
SAN JUAN – ccNSO Council Preparatory Meeting
Sunday, March 11, 2018 – 12:15 to 13:30 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: ccNSO Council Preparation Meeting, Sunday, March 11, 2018.
12:15-13:30. 209-A.

KATRINA SATAKI: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We have a lot of things to do. The agenda for today is very condensed. Therefore, let's start. We'll start with the council prep meeting. You have all those printed documents in front of you. This is something that we have to go through really quickly. Then we will have our workshop.

But before we do that, you have this draft agenda version one in front of you. Before we go to the agenda, there's one thing I'd like to discuss with you. As you know, unfortunately, on Friday, one of the members of our community, Ben Fuller, who had been appointed as our liaison to the GNSO Council, had passed away. This definitely must be somehow part of our agenda for our face-to-face meeting. We did not know how to address it properly. Probably we'd better start with that, rather than do it at the end of the 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.

If you agree, then we will try to find the right wording to address this. I must say, I would ask somebody else to read it when it's ready – probably Byron. Not today, but on Wednesday.

If we are in agreement on that, then let's move forward with our other work. We start with meetings with other SO/ACs. Here you can see this document you have printed out. Today we have this council prep meeting. On Monday at lunchtime we have a meeting with the GNSO Council. Here you see some topics that we need to discuss. Actually, the agenda for that meeting is also very packed.

First we'll talk about us as decisional participants. I will briefly cover what we're doing now and where we are. Second, we'll talk about the progress on the rejection action procedures and other items. Probably [Stephen] will cover that.

Proposed financial year '19 budget exchange of views – it will be great if Giovanni could...

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. With pleasure.

KATRINA SATAKI: Giovanni could participate and share with the GNSO Council what are main concerns are. Customer Standing Committee-

related topics – that’s naturally Byron. And then there’s the charter review process and progress to date. That’s Abdalla and Donna from the GNSO side. Then there’s Work Track 5. I’ll ask Annebeth to join us and to represent our views and share what we think about the process from the ccNSO perspective.

About specific reviews, today, during the meeting of our Guidelines Review Committee, we had visitors from the MSSSI Team from the ICANN org. We discussed operating standards at great length. This is one of the topics that we’ll need to cover.

One of the things is that the MSSSI Team shared was not a full slide, but it was a slide with the current and upcoming specific and organizational reviews. So there were only two types of reviews on the slide, and it already looked very scary. If we add all other reviews that we are supposed to do, it will get even scarier. As we’ll see pretty soon, we have issues with volunteers.

During the SO/AC Chairs meeting with the ICANN CEO on Friday, it was clear that this huge amount of reviews causes a lot of strain on the ICANN org as well. But they are all mandated by the bylaws, so we cannot just say, “Let’s forget all the reviews.” It needs to be done in a proper way if we want to reduce the number or at least make it more bearable to the community. So somebody has to come up with the idea. Maybe this is something that should be raised during the public forum.

Then we'll talk about the Internet Governance Engagement Group's proposed charter. I forwarded it today. It's to you. So, Young-eum, I hope you will cover that. And there's Any Other Business, if we have it.

Then on Tuesday, we'll have over ccNSO-Board meeting. They will come to our room again. We received a couple of questions from the board. We'll try to address our key goals for 2018. Hopefully, today during our Council workshop, we'll identify our main key goals for this year. Our most relevant long-term goals – this is something we also probably have as an outcome from our workshop today. Those questions that we raised to the board we have discussed during our meetings.

We also received one more question from the board. I think it's not here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: The first one?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI:

Okay. Yeah, that's true. Yeah, that was the first one. That was about due diligence. [inaudible] that was one of the recent additions that the board decided to ask everyone.

Then we have the ccNSO-GAC meeting. That's on Tuesday. That will take place in GAC's room. Again, we'll talk about Work Track 5: geo names. As you know, that is a hot topic usually. This topic alone can cover the entire timeslot allocated for our meeting, but we will try to be quicker than usual. Probably we will be able to cover other topics as well. So that's one of them.

The topic of FAQ regarding ccTLD delegation and transfer – recently it has become clear that, apparently, people at GAC or in government do not understand all that terminology used when we speak about delegation transfer and other things. So I'll forward to them this list of terminology and when and how this terminology appears in various ICANN documents. We will meet on Monday with the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group to see what else we need to cover during our meeting.

Another thing that we could discuss is the role of the Agenda Setting Committee, just to make sure that these bilateral meetings that we have with GAC are useful for them and they give some additional value to us, something to think about, and something to work on.

Peter, I hope you can at least initiate the discussion. Definitely, we will not come to any conclusions, but –

PETER: Thank you, Katrina. Very briefly, because I have been e-mailing today with [Pierre Brumach], my counterpart within the GAC, and we're trying tomorrow, somewhere in the final section of the opening meeting, to get a face-to-face so that we can synchronize and prepare this topic. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: That sounds excellent. Thank you very much.

And then, if we still have time, we will update them on the PDP. That's on Nigel and Stephen.

Okay. That's it for our bilateral meetings. Any other questions? Anything not clear?

Well, obviously everything is fine, so let's move to the next paper you have. That's Roles and Responsibilities on the ccNSO Council. Here we have a summary of all the roles that we have and who's already doing that.

On Wednesday, we will have to appoint people to their respective roles that we have to do. There are things that, clearly, we need to address. For example, as you can see in the

comments column, according to our charters of the respective committees, it says that, “Triage Committee members appointed for one-year term, and for no more than three consecutive terms.” There’s a wish that one of the appointees is a NomCom councilor.

For example, Margarita has already served for two years. Actually, Margarita, I think, served there even before that. So she’s the most experienced triager. So she has to be the first to go, which is of course a very sad thing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: That’s a good suggestion, yes. So really think about your participation in these role and committees whenever you see that you have been serving too long on these committees and it’s time to give – probably it’s just you – new blood that’s necessary a chance. So please consider some other people to replace you. That’s one thing.

Another thing is, of course, we do not want all committee members to leave at the same time. It could cause some issues. Let’s do it gradually. Nevertheless, there are things that we have to consider.

We have two new roles, even though rejection action and approval action guidelines have not been approved by the council yet. Nevertheless, we should appoint people to the roles that are introduced in these guidelines. One is Rejection Action Process Manager. Another is Approval Action Process Manager. It could be probably the same person.

Also, according to the Rejection Action Guidelines, we need a Rejection Action Process Committee, which means a Rejection Action Process Manager plus two more people will look into rejection action petitions, should we receive any. I'm sure you've read the short and concise guidelines that we have developed.

Okay. That's about these roles and responsibilities.

Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

I will approach the individual councilors over the next couple of days to check whether you're still willing to serve or want to step down and try to see alternatives. It's on the agenda for Wednesday, so hopefully by then we get the full slate again.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. You can always also come to me and volunteer to do some extra work. Always appreciate it. Always

welcome. Again, please look at the list and consider your involvement.

Any questions about roles and responsibilities?

If not, let's move forward. That's a draft agenda. It's version one. We already have some new items to be added to the agenda, so this is definitely not the final version yet.

As you see minutes, you still have a couple of days to review them and comment if you wish to do that.

Then there's an overview of intermeeting council decisions. As you remember, on our latest council call on the 15th of February, we were not quorate, which is an issue in itself, something that probably we should think about. I see you thinking already. This is not good that we cannot take any decision at council calls because we're not quorate.

Nevertheless, the resolutions were distributed on our mailing list and were adopted. Anyway, it's counted as an intermeeting decision.

Again, today, during our meeting with the MSSl Team – we're going to have another meeting on Thursday – we discussed the ccNSO review. We saw the timeline. The review has to be started not later than the 31st of August this year. It's just because the

board decision was to postpone this review no later than August. It was for next year, which is this year.

The council asked the Guidelines Review Committee members to agree to participate in the work. Some did, some did not, and some could not, unfortunately, dedicate enough time but hopefully will be able to join us as we work because the review will take at least one year. The review itself will take one year, but prep work will take probably a little bit longer.

We also issued a call for volunteers from the community. On Wednesday, we'll have to appoint ccNSO Review Working Party members, all those members from GRC who agree to participate, and also those volunteers who put their name forward and agreed to the processing of their personal data. If they haven't agreed, they cannot be part of the working group. As you remember, that was one of the updates from our latest call.

To be GDPR-compliant, ICANN introduced new requirements for those who put their name forward to participate in working groups. They have to consent to processing of their personal data. Otherwise, their e-mails cannot be added to the mailing list, and so on.

Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you. First of all, that reminds me I need to do this with Kim about something. I think ICANN is sadly mistaken in its interpretation of GDPR if it thinks it can do this on the basis of consent.

KATRINA SATAKI: Consent can be withdrawn at any point.

Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: You might be right. You might be wrong. I don't know. The only thing is that we are under instructions that, if you don't, you will not be added to an e-mail list supervised by ICANN. It's that simple.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, it's that simple and that complicated. Well, that's the fact in any case.

Okay. Next is just informative: ccNSO travel funding guidelines. As you remember, we received comments and a heavily redacted guideline from one of our councilors. I will not say who, even though it was Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Since it was so heavily redacted, there was no point in sending it for public comments. So my proposal was to ask the Guidelines Review Committee to look at again at the guideline. I also informed the Guidelines Review Committee about that.

Next, as you all know, the Board has initiated this thing about emoji as second-level domains. We will have clarifications from SSAC from a technical point of view on Monday during Tech Day. On Wednesday, I think – not during our ccNSO members’ meeting day – Patrik from SSAC will talk also about emojis, not only from a technical perspective, but just for normal people to understand what it’s all about.

Clearly, on Wednesday, we’ll have to decide whether there’s a need for us to launch a study group to address the issue. If there is an issue, then maybe we need a study group. This is something that we will have to decide on on Wednesday. Patrik will talk about emojis on Wednesday. Then it will be clear if there is a need for us to do anything.

About the SSR2 Team – again, this is an update – the SO/AC chairs have asked the ICANN Board to provide an external

facilitator to help the team, to get together, to understand how to look for a consensus, to understand how to select their leaders, and to help newly-appointed members – we really hope to appoint new members to the team – to help them to get onboard and work them all together.

Again, currently there's a new draft letter from SO/AC chairs to the respective ICANN Board committee to make sure that we are on the same page and that they understand what we mean by "external facilitator" and what will be his or her role. Definitely there's a hope to restart the work on the SSR as soon as possible.

Roles and responsibilities we've already discussed. Work Plan 2018-2020: what we need to do. Rules of the ccNSO. Again, during one of the sessions our ccNSO members will initiate the discussion on the rules of the ccNSO.

As you know, these rules had been developed in 2004, when there were only 14 members or so. Now we have 165 members. What worked well for 14 members does not necessarily scale. It does not work for 165. We definitely hope to get more ccTLDs on board. How do we ensure that the ccNSO that has evolved can operate successfully? Should we change anything in the rules, or should we maybe take a little bit different approach?

Another thing is that, during these past 13-almost-14 years, ICANN itself has changed. We have new bylaws. We have new obligations under the bylaws. We are decisional participants. The timelines in the bylaws are really tight and, again, do not scale. We cannot apply the timeline that we have in the rules to all those new things that we need to address.

Again, the board request on screening: let's see how it all evolves during our bilateral meeting.

We have reduced the amount of updates significantly. As working groups will provide their updates during members meeting days, I thought that probably we should save some time and effort on that.

Nevertheless, we have CSC-, RZERC-, and ECA-related updates, if you think that's okay, and updates from our liaisons. Actually, on Friday, Ben sent his report. Unfortunately, later we learned that he's not with us anymore.

List of next meetings. After that, the annual fun of selecting ccNSO chairs and vice-chairs. As you remember, I sent another e-mail. I haven't received any feedback from you guys. Maybe you will share some now. There is another guideline on ccNSO Council roles and responsibilities. Somehow it totally slipped under my radar that the council hasn't approved the guideline. It

was actually amended or updated to reflect the procedure that we had last year when we had to introduce it ad hoc.

Then we updated the guideline, but with all the work on approval actions and rejection actions and everything, it just was put on hold. Nevertheless, the procedure is described there. I tried to summarize it and proposed to follow this procedure in case there's such a need.

I received no comments, which means no objections from you, so I assume that we can follow this procedure. So the procedure is: "Yes, please."

You're cold.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

It's not the warmest in here, Katrina. I've been thinking quite a bit about the procedure about electing the chairs and vice-chairs. My preference for people to consider: I think it's ideal that we should strive to have diversity. I think we could even say that councilors should take that into account when selecting.

But I'm also a great believer in having the best people for the role. I just wonder how much we want to subscribe to the idea that you cannot have two from the same region because this is very specific. Basically, as soon as the chair is appointed, other people are automatically taken out of the vice-chair [role].

Now, that's fine, but I just wonder if it's better to say we should take that into account, but it shouldn't be quite so prescriptive in the procedure.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Well, it has always been the case – at least that's what we always strive to achieve. I'm not saying it's good or bad. I'm just saying that that has been the case.

Personally, I think that's the right thing to do: to ensure that nobody feels like – yeah, I always struggle with the diversity thing because I agree with you that we have to have the best people, not diverse people. I mean, it's great when people represent a diverse group as much as it's possible as feasible, but, for example, is it good to have three big registries or three small registries being in the leadership position?

I noticed that, when I joined the council, we do not think in such categories of big registries, small registries, woman, man, or something – I see Nigel – but even if we on the council share these views of, “Okay. We want to have the best people,” it doesn't mean that the community would believe in the same approach.

Now, this is definitely something to discuss, something to think about, and something for the council to decide. Thank you for raising this issue.

I see you're against diversity. No, no, no. I'm just kidding. I know that you're not – okay. I always also prefer to have the best people.

Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Well, I was offering to help you out the hole that you were digging yourself into.

I want to make some observations instead because you've dug to the bottom of it now. I don't see anywhere in any of the rules, any of these kind of rules that you've been talking about. I was a bit surprised a couple of years ago when an election procedure within the ccNSO formal council meeting was adopted apparently on the fly to have two separate elections for vice-chair.

That notwithstanding, councilors are not from large registries. They're not from small registries. The ICANN bylaws say that councilors serve in a personal capacity. We've had this before, where we've had councilors who've stopped working for a

registry and there were questions as to whether or not they should continue to be councilors.

I think we are a little bit confused in some of the things that we do, and some of the stuff that we need to do in the forthcoming review is to clarify and fix some of the uncertainty.

When it comes to the vice-chair positions – we have two vice chairs – their jobs, as far as I’m concerned, are to be understudies for the chair. We are automatically representationally diverse because we are representationally elected in regions.

I think this idea of categorizing people according to how tall they are, how short they are, or whether they’re male or female – I understand the ICANN encouraging diversity and so on. It’s not a bad thing. But applying it blindly to the ccNSO produces undesirable affects. You may find a situation whereby you have nobody prepared to do one of the vice-chair roles when you have two perfectly capable people available to do it.

We need to look at this very carefully, and we certainly don’t need to be doing things that are not written down in our election procedures.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Nigel. I'm not sure I fully agree with you. Well, I definitely agree with some of the points you're making. Yes, I agree that councilors serve in their own capacity, not as ccTLDs. Nevertheless, you yourself have several times indicated that, by not providing enough travel funding, we discouraged smaller registries from participation. So we cannot totally, completely ignore the concept of big or small registries. That's one thing.

Another thing is the question of why we have regional representation on the council then. Certainly, there is some idea to that. We have an equal number of councilor from each region, which means that we have an equal presentation on the council.

Actually, our guidelines do not say that we have to have two vice-chairs. It's our decision to have two. We can decide to have ten or whatever.

Speaking about guidelines, they are what they are. They are guidelines. I think they should not incapacitate the council in any way. We try to capture current practice in the guidelines, but it does not mean that, once we capture it, we cannot change it. It's still possible to change. Yes, it's great if we can follow it, but if we see that we can achieve – for example, by having a chair or vice-chair from the same region – a better result, so be it. This is the council's decision – the council as a collectively responsible

body. They can come up with this proposal. And now that's what we're doing. Debbie raised an issue, and now we have to think about how to address it. I'm not saying we have to decide on it now because this is just a prep meeting. I see that there is an issue, and we have to think about it.

Yes, Byron? Please.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Dare I wade into this discussion, I think Nigel has raised some important issue in terms of what's written down, what's not, what's convention and practice versus what's in rules, and the types of diversity that we want to think about. There's a whole range of diverse expertise background knowledge that we should and we do all factor in as we elect people in this body.

The one that I would actually take umbrage on with Nigel is the notion that vice-chairs are there in waiting to become chair. I think that – yes, you did. You made some mention that they were there.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

I'm sorry, Byron. I'm going to have to interject here. I said "understudy." That does not mean they're in waiting to become chair. What it means is that, if the chair is sick or incapacitated,

they take over the chair. That is the definition of a vice-chair's role.

BYRON HOLLAND: Then we should clarify the language to make sure that everybody is clear on what “understudy” means. Certainly, I think popular interpretation of “understudy” is “in preparation for,” not necessarily just “in the absence of.” I hate to get into, in a diverse group like this, two native English speakers parsing words, but it's important, because we are parsing those words, that everybody is on the same page as to what “understudy” means.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I think, actually, Byron, you've made a very good point because what you've actually done is shown that we are not two native speakers of the same variant of the English language.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Can we stop it now? I'll just make my point. We can agree to disagree and “understudy” is somebody willing to serve should

the chair not be here but not somebody who is in waiting to hopefully become the chair.

KATRINA SATAKI:

I'm getting a little bit nervous. I hope there are no killers waiting for me somewhere around the corner.

Actually, that is one of the things that we have discussed previously with some of you native speakers. So please respect non-native speakers.

Who are non-native speakers? Please raise your hand?

You see? You see how many of us there are? So please respect us and do not use the words you yourselves do not understand.

Okay. Thank you very much. So that is the agenda for our meeting on Wednesday.

Bart, please?

BART BOSWINKEL:

I'm already aware that some items will be added, so an updated agenda will be circulated later during the week.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I already mentioned that there will be new things, and you will receive them as soon as they are captured.

Yes, please, Peter?

PETER: Katrina, just a question for clarification. How will we proceed with this one, given that there is no anonymity? Do we keep it on the agenda and determine it for a decision with the risk that we will have a large discussion in the council? I'm just trying to figure out how to further deal with it and make sure that we, for instance, on a Wednesday evening, do not debate this for half-an-hour and not reach a conclusion. That's all.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. I think we will not come up with a conclusion now. This is something that has been just raised. We can discuss it during the remaining couple of days. Then, apparently on Wednesday, depending on how things evolve, we will see if we need to decide on any amended procedures.

Any other suggestions for that? Or you want some clarity now? I don't think it would be fair because this had been just raised. Probably the councilors need some time to think about it and discuss it.

Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: You can see it in your e-mail from the 26th of February as well, which Katrina sent. It included this procedure, which is now on the screen, in the paper. It was circulated on the 26th of September to you all.

KATRINA SATAKI: Not September. February. Yeah, it's something to think about and discuss amongst yourselves and see how to proceed with that. Okay?

Okay. We're a little bit ahead of schedule. We're doing great. Shall we move forward, even though I think that – ooh, that's good. Neither Mike nor Chris are here yet.

Anyhow, let's move forward. Now it's about the workshop. The idea is that we will discuss all the issues in groups. We have our own external facilitator, David. Welcome.

First for all, he will keep us on track to spend as much time as is allocated. Having said that, I'm sure that we will still need more time for discussion. They will get more heated.

I hope you all had time to look at our mind map of all the things that we need to do. I hope you had some time to think about them. Bart will walk you through these items a little bit later.

What we'll need to do is decide what our priorities are, what we're going to work on. Just to put the things into the right perspective, I will share with you some initial findings that we have about our volunteers.

Kim, can you open, please, the volunteers slides?

What we did was we went through all the working groups. Please note: only working groups. We didn't look at all cross-community working groups. We didn't look at those volunteers who put their names forward for specific reviews and things. We just looked at ccNSO working groups. It's all those people who are in these working groups. Of course, we could add some other perspectives to this, like all those cross-community specific reviews and other things, but now please note that this is just about ccNSO working groups.

Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

Here you see – the third one is a council, but just to give the right perspective. As you can see, the largest number of people participate in the PDP Working Group, which clearly shows that

this is something important for our community. They were happy to participate in this PDP.

Another thing – these slides, these numbers, show only the people. They do not show their actual contribution. It is a different thing, but it’s quite difficult to capture. So it’s just the number of people. SOPC, 18. The last one was a Meeting Strategy Review Team. It got four volunteers.

Next slide. If we look at the activity of individual participants, we have 38 participants who participate in one group. Nobody participates in two working groups. Four participate in three working groups. One participates in five working groups. I even know who it is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Steve?

KATRINA SATAKI: No. It’s Stephen. Yes, please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We’ve got a differentiation between what’s shown up there and what’s being shown in the Adobe Connect room on this slide. It’s showing 17 participants in two groups, and you’re showing none.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Which I think is correct. It's just not picking it up – okay, now it is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, sorry. Right – 17.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a question of clarification, I guess from a math or methodology point of view. You say 60 in total. I just want to ensure there's no double-counting of the 17, 4, and 1 in the 38. Are these distinct in separate people and we're sure we're not double-counting those in multiple groups?

KATRINA SATAKI: Stephen participates in five. He's not in those 38 who participate in one.

Next slide. It's getting more and more interesting. About registries. Please note: we have 165 members, and only 38 participate in working groups. I'd say it's a very disturbing number. So, ten in one, and one registry participates in six.

Okay. Next slide. As you can see, 77% of our members do not care to participate in working groups. The question is, why is it so? The second question is, is there anything we can do to improve things?

Next slide. Now look at the number of the ccTLDs. The most active ccTLD is .uk. They participate in six working groups. There are five individuals who participate in these six working groups. I'd say this is a very good balance. Not all ccTLDs can afford that; for example, .as because they only have one employee.

Yes, please, Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS:

I have a little question. There seems to be a ccTLD on there that doesn't exist. Where is JJ?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Okay. GG. Okay, yes. Sorry. My bad. My mistake. It's so difficult to write GG and [JE]. It's just combined together as JJ.

Of course, these numbers do not show all participants. This slide shows that the heaviest workload is done by only 27 people.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

26.

KATRINA SATAKI: True. Yeah, unfortunately 26. Now 26.

Next slide, please. But now look at the world's ten most populous countries and how they scale. Maybe we should work more closely with Chinese registries, Indian registries, and other registries who are our members but do not participate in working groups. Why? What is their reason? Why don't they participate?

Okay. Next slide. This is the regional participation. Why is the European region the most active one?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, yeah, comparing to North America, definitely more countries. But why do the Europeans believe that there is a point in participating?

One of the comments we received from one of our previous meetings was that there are too many presenters from the European region on our agenda. They wanted to have less, but that's the reality, unfortunately.

Yes, please, Margarita?

MARGARITA VALDES: Excuse me. There is something that I don't understand. If I can see, from EU, 39 working groups –

KATRINA SATAKI: It's not working. People in working groups.

MARGARITA VALDES: Okay.

KATRINA SATAKI: Next slide. This is just a slide to summarize the percentage of participants from one region in all these working groups. I think there are many, many Europeans in PDP and in SOPC.

Okay. Next. This is just a summary slide to show that Europeans participate more or less actively in all working groups. Some of the regions, first, are less active. Second, there are some working groups where those regions do not participate at all.

So I hope this is something that gives you food for thought and shows that, yeah, unfortunately, we do not have enough volunteers to do all the work that we have in front of us.

Okay. Any questions?

Obviously not – oh. Yes, please, Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND:

I think this is clearly an important issue for us to wrestle, particularly in light of the growth in our membership. Just as a first cut of this information, when I see it, it strikes me that there's a couple of obvious observations.

One is, if we did this five years ago or more, it probably wouldn't look much different in terms of absolute numbers, and yet we've dramatically increased our membership. So what are we doing or not doing that is preventing or putting a hurdle in front of our new members to become engaged and participate? What can we do to enable those new folks to get involved?

In almost any one of these groups, there's enough history and institutional knowledge and expertise and background that it can be very daunting for a new person to try to show up in one of these groups and be a contributor or even speak. So what do we do for all of those new members to help them get involved? That's just one observation.

I guess the other is around the European Union, which obviously I'm not part of. If we look at the participation rates, there's probably some obvious things there, just in terms of numbers of people involved in the registries. What is it there that's enabling that kind of participation? And is there anything we can learn from that that could help in the other regions?

I don't know that there is. Maybe the circumstances are just too different. But when you see an outlier like that, is there something there that we can port to other regions?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Byron.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'd like to contribute to that. I strongly believe that capacitation workshops could make a difference. You hit the nail right on the head. I strongly believe that newcomers want to be part of the ccNSO because there is an inherent benefit to participate within the ccNSO. There are things to be learned. There are things to be done in order to improve their registries and so on and contribute to their region.

But without a doubt, there is an ongoing conversation here that newcomers are not part of. They need someone, some kind of mentor, to sit them down and say, "Hey, let me tell you what we can do."

In my case, I look for mentors. I come to you. I go to Katrina. I'll go to Stephen or Nigel, and I ask. So I'm continuously looking for mentors to explain to me what is going on. What is this in detail? What are we talking about regarding this particular position? That could make a big difference. And it could take a little bit of

the fear away about how they could contribute to something they don't quite understand. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: Eberhard Lisse from .na. I chair the Technical Working Group. I have a few comments. First of all, without trying to impolite or rude, these slides fulfill almost every criteria on how not to make a slide. They're difficult to read. The font is small. I found it difficult, sitting here, to actually access them.

Byron, it's not the EU. It's not the European Union. It's the European region. There's a large number of countries different. That led me to think: shouldn't we redo this now by the number of ccTLDs in a region? Should we maybe redo it by the number of domain names in these ccTLDs? Because a registry like .ca and .uk and .de can afford to hire professional staff to deal with these issues and send them to these meetings, whereas places like my three colleagues are from, the continent – you used to say, “My three brothers-in-law” – are running very small registries. Without travel funding, it's almost impossible for some of us to come here. We see on a regular basis that, on the

PDP Working Group, we have very little contributions made by anyone but four or five people.

One particular participant from the African region has, generally speaking, connectivity issues. I see this on every call. He says he need to be called out. He has Internet issues and so on. So it's not very easy to increase the [inaudible].

I'm quite happy that, on the Technical Working Group, we are quite [inaudible]. For example, what irritates me on the Technical Working Group is that we don't have a single female.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] an observer there.

EBERHARD LISSE: It's something that I have tried to address for quite a while, but there's really nobody who comes or says, "I would like to become a member." We are quite diverse regionally, but [inaudible].

I think these calculations are a good idea, but we need to do the numbers from different aspects, to look at the data from different angles. North America has got four registries. Two of them are huge. .us and .ca are huge. They can afford professional staff. .vi is an 0.8 person registry at the moment.

Dotty is not at the moment even here. I don't know whether she's doing very well health-wise. She had an operation. So it's basically three. Stephen is carrying a huge workload, which is quite not appropriate to the funding he has toward his own business.

So we should look at this from different metrics, as far as I'm concerned.

KATRINA SATAKI:

I absolutely agree. As I said, this is the first step. If we want to have a clearer picture, we still need to add a lot. That's one thing.

I wanted to go back to this particular slide. I cannot say that there are only big registries here. Not at all. There are many small registries that still contribute meaningfully.

We don't have much time, but...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Which ones are small?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

.gt.

KATRINA SATAKI: .gt is very small, yeah. .as is very small.

I have Alejandra. Please be brief. We don't have much time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Just wanted to make you all aware, again, of the onboarding program and the achievements that we accomplished so far. For example, we have now the ccNSO Quick Guide, the ICANN Learn course for the ccNSO, the ccNSO wiki updated, and now a ccNSO mentor/mentee guideline on the [making] draft. These are first steps to getting people involved in what we do.

Still, we're lacking some paths, as in, what is the methodology, for example, to join a working group? Because, so far, in the guidelines, it says the council appoints the members, and, once appointed, it doesn't say anything, as in, "You can e-mail and ask and maybe join." It doesn't say. For example, that's one thing.

Another thing –

KATRINA SATAKI: I'm sorry, Alejandra. We will have times to come up with ideas during our discussions.

I'm not asking for any solutions now because you will have a chance to work on that in your groups.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Only one issue: language. For at least in Latin America, the majority doesn't speak English as a first language. Normally, it's not something as a second language to have. So that's an issue.

KATRINA SATAKI: It's quite understandable.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I just want to make one very quick observation on this. Work is done in working groups by individuals, not ccTLDs. We are conflating, as ever, the idea of a ccNSO member, which is the ccTLD, and the individuals concerned who are members.

Many ccTLDs support the work that is being done here, and it's both big and small. Many big ones don't support their people coming here because they don't see the financial reward or return from it. So we have to be very careful about connecting these two things together.

KATRINA SATAKI: True. If we have an employee of a ccTLD that participates in the work of the ccNSO, it must be supported by the ccTLD or one way or the other. So we cannot say it's just an individual. No, he's an employee of the ccTLD.

One more thing before we move to the working groups, before I give the floor to David. It is very important here. When we were thinking about the workshop today and we looked at these numbers – let’s say it this way. We have a coin, a coin that represents our resources. Those are different kinds of resources. It can be money, time, or human resources. Here we look at human resources and why this or that ccTLD does not want to contribute their human resources to this work.

At the end of the day, if they contribute to human resources, it ends up with financial resources. On the other hand, another issue that we’re going to discuss today is financial contributions of ccTLDs. Why do some ccTLDs not contribute financially to ICANN?

Here is the big question. Are these two sides of the same resource coin? Maybe those ccTLDs that do not give their human resources and who do not contribute financially to ICANN – are the reasons the same? Maybe they do not see any value in participating at all.

It can be that way. It can be another way, but that is the question. I’m not saying those are the same registries. There are some registries that participate but do not pay, or some registries that pay but do not participate. The question is the

reasons behind that – are they the same? If yes, can they be addressed the same way? And so on.

Now we are almost on time.

Bart – ah, yes. Sorry. Two minutes, Bart.

[DAVID]: No worries.

KATRINA SATAKI: Just to make sure we are all on the same page.

BART BOSWINKEL: It's fairly simple. The ccTLDs at one point, effectively in 2013, agreed to contribute \$3.5 million.

Can you go to the next slide? It should be on this slide as well. On the gap. If not, you've seen that slide before. Over the time, since 2013, the ccTLDs have contributed up and to around \$2 million, and the number of ccTLDs contributing to ICANN is around 50 out of the total number. That number does not reflect whether they're members or non-members of the ccNSO. It is not related.

This came up in a discussion two weeks ago during APTLD. There is a clear question around: why should we pay a voluntary contribution to ICANN? What is the added value of ICANN's

ccNSO to us? Why should we pay any money voluntarily? Because it's not pay-for-service. You want to support the system.

The second one – this goes into the workload...I hope it's coming up. Oh, that's the slide. You can see the gap. You've seen this one before. The gap over the years. Fiscal year 2017 is not as bad as it works. That's the only caveat in the meantime. Additional financial contributions have been made.

As you may recall from the previous meeting, the discussion on financial contribution will recur, say, either in the next meeting or the next meeting afterwards because, in 2018, the current guideline is up for review. That's part of the setup.

Okay. Can you go to the slide around the...yeah. Maybe you reduce the slide a little bit. You see some mind maps on the wall. These mind maps capture the activities. It's the portfolios of activities of the ccNSO between 2018 and 2020.

They are included in a few buckets, if I may say. One is recurring appointment activities. It is, for example, Board nomination procedures and council elections (NomCom). This is what you will see in the [inaudible]. It is quite a lot of activity.

Probably a main one from a ccTLD perspective is the policy and policy-related work – everything that goes in there. What you will find in there is PDP. In the past, it was FOY-related. What is

included now is all the work around emojis, IDNs, ccTLDs, etc. You will see it on the big sheets.

The other one is everything we say from a ccNSO perspective done for the ccTLD community at large. It includes meetings, including Tech Day and what the ccNSO effort is into. It includes the activities around the ccNSO Members Day and other related issues.

That's a single one. The response and statement activities. Other Activities are almost like a garbage can. It includes the reviews, etc., and related activities and also the interaction with, for example, the GNSO PDP on Subsequent Procedures. So Work Track 5 is in Other Activities.

Joined SO/AC Activities and Administrative ccNSO Activities – that's a whole list of tasks undertaken by the ccNSO Council, as you can see.

That's the main summary lines of work.

If you look at the walls, you will a mind map that includes reasonably high-level working group work. If you really would drill down, you can, with a PDP, you can turn this into project plans and work phases. But that's not done yet.

So that was just an introduction to the mind maps on the wall.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Bart. You have received these mind maps long before even the latest council call. I hope you had time to do some detailed reading.

Now I think it's time that we give the floor to David, who will guide us through the rest of the process.

DAVID: Actually, we'll be giving the floor back to you in just a second. One of the things that we determined is that we want to gather a lot of information and get a lot of ideas around two topic areas.

Is this working okay for the speaker?

One of the areas is looking at these mind maps and working at the work load going forward and what's important and what maybe we should not be doing and what would be nice to do versus need to do. So that's one round that we'll use with this.

The second is we'll come back and start to think about the volunteer situation, as well as the financial situation, of how we meet our financial needs and how we increase our volunteer participation because we were hearing some ideas already being generated, and if we had three or four hours, we could really get that exhaustively around the group, but we don't.

So what we'll try to do is get a good start on that and then some action plans going forward by our end time at 3:00. So I just wanted to give you the map of where we're headed with things.

The first piece that we want to do is focus on these mind maps. We have three around the room. We want to divide you into three groups. Katrina will be with one chart. Byron will be with one chart. Demi will be with another chart. We want you to divide yourselves fairly equally around the charts so we don't have the European region clumped up all at one chart but dispersed around the three, just so that there's a good brain trust around the room and the wisdom is shared, if you will, from around the geographic regions. We also want to invite the working group chairs to participate in this as well and to be a piece of this process.

First, let's get you divided up on the charts, and then we'll tell you what the first task is. We've got four things that we want you to do with these mind maps.

This is where you get up and go to a chart. Go. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Just to be clear, only one region per chart.

DAVID: Yes, unless we've got more than three from that region here, obviously. Might have two.

So divide yourselves among the charts by regions, by working groups. We should have around, I don't know, six, eight, or nine per chart.

The charts are the mind maps. Nigel is doing a great job here. Byron, over here by the mind map. You're at the mind map.

It's the preprint. We'll come back to the flip charts.

So far so good. Okay. How are we coming? This looks like a good quorum. Looks a little light over here. We need some more at this chart over here.

Any other working chairs or councilors over here. This is a little light, too. Did you say something offensive and you chased them all off?

Okay. Perfect.

Good? Okay. Let me give you your first task. So you've sorted yourselves out. We obviously know the group that we're going to need to separate for the next activity.

Okay. Here we go. Here's your first task. The way that we're going to sort this: as you read through the mind maps: the first layer that we want you to look at is to read through and see if

there's anything missing. Is there anything that we need to add to this? If so, just write that onto the mind map in some form so we can capture what you think is missing. So read through. Get familiar with that and see what you think is missing, and then just write that directly onto the mind map if you find something missing.

We have some Post-Its if you want to use Post-Its to write things on. Let me just give them these.

Katrina, here's a Post-It. In case there's anything to add – you're good?

So for now, it's just what's missing. That's all you're looking at: just what's missing.

Another couple minutes.

Another minute, or you're good to go?

Okay. Let me stop you there for this piece. As you're reading through on these next iterations, if you see something else missing, you're welcome to put it up. This isn't by any means the cut-off point.

Okay. Here's the next sort. We're going to do three different sorting mechanisms on this. We want to give them to you one by one, just so that your mindset shifts each time. For the first sort,

we want you to use – let me make sure I get my colors right here – a green marker. These are things that we have to do. These are the non-negotiables, the “Got to do these very important priorities.”

I want to give you five minutes to go through and mark, with a green marker, the “These are the absolute we-have-to-do things.” Go ahead.

Just the green marker. Everything shouldn’t have a green mark, we’re thinking.

Perhaps it’s circling in green those items. I think the circles might work out well visually.

These are the absolute “We must do these things,” not necessarily, “Eh, maybe not. I don’t know.” Absolute.

Looking good.

Okay. One more minute on this.

Okay. Let’s move to the second sort. The second sorting on this is using a blue marker. You just did the must/shoulds, if you will. There was some great discussion over at this group of, “Do we mean “must” like it’s our core? Or should we do this? We’ve got to do it because it’s our core.”

This sorting mechanism, using blue and the same kinds of marks that you're using, looking at the chart, this would be "nice to do." It's not a must. It's not a have-to. But "It'd be nice if we could get to this."

Blue. That's very important.

Okay. Are you ready for the final sort, the final exercise on this piece? Using a red marker – time for red – looking at the chart, what is it we can take off of this? What would we like to eliminate from this that's not an "absolutely have to do" or "we would like to do," but a "we really don't want to do this, and maybe we shouldn't be doing this anymore," or whatever that reason might be? So take a look at it in red and make red marks on that.

There's been a request for additional red markers because you might run out of ink in these things.

One more minute.

Okay. Let me stop the action there. Let me have Byron and Demi and Katrina stay at your chart for right now and the others have a seat.

Okay. Have a seat.

Okay. Let's get ready to present back a bit here. Since we have these mind maps and they're kind of eye charts, if you were just going to look around and walk around the room, what we will do and consolidate this as the process goes on. But for now, we're just going to have Katrina and Byron and Demi or others designated by him do a summary of your chart of what was most important, what was the nice-to-have, and what you were going to cut.

Oh, you got a mic. Good. Go.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Can you hear me? Good.

Well, first we added three things we could not find on the mind map. The first was succession planning for all the work that we do – committees, council, the board, and so on – and then capacity workshops. That was something already mentioned by Pablo. And our participation in cross-community working groups, but in the PDP of GNSO, it's Work Track 5. I'm not saying it's not here, but we just got lost, apparently.

When we were thinking about must-have activities, we first thought about the bylaws – which activities are mandated by the bylaws of that we must have them. We definitely have to elect the council. We have to nominate people to the board. We

have to nominate our members to the Customer Standing Committee and appoint our representative on the NomCom. Something that we can do, according to the bylaws, is appoint liaisons to other SO/ACs. This is something that must be done.

Of course, some things that are important for our community are policy development, TLD ops, as it helps our ccTLDs to ensure more security and exchange of information, Tech Day – that’s outreach – activities, and ccNSO Members Meeting Day. Again, we can share information there.

Apparently we have to participate in the ccNSO org review. Currently we cannot avoid it. We also have to do IANA function review and CSC review. It’s good that we can participate in Work Stream 2 and CCWG Accountability. Triage, travel funding, and everything that’s related to us as a decisional participant. We should review ccNSO membership applications if we want to get more ccTLDs onboard. And some other things, like council meetings. Again, they are mandated by the bylaws.

But maybe we shouldn’t do so many of them. That’s one of the things. But judging by the time it takes to discuss things, I say, yeah, we should have them every month.

The things that are nice to have? It’s nice to review guidelines. It’s nice to have activity reports, meeting reports, and website updates. It’s nice to an onboarding program, as it would help us

to get more people. It's nice to have IDN ccTLD policy updated. SOPC. It's nice to participate in GNSO activities, and it's nice to participate in specific reviews. But again, we have to think about participating.

DAVID: Then how about eliminations?

KATRINA SATAKI: That was difficult. We have two red dots, actually. Probably we could skip our participation in Internet governance and auction proceeds. That won't help us to save much power, but that the outcome of the discussion.

DAVID: Thanks so much.

DEMI GETSCHKO: First of all, about the greens, we had some discussion here. If we are here to interpret the bylaws, the greens are what we really need to have because I suppose this is part of the input of the reviewing process that we will be going through in the next year. It's important to have input on what we think is important to keep. It's important to have in the new bylaws.

What we found missing here were more active outreach actions to show to the ccs not involved in the process the value to be here. Also, some kind of study and the financing of the organization. Then we had these two missing points, but it's not green. Both are in blue.

What we have in green is basically the council elections, board nominations, CSC nominations, liaisons, and all the policy-related things. We think it's important so it has to be in green.

Also, related to the administrative issues, the decisional participant and the ccNSO membership applications have to be considered green.

Apart from all of that, there was a full consensus that the cocktails have to be green in all the situations.

DAVID: The cocktails keep coming up as something to be kept.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Yeah. In blue, we have the travel funding, communications, the joint meetings between the support organizations, the IDN-ccTLD meetings, and the Support Organizations Act.

We have also in green the funding and the general outreach issues. We think it's very important to keep this in line.

If I'm missing something, please ask Peter to help me.

The only thing we found to mark in green – because we don't understand exactly what this means – is the ccNSO response and statement.

DAVID: Excellent. Thank you so much. But certainly not least.

BYRON HOLLAND: But definitely last.

Okay. I'm going to break it down by the major categories and do both must-do and should-do. To begin with, we had discussion about what must-do means. Is it mandatory, like bylaw-drive, or must-do because, by definition, we're here to meet with each other in a community group?

Anyway, we settled on must-do, should-do, and don't-do as our three categories, roughly speaking. In terms of reoccurring appointments and activities, must-dos included the council elections, board nominations, the key meeting-related committee meetings, CSC nominations, and council meetings themselves, as well as appointments to the NomCom. There were our must-dos.

Our should-dos were the Ethos Awards, mentoring programs, all liaisons, and all onboarding. We should do those things, but they weren't must-dos.

When it came to policy and policy-related activities, the ones around retirement and the policy development review decisions were must-do, but emojis and the past IDN ccTLD policy updates were should-dos.

As we move down into the ccTLD community and the meetings themselves in terms of must-dos, we had a lot of discussion around the various working group must-dos. We came to the conclusion that, if they're in existence, we must do them. But there was some question around: they are creatures of us. We don't have to do them, but if they're running, it's a must-do. So TLD ops was a must-do. The working group meetings were a must-do.

Tech Day we had a bunch of discussion on. Is it a must-do? It's very popular. It's very helpful. But, again, back to: is it a must-do? In the end, we said yes but questioned whether it was going to continue to be the cc community's responsibility. In the end, we said, "Yes, it's a must-do."

Our own meeting days were a must-do. Our working group meetings were a must-do. Because Tech Day was in there, we

said yes around the policy forum. That repeated through the three different meeting structures.

ccNSO cocktails – there was much discussion, but we went blue: it’s a should-do. Should definitely do, but not a must-do. That summarized that.

As we move down into the [SOPC], based on the fundamental philosophy that, if we created the working group, we must follow through with it, it was a must-do. We added something around the reserve fund there; that we should be participating in that.

As we move over here to the administrative side, it was interesting to hear Demi’s group’s comment about travel funding being a should-do. We had rated it as a must-do. The should-dos included the Triage Committee, the work plan, guidelines reviews, and council roles and responsibilities. I think that gives you a sense of how we were viewing these things. Obviously, we should do those things if we want to run effectively, but they weren’t must-dos.

Decisional participants was a must-do. Membership application: must-do. Working group and committee – the membership itself – was a must-do.

As we move down to communications, essentially all of that was should-do, except the website. As a primary vehicle, we must maintain and update that.

Down in here into the joint SO/AC meetings, they were basically should-do, not must-do. Other activities: the meeting strategy review, ATRT3, and SSR2 were should-dos. CSC-related activities were must-dos.

One thing we thought was missing from this category was the work with the GNSO around geo names and W25. Annebeth was also mentioning that there are apparently 25 ccTLD participants in that, which maybe was not captured in our earlier discussions, so that was an interesting fact.

We added an entire separate category, which is really ICANN-related issues which we can and should participate in, or at least and recognize and be intentional about whether we want to participate in or not, and that included that accountability framework review, universal acceptance, IDNs in general, and, from my group – this was a bit of a late-breaking issues – but, going back to capacity building and participation, something around translation. So that was how we viewed it.

DAVID: And that final bucket?

BYRON HOLLAND: I was hoping you were going to forget about that one. We had good and robust discussion about it, and our group was unable to come up with anything to actually cut, except we had Giovanni down here somewhere. But I don't know what –

DAVID: But that's his handwriting, though.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. Spelled with only one "n", though, so maybe it's not actually that Giovanni, but some other Giovanni.

And we had a diverse group who all, as is no surprise in here, are involved in any number of these things. I think we felt and saw that a little bit in terms of: should we cut something or not?

DAVID: Okay. Thank you. Question?

EBERHARD LISSE: Now that I hear it, would it not have been better, perhaps, to start with the cutting – in reverse order – because, once you've decided "This is a must, this is a should" – there really isn't much left sometimes?

DAVID:

Good point. Next time.

Here's what we're moving into next. I know that we're going to be running up on our time, but the next piece is an individual contribution, if you will. If you need to step out to the restroom or something while you're doing this, this would be the time to do that. So I'll just put that caveat in as I explain this.

This brings us to the resource question. There were two things. One was, "How can we meet our financial commitments?" if I can frame it as that question. The other was, "How can we increase volunteer participation?" These two charts in the back have the same question on the as well – thank you. If you could flip that one down.

At the charts, there are Post-It pads in the bottom. I'll give you about ten minutes to visit two of the charts. Either visit Volunteer Participation or Financial Commitments. What we want from you are your ideas – some of those ideas that came up. How can we meet our financial commitments? How can we increase our volunteer participation?

Put one idea on each Post-It. Don't write five ideas on one Post-It and slap it up there because we're going to sort those, too, as

a piece of this. So if you've got five ideas, that's great. Just write them on five different Post-Its and put them on the chart.

I'll give you ten minutes to do that, to walk to both of the questions. Contribute your ideas. If you need to step out for the restroom, please do that. We'll come back in in ten minutes. I'll draw you back in.

Let's resume. I've put financial questions together and volunteer questions together. I want to divide the group in half. How about if we take this half of the room to here? I'm going to split the two of you up, not because you're troublemakers or anything, but we'll start from here. So you, and then around to this side. Why don't we have this side take the financial commitment question charts? This side will take the volunteer charts.

Here's what I want you to do. Feel free to jump in, working group chairs, too, to help do this sorting. As you're standing here, reading through these could-be overlapping ideas or could-be similar ideas, say, "How do we organize this? What are the buckets that we would put these into? Basically, what's been said here and how can we present that back so it would make sense to the whole group?" So it's organizing these ideas in some way and then presenting that back to the rest of us. Okay?

Go to your charts, organize, and we'll resume.

This is where you get up and go to the charts and organize. You can do it. Come on. Come on. Come on.

Byron is doing a great job. He's up. Nigel is at the chart. He's doing a fine job. I just thought I'd point that out.

Nigel is already moving Post-Its around. Quickly. Quickly.

Remember, both of the charts have the same things. And remember, these are the same, too. So you might want to put all on one and then reorganize to another.

Okay. Are we ready?

Have your presenters figured – okay. Is this last-person-standing-at-this-chart-will-be-the-presenter? Excellent!
Excellent!

What we want is a summary of what you organized into buckets and what your findings were in looking at all this information.

This is on. I will turn it over to you. So how can we meet our financial commitments?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hello? Can you hear me? Oh, okay.

This is a very complicated matter. We have a section on why we should even be bothering with this or what the benefits are of financial commitments. This is one.

Here on answering the question we have people saying that the ccNSO should show the value of the contribution so people will contribute. Others are asking for recalculations of the amounts that were suggested. And others are asking maybe to have a meeting fee, as in paying for attending the meeting.

Also, honor. If you said you were going to pay, honor what you said. Maybe have a clearly published list on who is paying and who is not.

There's a couple of Post-Its saying that, if you are not contributing, then you cannot have a leadership position, maybe, or maybe not participate at all.

Also, reaching out to ccTLDs, as in approaching a one-on-one conversation, maybe, to see if they can get convinced.

So this is the spread of the Post-Its.

DAVID:

Thank you very much. Let's take a look at how we increase volunteer participation. Who's presenting this chart?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Some volunteers?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I was not in this one, so...

DAVID: Look at that! Look at that! Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. I'm reading it for the first time.

DAVID: Before you start reading it, we should get someone that was here that [could make sense] of why you organized it the way you did. I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think so, but okay.

DAVID: Here he comes. Here he comes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'm trying to spread the volunteership around. [Come on].

DAVID: But she was ready to work on five different committees there. That's incredible.

BYRON HOLLAND: So we broke it down into these five groups. The first group was really around mentorship and mentees and perhaps making it more mandatory, so those of us who've been around a while and been involved a while – as new members come on board, be it in working groups or ccNSO Council or general ccNSO membership, we strengthen that, the idea being that maybe it's a mandatory activity.

The other one was: try to simplify what we do to make it accessible to new people. Again, that's into the ccNSO in general, from a general membership perspective, and certainly from a working group perspective.

How do we simplify it and how do we communicate? How do we build onramps that folks who aren't involved or are not yet educated on these issues can quickly ramp up? The idea is to minimize the hurdle to allow people to step over it and participate.

The next one was around showing the value of it. Why do this? What's the point? Why get involved? In a volunteer member-based organization, that's always a struggle, not just in a place like the ccNSO. It's about really communicating the value proposition. One of the notions there was: an engaged member is a happier member. If you know what's going on, if you're participating, if you're part of the community, that's a self-reinforcing cycle. The key is: how do we spin that wheel up? How do we get that flywheel rotating for individuals to feel like participants?

Something that came out here – there were four different folks who raised it – was around translation. Interestingly, nobody said, “Full translation of all U.N. languages all the time in real-time.” It was really around “some translation” and “translation of meetings.” So just some acknowledgement that translation would be certainly helpful to getting volunteer participation.

Then this one was about creating incentives. Somebody very constructively wrote, “Chocolates for all new participants.” Then we got into, “How do you create that incentive?” Maybe it's a recommend-and-solicit. Those of us who are involved – again, working group or council members, or people who've been around awhile – identify and solicit to new members to participate, to try to put your arm around them and convincingly bring them on-side. How do you make that happen?

There were a couple of different ones around “recommend and incent” or “recommend and solicit proposition.”

One tangentially-related item to this was around: how can we create an environment where the elected officials (us) in here don’t have to depend on our employer for expenses? In other words, covering the entire meeting expense on our behalf, because that could be perceived as a hurdle.

So those were the five buckets of suggestions for improving volunteer participation.

DAVID:

Thank you so much. So we’ve generated a lot of information. We’ve started a lot of interesting discussions on must versus should versus “what should we cut?” and that was all in 90 minutes. Well done. Give yourselves a hand.

These charts will be consolidated. I say that as the [royal] “we”. I won’t be involved in this at all. So that’ll all become one chart. Then these charts won’t be lost either, in terms of the information generated. Some synthesis will be created from that, too.

I’m going to turn it back to Katrina for Next Steps and Wrap-Up.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Thank you, David. Thanks a lot to all of you for your active participation and your ideas.

Now here's the question: what do we do next? How can we implement these ideas? What should we do to make sure that we do some follow-up for this discussion?

Yes, please, Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS: I just want to make the observation that I don't think there's anything here to implement yet. This is raw material from which we will draw something that we will eventually implement. I think there are no recommendations here to implement.

One suggestion is – I think this session has been quite helpful – that, maybe not with 90 minutes but maybe with 60 minutes, we do this regularly. That's one suggestion.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. If we talk, for example, about increasing participation, some years ago we had a working group that came up with some suggestions on how to increase participation. So that's why I asking about next steps. If we leave all those Post-Its just as they are, even if we have, next year, the same discussion, we will not move anywhere. So we need to

understand next steps. We need to generate some ideas on how to proceed.

Peter?

PETER:

I wholeheartedly support your suggestion for a working group on the participation and engagement topic, upon one condition. I think it's critical for its success and the outcome of its finding that it's heavily populated by the members that are lacking in your [statistic] material in terms of participation because they are the group that probably has the most of the answers that we need. If it's, again, the usual suspects that are going to participate in that work group, I think we have far less chance of coming with things that are actually needed to kick us further.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Probably I will mention another fact. The working group that was supposed to come up with recommendations on how to increase participation are struggling with participation itself.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Actually, Katrina, that's a much better thing than you think. It's very revealing.

KATRINA SATAKI: Revealing. And the fact that the last council call was not quorate was revealing as well.

Yes, please, Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: If I [inaudible], I come from a developing country where we always get WHO and other no-good do-gooder [inaudible] through, and they push something on top of us which has sometimes the opposite effect of what is intended.

What we are very good at in my country is writing policy. What we suck at is implementation. Numbers of people attending a workshop is an output, is a target that they want to achieve. That's not output.

What I'm trying to say here is that we must find some metrics and then find a way of improving those numbers. What we can actually measure is the work we put in here. Hanging out here this afternoon is quite cool, but still, this is a workload. For whatever work we do, what actually do we achieve, other than spending two hours on it in a talk or so-and-so many hours in a working group?

The first thing we should really do is define metrics – what numbers are we looking at? – increase the number of members, and increase the number of participants in working groups. We have this number. We want to raise this number by 10%. Then we can look at strategies to achieve this and then we can measure after a while. We monitor this and then we can, after a while, evaluate if we achieve what we’re doing.

Top-down deciding something we’re going to outreach and we’re going to inbound and outbound and left-bound and center-bound probably is not going to achieve much other than creating a lot of workload.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. [Wafa] first, and then Peter.

[WAFDA DAHMANI]: Thank you, Katrina. I think that there are already some mechanisms in ICANN that are put through that we can use to increase the number of volunteers. We have the USC Department. They’re doing great work in terms of engagement and outreach. Last week, we had a webinar [review] within the Middle East strategy about this TLDs and IDNs. It was a good initiative. There were ten ccTLDs who attended from – no, four

ccTLDs? – ten people. And the ALAC. You can collaborate with the capacity building within ALAC.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. I don't know who was first. Peter?

PETER: I just wanted to build up on something Eberhard said and ask him a question about defining the metrics. Are you more looking into a kind of situation where those metrics are pre-defined, or could this be the first step in the work of that actual working group, setting the scene and setting what we want to have in terms of results and achievements?

EBERHARD LISSE: No. I want to basically reverse physics. I want to go from top-down to bottom-up. The point is that we're doing something and we will do something. As I just said, we have engagement and people attend the workshop. But that's input. It shouldn't be a measure of success – how many people attend the workshop. Some other measure should be. What is the bottom line and what do they achieve?

So I'm not suggesting what metrics we need to do, but one thing could be how many ccNSO members we have or increasing the

number and look at what percent it is or sharing the participation so that more people from different ccTLDs go into workshops. We can look at that. I have no fixed notion, but we should have an objective criteria.

We don't want to achieve more people attending inbound workshops. What do we actually want to achieve? We want people to participate in working groups. We want more ccNSO members. We maybe want ccNSO members to pay. We should look at whether our input over, let's say, six months or a year results in an actual increase in whatever number we choose.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. [Liz]?

[LIZ]: Just a couple of quick observations. I'm relatively new to the group, so I'm going to perhaps bring a little different perspective. It would be a shame if we're talking about volunteer participation and all of these notes were not put into a document and then distributed to those who are not here because, really, we're talking to the people who already participate. But what we want is other participating.

So is there anyone who is able to – I don't know who's responsible for doing that; I'm happy to help in any way – pull all this together in quite a programmatic, easy-to-read way?

Could we also distribute the slides to everyone on the ccNSO list so that you've got the document that shows the statistics, which is to Eberhard's point, and then says, "And this is what we also did when we were at our meeting to think about these two things"?

Could we also not separate increasing volunteer participation from financial commitments? Because the two things go together in lots and lots of different ways, which we can talk about at some other point.

I wonder, also, if we're looking at, back to the slide presentation that went on, the way in which participation is done across the regions, if perhaps this is a small document that could be perhaps – I'm privileged to be able to work in my own first language to translate this into French and Spanish or two other choices – distributed as an addendum? Because, essentially, what we're asking people to do is participate in an environment where the language choice that we make, which is what we're stuck with, is something that is a barrier instantly to participation, and comfortable participation.

So there's a lot of different ideas that you've all really put together. I'm not, of course, on the council. I'm not a work track leader. I'm participating in other things. But this stuff is common not only to the ccNSO but also to the GNSO. The common characteristic is volunteer overload in some parts and a lack of participation in other parts.

But I really want to hone into what Eberhard has said about output. It is insufficient to say we're sitting around the table to do something. We have to also demonstrate how we would measure success in: have we made any progress by the Panama meeting? Have we made any progress by the next quarter or the next quarter or the next quarter? Because, otherwise, it's a never-ending trajectory of activity and busy work that actually doesn't change the way we might want to do things.

And it's a simple thing. If you increase participation, you need a different room. That's a really simple, logistical thing. We can't fit more people. All of us sitting but it's nearly a full room.

KATRINA SATAKI:

This is also a different setup. We're not talking about a council meeting or anything.

[LIZ]: I know. I'm just saying it's an interesting example. If you want to succeed in volunteers [inaudible] –

KATRINA SATAKI: We will have a different room for ccNSO members meeting, so that's definitely not a worry.

[LIZ]: Of course.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Demi, sorry. We're running out of time. We have to finish, as ICANN has this block schedule.

Okay. We will try to summarize all of the feedback we've received and propose some ways forward. If you have any ideas, please feel free to distribute them to the list or to me. Or let's chat.

Bart, please?

Oh, yeah. You can send them to Bart, definitely.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just maybe one more question, Eberhard. As part of the logistics, could you, just by show of hand tomorrow at Tech Day, check how many ccs are in the room – say, ccTLDs represented

one way of the other? Because if we do the same on the ccNSO meeting day, then we have already very simple statistics which nuance this whole idea of participation. My guess is, based on some of the numbers we've collected over the years in an ad hoc manner, that the number of people who attend ICANN meetings just to visit and participate in ccNSO meetings is different than, say, the numbers that you have been discussing this morning. Probably you'll see the same with Tech Day.

EBERHARD LISSE: There is usually more people at Tech Day [inaudible] ccNSO [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, but the question is, how many of them are ccTLDs?

EBERHARD LISSE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. With that, we will have to report back to the community about what we've done here, and we'll have to talk about ccNSO Council priorities. Unfortunately, we do not have time discuss that, but I will try to summarize all those must-dos

and present them as something that the council believes are our priorities.

Okay. With that, thank you very much for your participation, for your ideas, and everything. Thank you very much, and see you around.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]