KOBE – ccNSO: Preparatory Meeting
Sunday, March 10, 2019 – 12:15 to 13:30 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

KATRINA SATAKI: I hope you had an opportunity to move a little bit around during our previous exercises. Now you have had your lunch and everything is back to normal. You have your energy back. So, we need to get prepared for the Council meeting and actually for the entire ICANN week, for the coming days.

Okay. I won't pretend that I can read anything on the screen apart from the title. But luckily – I hope you all have your printed versions in front of you. I think we won't go into the review of the workshop. We summarized everything perfectly at the end of the workshop. Current Agenda Item #2 is – may I give the floor to Bart? Bart, please.

BART BOSWINKEL: Two remarks. I don't know whether it's worthwhile but do you think – especially based on the hopes and fears session this morning to have a workshop in Marrakech to continue that discussion? Because if we do it right now as a starting point, if there is a "I'm going that way" we'll keep it in mind. That's the only question I have regarding that part.

KATRINA SATAKI: Normally we have a workshop once a year. If we make it more interactive, not just talking of some hands-on sessions to do some real stuff let's say, would you be interested to have a workshop more often? Next question on Marrakech. First was Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: I absolutely agree to have more workshop and hands-on experiences in Marrakech.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. I also agree. I would suggest we have it on very specific set of strategy how to address our … especially the fears part regarding community engagement and so on.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. So if there are no objections then we set this. It's decided, so we'll have a workshop in Marrakech with the specific target to come up with some solutions for the issue that we had identified during the fears and hopes part of the exercise. Okay, thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: That's one. The second point is – and this is more administrative – this Council meeting this week will be in this room again. So we'll move from the ccNSO Council or the ccNSO Members meeting, we move back to this room. So, on Wednesday at 5:00 PM, you're expected to be in this room. Keep that in the back of your mind.

And now Item #2, the most important one. This week you as a Council are supposed to elect the new chair and vice chair for the ccNSO Council, and hence for the ccNSO. Normally this is about the timing. It is where to put it in the agenda. Say in the past, we put at the end of the agenda before the closure of this meeting itself. So, it will be the final point on the agenda.

And the way it's done is that Katrina will step down as chair and one of the vice chairs will take over that part of the session. So, that's either Byron or Debbie. Maybe it might be interesting to do it say – we did it in the past as well that a vice chair or somebody who is remotely participating runs that part especially for Debbie because this will be her final session anyway as a councilor and participating in the ccNSO. I don't know if you agree. I will reach out to Debbie, see if she's available. And, Byron, if you could act as a backup in case

something goes wrong with remote participation. You'll never know.

Then the process will be – Katrina will hand over to the chair of that part of the session, so Debbie or Byron. There will be a call for nominations. One or two of you will nominate for the chair position and then can a call for [inaudible] and then my guess is if there are two or more candidates, we have a round of voting. If there are two or more candidates, we'll have a secret vote with ballots. I will walk around with a hat and say if there is a remote participant like Debbie, she can e-mail me and I'll count this in and that will count the votes. That's if there are two or more candidates. If there is just one candidate, there will be just a call for a vote. So say if the support for the position abstentions or objections, I don't figure there will be any objections to a one person. But you'll never know. Probably it's the easiest thing to start – who is in favor of that person.

That's the first run through the chair's position. I think after the chair's position, you hand back to the – it depends on who the chair is – but run through. And that might be the easiest thing. If Debbie runs the whole session, do it for the vice chairs as well because she's not conflicted anyway in no way, whether she's chair or vice chair. That's with respect to the chair and vice chair elections. Any questions? Any issues? I'll send a note around as well to that respect. Okay, back to you, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Draft agenda for the meeting. We'll go through main items below. More details will follow in the course of the week.

We'll also have to prepare for joint meetings. Let's see what we have here. Yeah. Joint meeting of ccNSO and ALAC. Maybe not all of you know, unfortunately we had to make the session shorter by 15 minutes. So, initial agenda we had to change it a little bit. But all in all we will dedicate this meeting to sharing our – the way we comment and view budget and the strategic documents. Giovanni has already prepared a presentation to show our approach to the thing. So, this is I think more or less clear.

Next. Our meeting with GNSO Council. We'll talk about the CSC Effectiveness Review, the final report. We'll meet to synchronize decision-making and next steps. Yes, please.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe Philippe Fouquart will be presenting on behalf of the CSC effectiveness. He's the GNSO liaison to the ccNSO Council and he's also a GNSO Council member and he's one of the members of the Review Team.

KATRINA SATAKI: I hope he will be there and I will be able to give a brief summary.

Auction proceeds. I'm not sure if Ching will be there. Peter, if he's not, maybe you can be the one from the ccNSO side. Just be there prepared. But I think that GNSO will gladly also provide their view on the thing.

Again, we'll talk about our comments, share of views on the operating plan and budget. What are the common concerns? And one thing that we have on here also, we'll talk – where is it? Giovanni's presentation is under Confusing Similarity Review. It's not Katrina, it's Giovanni. Giovanni has also prepared another presentation. If you remember – I think it was in Barcelona where we agreed – we mentioned this is an issue that we now have experienced with confusing similarity and how to address things and we also believe that the approach, not who can apply for a string or what the string can be but in terms of validation of these IDN strings. We believe that the approach to the [inaudible] needs to be harmonized. Giovanni will share some of our experience and we'll propose the way forward for what we can do and how we can harmonize it. Okay. Then –

BART BOSWINKEL: Katrina, regarding this topic confusing similarity, please note it's also a topic on the ICANN board meeting. So, this is building up through the meeting with the board.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, exactly. Now, we're coming to that. Now, we're coming exactly to that. Know the right questions you ask to the board. You know the questions that we ask to the board and one of those is related to what the process should be in their view. I don't know if that's the question to the board but at least maybe they have some views or how they see this to be addressed. But in front us we also have questions from the board and somehow we need to answer them.

They ask for clear suggestions. First is what the board, ICANN org, and the community should be doing now to prepare for the successful implementation of these plans? Please make three suggestions as concrete as possible. They really don't want us to go forever in philosophical notes but they are looking for as concrete as possible suggestions. So, do we have any suggestions? As concrete as possible.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: So, the board is asking our suggestions?

KATRINA SATAKI: I think it's a normal thing. We also ask community for suggestions and I think you need input. It's not that they come up with something and then – we are not obliged to have any

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

suggestions if we have no idea. So be it but I believe that we do – should be doing now. Of course when you come up with plans, you should think about the ways to implement those plans, but better late than never. Any suggestions? SOPC Working Group?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I have a suggestion on the second point, not on the first one.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. We can move swiftly, move to the next then. "While the success of these plans lies primarily within ICANN, we all know that ICANN does not operate in a vacuum and alliances and partnerships are important to our success. How can we increase the likelihood that important allies and partners in the space are on the same page and working together to achieve common agreed upon goals? Please provide one suggestion of something that could be done externally to improve trust and collaboration."

Apparently, Giovanni has a suggestion. Yes, please.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Just so it's clear, this is a question that is coming from the board to us. Okay. First of all, although I do not own the language –

KATRINA SATAKI: Sorry. Not just to us. These questions go to all communities they're meeting with.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I do not own the language but the fact that twice in these few lines there is the word "alliance." To me, from a psychological perspective, if you have done some psychology courses, it does a lot. To me, what they should have clear is to have their message they want to pass on clear and make sure that there is consistency in what they are doing. And to me, the most critical example is what they are doing at the European Union level. I've been trying to understand if there is consistency in what they have been doing for the past five years and honestly I failed to see it. Even a strategy, not even consistency, so it's a much higher level if there is a strategy. And to me, consistency, having a strategic approach, follow the approach, make sure that there is one clear message rather than million of messages – I think that is crucial if you want to establish not an alliance but a long-term partnership. That is my suggestion.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Clearly, the way I read the question, we're talking about ICANN. We do not talk about ICANN org, for example. We talk about ICANN as a community. Coming from a practical point of view, how can you imagine that all different parts of ICANN

community can come up with one clear consistent message? I just think it's not realistic. We still can propose that. I just say that the message that ccNSO, for example, would go with ccTLDs or ICANN org or ICANN board or … I do not see a practical way to implement this suggestion.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I think we are not talking about two million people organization. We're talking about 400 people organization. If there are different people managing –

KATRINA SATAKI: Wait a minute. Organization? You're talking about ICANN org?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI: But the question is not about ICANN org. The question is about ICANN the community.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. But it's from the board perspective. No? Isn't it from the board perspective?

KATRINA SATAKI: The board asked the question – we all know that ICANN does not operate in a vacuum so we need allies, whoever that might be, ITU, I don't know. Governments partly are also within ICANN, GAC for example. But here the question is – I'm not saying it's a good question. I'm just trying to understand the question and it's definitely not about ICANN org.

BART BOSWINKEL: That in itself is probably – just as an observation – the first question, to make a very clear distinction between what they consider ICANN board and ICANN org, now they talk about ICANN. What do they mean? Because if you go down this path with them, it doesn't make sense anymore. You talk about the language and this in itself is already something in them messaging towards you and towards the broader community. What do they really mean with the second question? Who are they referring to?

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, I think the way we could phrase it and say that we believe that any message must be clear, and this question is not.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This question, it says, "How can we…" I don't think that must mean "How can we, the board" because it's a board question,

right? It's not "How can we as the board increase the success of ICANN as a whole?"

KATRINA SATAKI: Wait a minute. If they say, "We all know," it's not that the board knows. When they say "we," they mean ICANN community. Well, that's how I read the question. I don't know if that's how they meant it. Yes?

JORDAN CARTER: I read the question saying the whole three, so it's "we" the collective ICANN in these broader engagements. "How can we together increase likelihood of allies and partners in this space?" That's how I read it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. I agree with Jordan even though he's a native speaker. That's exactly how I read the question. So it's not talking about ICANN org or "we, the board," they're talking "we, the community."

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Katrina, in the first item it ends by saying, "Providing one each of the board, ICANN org, and the community." So it seems that the second questions are already referring to that conglomerate of

the three, so I do agree with Jordan. The other thing is that it's seems to me that the second question – the first part of the two questions in the second item are missing context as a result of it, that's why we struggle with trying to define or describe some type of approach is because we're missing the context. I am confident that when all the members of board, ICANN org, and the community find something in common that is affecting everybody, naturally we tend to find ways to work together. In this case, we don't have what that context is.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments? Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: Thanks, Katrina. What I remembered from the time when Fadi was still a CEO of ICANN, that he had come up with a kind of measurement methods and during each opening session, he would address publicly "These are the things that we have been debating about and this is how we are executing on them." So my question would be, is there another way to translate the goals set in the Strategic and Operating Plan to translate them in a number of practical items, a number of parameters that can be measured, and then try to figure out within external consultant how this could be transposed in a kind of a metric or an [objectivated] measurement tool so that it can be presented

during each ICANN meeting so that the community can be kept up to speed about how is execution of all those plans coming into reality and what might be the roadblocks that are jamming from going any further?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Peter. Which of the questions were you talking about now? Number two. Well, number two is not about informing ICANN the community but about us going to other communities. Yeah. Well, now we're struggling with the language here but as we agreed with the interpretation, they ask what we do implement – the way I would see it, the success clearly lies primarily within ICANN, within the community, right? But now there are certain risks maybe from the outside which might influence the way we implement these plans. So we need those allies and now we need to decide how we can talk to them, and so they ask. That's what they're asking. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: I don't know if I'm allowed to say this but I'll say it anyway. It's one of the ways that ICANN could increase the likelihood that [all these] will work. That is to be very clearly independent from the United States government.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, you're clearly are allowed to say anything. This is one of the options, yeah. If we do not come up with any better answer, we can go with this.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I reiterate that to be consistent. Be consistent in what they are doing.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. But who "they"? We're talking about "we." That is the thing here. We're not talking about "they." If we talk about ICANN org, yes I agree. We can say that you ICANN org should be consistent

.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Okay. So, we should be consistent.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Young Eum.

YOUNG EUM LEE: Thanks, Katrina. Well, actually ICANN has been doing a lot of work in going to those meetings of IGF and ITU and trying to present to those communities what ICANN has been doing but maybe to make it a little more efficient, instead of just generally describing what they're doing – first of all, inform the internal

ICANN community of things that are going on outside of ICANN like within the ITU, that may have consequences for the ICANN community and then have members from SOs or ACs that have been involved in specific issues or specific problems or whatever and having them go to those communities and explaining to them that what ICANN is involved in is very specific and very real and very relevant and that the community itself is actually working.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: It seems to me – and I'd like to refer back to what Peter was mentioning. In the translation of action items – and, Peter, correct me if I misinterpreted what you said – but it seems to me that if we have a number of goals then we can translate what are the action items, what are the actions that we must follow in order to achieve those goals in relation to what has been said, maintaining that consistency with what we have claimed that we are or we tend to be.

At this point I think that it would be important to understand what is it that we have said – we as a community have said that we want to achieve and convert that into these are the steps

that we need to follow to get there and set up a roadmap and now we have at least a starting point to talk to other communities about that.

KATRINA SATAKI: What other communities?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: For example, the piece of the SOs and ACs, and we could talk about how can we achieve those goals.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. But again, you're talking about our community.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Yes. The way I see it is, we would take this question and device a plan on how as the ccNSO would approach a number of steps to achieve whatever goals we have on that agenda. However, we can talk to other SOs and ACs about joining, right? We're talking about allies and supporting groups and so on. So, how does that work? The bottom line is that we will achieve – when we talk about the bottom up, it's nothing more than the interdependent interaction between one community and another community. What I'm putting forward my agenda as my concerns and they're putting forward their agendas and their concern and we find

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

common consensus and from that knowledge emerges and innovation emerges consequently we'll be able to achieve in a more efficient way and in an easily adaptable way so that others will be more likely to adopt those changes if they are participants of that movement.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Nevertheless, from all that I'm hearing here, I think that we start by asking the board to be clearer when they ask their questions because we cannot even agree on the interpretation of the questions. How can we agree on the answer, right? Yes, Peter.

PETER VERGOTE: You're spot on, Katrina. Let's take, for instance, law enforcement. Is that a partner or ally that we consider to be part of the ICANN community or is it more external? We need feedback from the board to have the answer to that because if they are more referred to that external potential ally then we can come up with suggestions and start thinking about it but we need to have that answer first.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think that even more important, they talk about ICANN community being on the same page with partners when even we

without ICANN are not on the same page. So, how can we even consider answering this question? Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. Do we know if ICANN org post these same questions to the other SO/ACs?

KATRINA SATAKI: As I said, these are question that are sent to all SO/ACs.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I missed that thing.

BART BOSWINKEL: These are questions from the board, not ICANN org. The board.

KATRINA SATAKI: ICANN board – and they usually send it to all SO/ACs, SGs, with all that they meet. Yup.

PETER VERGOTE: Do we have a timing in mind to ask them that clarification? Because if we don't do it immediately, they could use it and only bring it up during our face-to-face meeting. They could easily come up with the feedback like, "You should at least have

considered that earlier because now we cannot go into depth or into substance of that question number two, while we could have had that possibility if you would have communicated that concern earlier."

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, I forwarded the questions long ago to the Council list so we had the opportunity to read them, and if we did not understand, to address them. Yes, we didn't do that but – yeah. Okay, who wanted speak now? Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Recognizing questions were circulated to the list but reading these and that risk of going [off piece] in the discussion we're having right now, one thing I just want to note is the comment period for the draft is still open for another couple of weeks, and yet just the framing of this suggests it's a done deal. I think that might be worth noting is that in terms of how they are managing this process and corralling the process, they're suggesting that their published plan effectively is the plan. And please add some details and commentary on our existing plan when the comment period is not even over yet because of their five key strategic objectives.

I'm not sure that we would all agree if we all actually sat down and read them and said, "Do you agree as individuals that these are the five most pressing strategic objectives of ICANN over the next five years?" I'm not sure we would have agreement on this, and yet the framing of their questions suggest that it's a done deal and I think that that in itself might be worth pressing on them as we answer these questions or attempt to respond to these questions.

This is a follow-on to that, sorry. And do it in a constructive manner. It doesn't have to be a challenging manner but on a constructive manner. Make note of that and get that on the record. As they ask about specifics here or they ask us to speak to specifics, I mean one of the things we could note is that their objectives are fairly open-ended, right? Address geopolitical issues. What does that mean? It's not very specific. It's certainly not particularly measurable, how do you action it and do all of those things? Are they really the five they should be?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. In a manner we do challenge them when we ask our questions. For example, what criteria do they use when they … Peter?

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thank you, Katrina. Peter Van Roste from CENTR. Byron highlighted something very important there. With this thing, it's probably just an illustration of something that I would consider to be a larger problem. If ICANN represents the ICANN community outside of its traditional scope, so in relation with government's ITU in Brussels that ICANN only represents the community there when there is agreed policy or an agreed position that has passed through all the mechanisms of approval, for instance, for the strategic plan. I'm not sure that we should bring it up here but I would like to make that as a point for this group that I think it's important that ICANN sticks to its remit when representing the community. I think ICANN perfectly fits to go out and talk about the ICANN model and such as to what we are doing and the importance of what ICANN is doing and the importance of the multistakeholder aspects to that. But coming to examples like representing the community's interest and the GDPR discussions in Brussels, that's a very tricky one because that ICANN community has as we know quite different interest and I'm not sure which one ICANN takes to those meetings.

KATRINA SATAKI: Stephen, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. Byron, I concur with your remarks completely. Thank you for those.

Peter, with regards to your comment, it has been my perception from ICANN board's statement over and over again that they "serve with the will of the community" but I think as you just stated implicitly, their actions speak otherwise. I'm wondering if it would not be appropriate for us to reach out to board reps immediately and ask them what are these questions.

KATRINA SATAKI: We can do that but again, taking into account that we should have done that earlier. I don't know if that's … Anyhow, we won't have time to come together and discuss the answer. So probably we just go with the plan and next time we are more careful and read them in advance when I send them – I mean when the chair sends them. It was in January or December.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just again say strengthening or supporting what Byron just said as an observation, this in itself the discussion you have around this question shows there is no so clear answer and this probably is something to surface during that conversation. I think that you do not understand this question. I'd say at first

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, then we refer back to the clear message. The message must be clear and this is not. Okay, thank you. Then we have this joint meeting with ccNSO.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just one more point. Who is going to lead on these questions?

KATRINA SATAKI: I'll start and then I hope others will join. Nick please.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I was going to say there's a third question here about implementation. I was just reflecting on the fact that they're going to multi-year planning and some of these processes are quite long processes. I wondered whether one suggestion we could hopefully make might be that they look or consider more strongly, sort of an effective project management approach when they implement some of these things because the way that ICANN is historically implemented some of the things has not been very consistent or well planned and perhaps that is

something that we should offer as a suggestion since they are asking and then moving to multi-year planning.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, but that's the board. It's definitely a suggestion for ICANN org and Göran hopefully will –

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Maybe I guess it's Question 1 then perhaps [inaudible] about board and org suggestions.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, good point. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Now that we've been talking about it and I've read them abyss. I've got another suggestion for that Question 1 about thing the board could do which is that the board could focus its meeting time and attention on the strategic goals instead of on all of the other things that it gets distracted by. So, if they are focused more on discussing and thinking about the goals and how to achieve them, they might then flow down into what the org is doing.

I know that in my case, my board when they focus on our strategic goals, we get more useful input from them when they get distracted.

KATRINA SATAKI: Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I'd like to say something on the basis of the experience of the SOPC over the past years, and it's about having a certain degree of flexibility when managing the strategic plan implementation. That's because in the current strategic plan and in previous one, the SOPC was told that the goals were set. The objectives were set. They could not change the approved objectives and goals. They were set, they have to cope with them and deal with them for five years, which in such a dynamic industry thinking, "I have a goal, I have an objective, I have to stick to that without reviewing because it's approved." To [answer], because it was a strong comment made by the SOP five years ago and also in the previous strategic plan, it's tough to understand. It's just like, "That's the approved objective. I need five years before I can review it."

Over the past 10 years, if we look at – this is an exercise I've done for the ALAC and I took the ICANN Strategic Plan 2005-2006 and

then 2010. Yeah, it was like archaeology. If you look at those plans, it's like you work in archives and it's amazing the fact that, for instance, if you look at those plans, it was nothing about at some point the advent on social media, non-anticipation of possible saturation of the market, these kind of things. To me it would be important. Yes, I like it. But to me it would be important for the ICANN board and the ICANN org, not only to be flexible but with all the knowledge they should have to anticipate possible market scenarios, possible developments of this industry. And this is something that is still hard or is proven to be hard for them. So just study a bit more.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. May I ask – yeah, Peter?

PETER VAN ROSTE: I may have something for Question 3 or even 1 but I need to check this with you.

KATRINA SATAKI: I'm sorry, we don't have much time but can we agree that those who have suggestions to send them directly to me. I will summarize them and then we'll go for, okay? Yeah, thank you very much. Because otherwise, we won't –

BART BOSWINKEL: If you want to say something about these questions [inaudible]. You could do it the other way around as well. You say you hear people talking about it.

KATRINA SATAKI: I forgot already. I did hear and I wrote some down but I forgot who said what. I would really appreciate e-mails really in very concise ways. Peter, Byron, Jordan, Nick, Giovanni, anyone else, if you have any suggestions, please send them. One more thing, I wanted to say about our joint meeting with the ccNSO and GAC. Thanks to Peter for helping to set this agenda because this is something that is done in collaboration with Peter's pal from the GAC side. I hope that [inaudible] – I think he will have another term. But unfortunately, Peter leaves so be ready to fill in his shoes and those are big shoes. Anyway, please be ready for that.

Here we have another Peter. Peter [inaudible] make a presentation on DNS over HTTPS explaining what it is, what the dangers are, and this is very anticipated by the GAC.

Another thing I want to remind you and stress, we need arguments and we need to discuss the future of scheduling of our joint meetings because again, let me remind you, GAC meets with other SO/ACs today – this is Sunday – and only for us they

have this slot during our members meeting days. Of course they want to have it – we more talk about GAC Secretariat. For them it would be easier if all bilateral meetings happen on Sunday. We think that for our community, it will be better to have it during our members meeting because maybe some ccTLDs are not even here on Sunday. So for them it's an opportunity to talk to me, to their GAC representatives, and at least exchange some views. These are arguments at this moment we have. Maybe there are other arguments why it's not a problem perhaps to have a meeting on Sunday. They can join those who are not. Maybe they are not interested. This is something that if you have an opportunity maybe talk to other ccTLDs, maybe talk to your GAC representatives and try to see how they feel.

I think we should go over the message that it would be good for both GAC and ccTLDs if we meet during ccNSO members meeting days because that would give us an opportunity to meet and exchange views. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. Should we perhaps propose a compromise where we flip-flop? One meeting we do what they like to do and meet on Sunday and we arrange all our working group stuff and then the next meeting they do what we would like to do and

meet during the members day. Do you think they might be open to that?

KATRINA SATAKI: I think we first tried to convince them to keep it on Tuesdays and if it doesn't work –

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It's a fallback.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, it's like a compromise. But if we start doing that at some point, we might end up with doing it on Sundays. But again, if it works for ccTLDs maybe it's okay, but this is something that needs to be discussed.

PETER VERGOTE: If there would be massive support to bring it to Sunday, please talk to Katrina and myself so we are not caught off-guard.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, true. Thank you, Peter. That was very good. Bart and then –

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe that you ask on Tuesday morning and/or Alejandra asked you in the open sessions that this comes up. It takes five minutes. Let people show their cards what is your sense.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, okay. That's a good idea. Margarita?

MARGARITA VALDES: More or less the same idea. The problem that I felt with Sundays is that it's about the GAC and the ccTLD community or ccTLD at the organization, the participants. So if we have this kind of meeting on Sunday … the good thing is that normally in the case of Latin America, for example, the GAC representative does not know the ccTLD managers. So that's a good opportunity to meet them. And if it's Sundays probably we will not have the same participation in that meeting.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's the message that we will try to convey. If it doesn't work then we can offer some compromises. Okay, let's go back to our agenda.

We have High-Interest Topic Sessions on Monday. One is on ICANN Strategic Planning from 10:30-12:00. I hope that Giovanni

and others who are involved in SOPC will be able to join this high-interest closed community session.

Next steps in ICANN's response to GDPR – actually, yesterday I proposed that Pablo could register domain name GD under .pr and then we could make a lot of money but he said, "It cost like $10,000. Can you imagine?" How many? Only a thousand. Maybe but I thought it was a very good business plan. We can register it and then we can sell it to ICANN actually, yeah. GD.pr.

Okay, next. I hope you're still around on Thursday. There's Cross-Community Session on Universal Acceptance/IDNs. Then there is ICANN Board Session on Governance and there will be some new things presented. It might be interesting for you to hear if you're still around. Then there are questions and answers with ICANN Organization Executive Team and we submitted our question to Maria there. She will put it as number one. So we have asked our question, if you're around, please participate in this session.

Annual Work Plan, Next Steps. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Normally, you'll have an Annual Work Plan discussion say in the Council Workshop. But given say the program this morning, we didn't want to include it and bore you with the Annual Work

Plan, so it will be up for the next meeting in April for you to look at. We've done that before and it includes all the work items from now. One of them, for example, and which needs to be reflected in the Annual Work Plan is an update on the schedule of the current PDP and probably from the roadmap for the IDN ccTLDs as well, how that moves forward. So that will be reflected in the Annual Work Plan. So you will have it on your April agenda.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any questions around that? No? Currently, we have identified main items for the Council meeting. One is about elections, then adoption of CSC Effectiveness Review Report. So, it has been done and everything. It looks very great, very quick, very efficient review. Others should be just as quick and efficient and very cheap.

Discussion and next steps on the roadmap on IDN overall policy. This is one of the sessions on Tuesday.

BART BOSWINKEL: I'll be working on it this afternoon and tomorrow.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. This will be an interesting thing. Then assignment of other roles and responsibilities. I haven't checked all the volunteers. I can't see from here but it looks like very many volunteers are there.

About PDP 3 schedule, any comments on that?

BART BOSWINKEL: As I just said, and yesterday it was presented to say in my role as Issue Manager, I presented yesterday to the PDP Retirement and based on the progress they made, it looks like if all goes well, the PDP 3 will be concluded in January 2022.

KATRINA SATAKI: Are there any indications that everything will go well?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. Say the original schedule was January 2019 and probably it's very clear we've missed that one. In a way, the working group missed a lot of time during its first year. I'll present it on the Council call just for the record and I'll share with you the updated schedule. You can see where the slippage is, and the slippage is effectively in the first year of the working group retirement already.

KATRINA SATAKI: Stephen, please?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: If it's any consolation to this group, when Bart presented this revised schedule, the working group meeting yesterday they were shocked as well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But yesterday it was still March 2022 and now it's already January, so there is hope.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm cracking the web.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Speaking about – I don't know if it's relevant note or irrelevant note – bylaws change and we're going to discuss that with the board as well. Just a quick update, Chris sent a question to ICANN Legal and they're asking how should these changes in the fundamental bylaws and that's about the composition of IFRT (IANA Function Review Team), how those should be initiated, how to do that. But there's another change that we wanted to make, it's the change of the definition for ccTLDs that currently is not satisfactory.

The first one, it's the change in the fundamental bylaws. It will call for approval action and I already mentioned this to other SO/AC's decisional participants in the room that we will seek their support. For this change – basically, we have to write to the ICANN board, ICANN board sends it to ICANN org. ICANN org or Legal, they prepare this wording and then it has to go through the process – public comments period – and everything related to that. When I asked about the timeline, Sam from ICANN Legal, she [saw that] at least for a month but most probably this is going to be like our PDP. It might take six or maybe even nine months. In any case, this is something that needs to be done.

When we talked to other SO/ACs, it turned out that others also need some changes in the bylaws and the idea was to make it more efficient, to bundle those changes together and move forward more quickly let's say. But of course there's a difference if the change is in fundamental bylaws or in standard bylaws. Again, when we go to approval action, if there are several changes in fundamental bylaws then we should vote on each change separately. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Regarding your point, this is also implied in the questions to the board around the IFRT. Whether there is a need for a bylaw change right now to make it happen or is there another way.

Because currently, the IFRT cannot be convened because it doesn't meet the criteria of the bylaw.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. We hope that we can agree on the way forward but we'll see. Okay. Those are the main items. Any other item you would like to add? I think you have something there. No other ideas at the moment. Well, if something pops up during the meeting, please let us know so that we can react and discuss things during our face-to-face meeting which will take place in this room.

Any Other Business. I know that there is Any Other Business. Yes, Peter? Please.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thanks, Katrina. Peter from CENTR. Just to give the Council a quick heads up on something, I'm going to brief the ccNSO meeting on Wednesday. I would say it's a former plan or a concept that I believe still deserves some form of discussion. I think everybody knows that the GAC has decommissioned its independent Secretariat in January 1st. Lots of reasons for that, the main was an impractical one. The governments find it very hard to pay into a Swiss fund but [inaudible] proper procedure

and a call for tender and all that. But that's just FYI. That was a bit the starting point.

But that is not our issue and it's definitely not the most important one to us, but it ties in with discussions that I had with plenty of ccNSO members before, CENTR members and non-CENTR members, and that there is an increasing need for policy support. As long as it is ccNSO policy, we have obviously the ccNSO staff that does a marvelous job in preparing and helping us through these difficult PDPs and briefing us for the work at hand in the ccNSO. But we rely on volunteers to do the same thing for us when it comes to Work Track 5. I'm somewhat flattered but it's also a bit scary that for most people that I'm talking to, the CENTR guides and the sent report from ICANN meetings are their main sources of information to summarize some these complex policy debates. That [wasn't if you're right]. It's also not scalable. I'm sure that since we stopped following the GNSO Tracks, there's quite a few of the issues that might need to be at least on some of your radars that are simply not.

The volunteer fatigue has been discussed in extent over the last couple of years. It's also part of that.

The last thing was that when the GAC started the discussions with ICANN on getting support from ICANN to run the Policy Secretariat, ICANN basically signaled that due to budget

restraints they were not in a position to commit on long-term for that. So I think there's now an interim solution where for the next year – January to 31 December – there is that support.

All that is background to say why don't we look into possible solutions that are external to ICANN, so an independent Policy Secretariat? And the GAC members that contributed to that fund which is, for your information, about 250,000 Euros on a yearly basis. They would be happy to send that money somewhere else, in particular European Commission who finally after I think three or four years managed to get a process in place to transfer the money and now there is nobody to transfer the money to anymore. But there's also ccTLDs that want to contribute and I see that is part of that very complex calculation on ccTLD contributions to ICANN but that would like to contribute to that, typically in collaboration with their governments. A few ccTLDs have actually come forward and already committed to that.

So, combine existing funds from the GAC. New funds – probably ccTLD and some governments combined into a fund that could be used for an independent Secretariat. The [match] for it means that as soon as we reach about 300,000 which is not that much higher than a 250 that the GAC is already putting on the table, we would've have sufficient resources for two external resources to give us that policy support that I mentioned earlier.

The idea was a kick-starter for discussion. We had that in the CENTR community starting with the board. The board was very clear. It's a nice idea but we can only move forward if all regional organizations support that and that was not the case, so that's the end of the road for us, unfortunately I should say. But Katrina pointed out that there might be other people in the community that might be interested to pick this up to continue that. I'm happy to hand over the draft concept paper to anyone who's interested. I'm going to share that with the ccNSO but just for the sake of transparency, I want to make sure that the Council knew what this was about. Are there any questions? I see lots of question marks but I don't hear questions. That's it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. With that, our Prep Meeting is over. Please don't forget that at 5:00 we meet with ALAC. Please be there. It's the room next to this one in Topaz. Yeah, so have a nice the rest of the day. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]