEL:

And to that, I may add one comment, just that I still think that -- and I maybe speaking personally here -- is that getting a 24-hour advance notice is not the same as being consulted.

KATRINA SATAKI:

It was less than 24 hours.

JAMES BLADEL:

Less than 24 hours; and I think, you know again, not, you know, stepping back from the actual decision, which may be the right decision, but it feels like it's happening in a blind, and it feels like it's -- we get a letter from one of the five communities, and therefore, it's extrapolated to mean that all SOs and ACs have been consulted, so this is what we're going to do.

---

I think that's where we started to see a lot of confused looks from the GNSO. But, more importantly, I think how do you we go forward from here? We have kind of a Bat-phone, or emergency SO/AC chairs call that happens without staff, and almost every time we ask, you know, "Are there any topics --

KATRINA SATAKI: Which we discussed this topic --

JAMES BLADEL: Yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI: This topic --

JAMES BLADEL: Sorry?

KATRINA SATAKI: We discussed this SSR2 topic.

JAMES BLADEL: We did? I thought we canceled the last meeting. Well, we cancel a lot of those calls for lack of agenda topics, and I think this is --

---

KATRINA SATAKI: But you could not make that.

JAMES BLADEL: This is ideally the perfect sort of topic that we should maybe table for that; and when I say we, I mean Heather.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, that's great. Yeah, but speaking about some next steps that we could do; during our discussion on Friday, and after we had this meeting with the chairs only, again, we tried to discuss this if we understood it correctly. So, apparently, it looks that at this moment, the board does not expect us to help them, to help the team to set the scope.

They are going to consult some groups that are considered experts in this area, but they do not expect SO/ACs to actively participate in this process. So maybe that's a wrong approach, maybe we should insist that we would like to be part of the scope-setting activity.

JAMES BLADEL: Attention?

---

HEATHER FORREST: I don't know. Well, we need to talk about it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. We need to talk -- yeah.

JAMES BLADEL: Yeah.

HEATHER FORREST: Yeah. I mean -- sorry. Thanks, James. Heather Forrest. I think, you know, on the one hand, we need to have a think about the fact that this is a self-scoping organization and doing this could have impacts on other things, let's say, to the extent that we step in on a SSR, where else, you know, where do we draw that line. I guess, I'm not sure what the parameters of this would be, so I think it's a good idea.

I think what we need to be doing now is, ironically, going back to those bigger picture questions that have been, you know, discussed at the leadership level, and talk about them within our respective SOs and ACs, and try and come up with a path forward that, you know, maybe isn't a one-size-fits-all, and deals with the concerns that the board is raising. You know, ultimately, how do we deal with the concerns the board is raising and get the work done at the same time. So, thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

And there's another thing to that; today, quarter past three, I think, we have a Cross-Community Session where we're we going to discuss operating standards. And in the operating standards, now we have a draft for some of the procedures that are going to guide future reviews.

I really would like urge you all to participate there, and with your feedback, including this your feedback on scope-setting and other things. Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Katrina. Yeah, so just to be clear, when we're talking about the scope of specific reviews, these are outlined in the bylaws. It's actually for SSR. It is Section 4.6(c), where it actually goes into fairly good detail to say this is what is in scope for an SSR review team. So, I think what we need to do -- and yes, the groups are supposed to be self-scoping to the point where, you know, the members say, "Okay, here's what the bylaws say, and here's how we're going to, you know, adjust our work based on, you know, the realities of the day."

So, I think our job as the SO/ACs is to review the current scope of the review team, as it was defined by the review team members; compare that to what's in the bylaws; and to see if there's a

---

discrepancy. And frankly, I'm a little bit concerned about the suggestion that, you know, the board would engage some third-party to come in and help the review team fix its scope, when it's not clear to me that the scope is broken.

And maybe there is something that needs to be adjusted. I'm not, you know, making an assumption one way or the other, but I think the bylaws are explicit, and we should refer to the bylaws in this case. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

No, I think the bylaws are not that clear -- well definitely, they give overall structure and guidance, but they do not go into much detail, and I think that the scope must be defined in more detail than it is in the bylaws. And I'm not sure that the team itself should be doing it, especially in this case when we clearly see that there is a very big diversity of views on the scope.

Some might say, "No, it must be narrowed;" another group say, "No, no, no, it must be widened." So, there needs to be clarity on scope. At least, I certainly believe that before we start the work, the scope must be defined.



---

JAMES BLADEL:

Well, thank you. I think that was helpful, at least to get to a different perspective on what was a very surprising development for us yesterday and Saturday.

So, if we can move on then to part B of this discussion of reviews, there is now an opportunity for review, the meeting strategy, the meeting structure. And I think to Donna Austin -- I'm looking at our other vice-chair, who maybe thought she was going to escape this session without having to speak -- but she's been a bit involved not only in some of the planning efforts for the GNSO, and you know, these sessions going back to our first experiments with the meeting structure A in Marrakesh, but also was involved in the meeting strategy working group prior to that.

And I know she has some thoughts on how this process could look, and some of the things that we could, perhaps, examine as we go forward. But I think generally thinking that we're now two years into this new, you know, routine, and what's working, what isn't working, and what are some of the tweaks that can be made to make it work better? So if you don't mind, Donna, do you have any additional thoughts, or things you'd like to table, questions for the ccNSO?

---

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. So, I guess, there's two parts to this, and I'm sure Katrina -- and is that Alejandra that's involved from your group in this? ICANN has recently put out a document, which is a suggested tweaks, if you would like, to the meeting strategy. And in a call with Göran some time ago, I don't even remember when that was, there was some suggestion that if the community wanted to make significant or substantive changes to the current meeting strategy, then it would be up to them to get together to do that; that would not be something that would be driven by ICANN.

I have, certainly, advocated that I think we can do better in using our time at these meetings, so I have some ideas. So, I guess, to the extent that we could have a conversation with the ccNSO to see if there's any alignment there, and whether we could take that forward as a community suggestion to, you know, look at, you know, as James said, we're two years in -- are there any improvements we could make that would be considered substantive, and how would we go about that?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you very much, Donna. So, we have a meeting program working group that shapes our agenda for our meeting days, and now, they also have to work on these Cross-Community Sessions and all the coordination work, and the

---

chair of the program meeting working group is Alejandra -- Alejandra Reynoso. Unfortunately, she could not make it to Abu Dhabi.

But on the side note, two years ago, when we just were preparing for this new meeting format, the Council decided that we go with the flow for two years, and then at the end of the second year, which is actually now, we start reviewing how this new meeting structure works for us, for our community; and how we see ourselves in this new meeting format.

Currently, the work is still ongoing, but by the end of the year, we will have some clarity on that; probably will need some input, feedback from our community. But I think that -- well, your idea to have some joint discussion and attempt to find ways to make this work better -- because at this point, it's still -- the level of complexity of meeting planning has increased significantly. We used to live happily, and we expected to live happily-ever-after, and then the new meeting strategy came, and all of a sudden, living happily-ever-after does not work anymore.

But yeah, we would really welcome any joint efforts, some discussions on this because probably something that does not work for you, works great for you, and you can maybe even suggest how to make things work better. And if something

---

works for us, it doesn't work for you, again, we can find some joint aspect to this discussion. So, we would really be very glad and happy to collaborate on that. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL: I completely agree that the complexity involved in planning these meetings has gone through the roof, and just as an example of that, I don't know how many folks are aware, but the planning for the next ICANN meeting always begins on the last day of this ICANN meeting. It's exactly how much time it takes to put that calendar together; is you have to start at this meeting, start planning for Puerto Rico.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Before this meeting ends, it's on the morning --

JAMES BLADEL: Yes, it's on the morning of the last day. It's crazy. And it's a reflection, I think, and certainly, those of you who listen to me -- and why would you -- have heard me say that it's because ICANN has become this collection of meetings.

It's really a conference with a lot of different tracks and a lot of different sub-meetings, and blocks, that sometimes they'll overlap or intersect, but for the most part, people are coming in

---

and not even -- maybe they see each other at lunch or something, but they're not even -- it's not one big meeting anymore. It's a lot of small meetings, operating under one heading.

So, I don't know if folks want to weigh-in on this topic, have questions. Donna, you said that there's a document out now for comments?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Marika or [inaudible], I don't know who that document went to, I just can't remember. It wasn't posted for public comment, was it? It was circulated to SO/AC leaders, I think, so the actual planning committee now. Yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI: It's just very, very, very much a draft, and it's just a first attempt to summarize everything that was discussed during the call.

DONNA AUSTIN: That's right.

KATRINA SATAKI: There will be many other discussions, I'm sure. Yeah, quite experienced in ICANN environment already, so I know things do

---

not happen overnight; oh, apart when they need to suspend a review team, then it's really quick, but otherwise no, it takes time.

So, if there are no comments on that, maybe then the last item, and maybe again, Donna, about the CSC review?

DONNA AUSTIN:

I guess just a quick update. So the CSC is the Customer Standing Committee, and it's something that the ccNSO is very much aware of; probably something that our councilors aren't so familiar with, with the exception of the Contracted Parties House.

So, as a result of the IANA transition, the Customer Standing Committee was established. And under the charter, and also reflected in the bylaws, there is a requirement that the CSC charter be reviewed 12 months in, and we're 12 months in, so the ccNSO and Registry Stakeholder Group are responsible for conducting that review. Keith and myself are the registry representatives on that group, and Martin Boyles, and Abdalla are representing the ccNSO on that.

We've had conversations with the CSC and also Elise Gerich. We're aware that Elise is stepping down from her role in the new term, so we thought it would be helpful to have a conversation

---

with her. We have a session here, I think, on Wednesday, that's a public session, and we're also -- we will have some discussion within the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting on Tuesday, and I think you have it slated for a conversation later in the week within the ccNSO, if I'm correct.

This is going to be a pretty quick process, hopefully. We think -- the feedback we've got so far is that the CSC is working well, and the charter seems to be fit for purpose. The only thing that probably will be a substantive change is related to the process to change the SOAs, so that's something that we'll have to work out.

But just to note that this is a very -- this is about the charter. It is not about the efficiency of the CSC. There's a provision within the bylaws that that will be conducted in 12 months from now. So, all we're focused on is the charter, and it's a review of that, just to make sure that it's fit for purpose and given that at the time that we developed the charter through the CWG, we weren't really sure how things would stand up, so we built in that review 12 months in. Thanks, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Donna. I think that CSC is a very excellent example of a committee that can work very efficiently and can

---

be really very helpful and do a great job. So I'd like to thank all our members on the CSC, for their work, for their input.

Maybe, at some point, we should think about changing bylaws to reduce the number of reviews related, at least, to this one, because it looks like there are too many of them. Something to think about.

With that, thank you very much. If there are no more questions, maybe -- yeah Byron, as the chair of CSC, would like to say something.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Yes, thanks. I'll be very brief. Byron Holland for the record from the ccNSO, and chair of the CSC. Essentially, I just want to put a plug-in for the work yet to be done in the next year, in particular. We've heard about the charter review, but I would also just remind this group -- because both the GNSO and the ccNSO have responsibility for the effectiveness review, which starts next year. So I'll just put that plug-in that the GNSO will need a shepherd to move that process through your constituency, and as well, there is the IANA functions review. T

he first one must begin by October of next year, so I know it's a year away, but I'll just put that plug-in to remind you because also we, as the communities, have the key role in that. So, there



---

are three reviews around the CSC, starting now, and two more a year from now. And both of our communities need to participate, actively, in that.

So, that's my plug. Think about it. Find your shepherd, and be ready for the next two. And thank you, Donna and team, for the work you're doing on the charter review now.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thank you, Byron. And these reviews always seem like a good idea when they're off in the future, but these reviews have now come home to roost, so we have to -- yeah, Donna, go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, James. If I could just make one final point; the reason the CSC's really important in the context of the IANA transition, is that the CSC is very narrow in scope in monitoring the performance of IANA. And if the performance of IANA starts to go a little bit off the rails, the CSC has the ability to trigger additional reviews, with the end result possibly being that the IANA function can be taken out of ICANN.

So, I just wanted to make the point that the CSC is traveling along really well, which is terrific, but it's narrow in scope deliberately, when we had some conversations around this in

---

the transition CWG, but it is a -- you know, if the IANA starts to go off the rails, it's the CSC that can trigger, through the ccNSO and GNSO, a review that could ultimately result in IANA being taken out of ICANN.

So I just want to make that point, that it's -- you know, we're really happy with how it's going, but if IANA starts to go off the rails, the CSC becomes really important in the process of potentially taking IANA out of ICANN.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thank you, Donna. I think that underscores the importance of the CSC, and the review of its charter. Well, I think we had AOB down here, but I've been told that we are losing the room, so I hope that everyone found this session to be useful and informative, and certainly, with some of these topics, I think it's good to exchange views and make sure that we're all at this from the same page.

I will note, for those of you who aren't aware, and I'm sure everyone is, this is my last meeting as chair. On Wednesday, there will be an election to designate the successor amongst the new councilors, and Heather, I'm pleased to report is running unopposed. So, it will at least be someone who you know and love already. But all of that will take place later this week.

---

So, thank you very much for not just today, but for all of your help and support over the years, and next time you see me, I'll be in the audience. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, James. It has been a pleasure and it's great working with you, and I'm looking forward to working with Heather, at least for some time, while I'm still the chair. And I'm sure that my colleagues from the Council will also welcome you. And if you need any help, any support, you're always welcome. So, thank you very much.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**