
ICANN68 | Virtual Policy Forum – Joint Meeting: ccNSO & GNSO Councils
Wednesday, June 24, 2020 – 11:30 to 12:30 MYT

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you very much. So, hello everyone and welcome to the joint ccNSO GNSO Councils meeting on Wednesday, the 24th of June 2020.

My name is Joke Braeken and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments will only be read out loud if submitted within the Q & A pod. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of the session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, you will be given permission to unmute your microphone. Kindly unmute your microphone at this time to speak.

Please remember to set your chats to send to all attendees and panelists if you intend your chat to be read by all. You can do this in the dropdown menu at the bottom of the chat bot. With that, I will hand the floor over to Keith. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay, thank you very much, Joke. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is Keith Drazek, the GNSO chair, and I just wanted to welcome everybody to the joint GNSO Council and ccNSO Council session for ICANN 68. This is a session that we typically have at every ICANN meeting face to face and we've decided that we

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.

wanted to have this joint session again to make sure that we're keeping in touch and keeping in contact. But we also recognize that there may not be a tremendous number of substantive items to discuss today. So, the meeting may actually go more quickly than the full hour that's been assigned, but we do have one substantive issue that we agreed would be a worthwhile touch point. And I'll tee that up and then hand it over to Katrina.

So, essentially the one substantive item that we're going to speak to, it relates to IDNs, IDN variants, and the various policy or our respective policy efforts related to IDNs. I'll just note that, going back to the Kobe ICANN meeting, the ICANN Board passed a resolution that essentially instructed or resolved to have the GNSO and the ccNSO compare and keep in touch and understand each other's respective work tracks as it relates to the IDN issue and policymaking in our respective communities.

So, that's going to be the one topic that we want to touch on today on substance. But, generally speaking, we wanted to make sure that we had a continuing touch point and an opportunity for our respective councils and communities to engage with one another while we're in this virtual circumstance. So, with that, Katrina, I'll hand it back to you for any opening remarks and then we can get to business.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Keith. Thanks. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, probably good night to some. My name is Katrina Sasaki, I am the chair of the ccNSO Council, and yes, indeed, as Keith

just mentioned, we agreed to have this meeting to make sure that we keep the channel of communication open.

Yeah, there's one substantial issue that GNSO proposed to discuss. Yes, we're ready to move forward with our ccPDP 4 that's on the IDN ccTLD strings. We have a presentation that will explain everything where we are, where we stand, and where we are going to.

Should we start with that? Or maybe we can just really briefly go through the first two agenda items? We added them so that we can ... this is going to be really quick.

KEITH DRAZEK:

So, thank you, Katrina. Let's go through the agenda as it's on the screen, and you're right, there are a couple of additional things that we'll discuss. But I think the bulk of our substantive discussion will be on the IDN issue, and of course, as we know, the ccNSO is ahead of the GNSO in its policy work in this regard. So, we very much look forward to hearing your experiences so far. So, thank you. I'll hand it back to you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, Keith. You do so much in PDP-related work, so we can't keep up with that. We were really very conservative in terms of starting new PDPs, but that can be easily explained by the scope of our policy development work as it stands in the bylaws.

Yeah, so first—not first, first is welcome, we’re done with that. Just really briefly remind everyone about where we are with Customer Standing Committee. As you know, terms of two members and two liaisons expire on the 1st of October. So, we have to select and appoint new—not necessarily new—members to the CSC.

CcNSO has launched a call for volunteers, so we already have one candidate, the call is closed, one of our members whose term came to end, but he was eligible for reelection. So, he was not term limited. He stepped forward. So, Brett Carr is our candidate and most probably he will get approved. So, we're good.

As far as I know, Registries Stakeholder Group will select their member by mid-July, hopefully no hiccup there. What is important here, according to the process, first Registries Stakeholder Group and selection committee of the ccNSO Council, they will approve member slate, all four members, and then when we have new liaisons, new members and everything, then ccNSO Council and GNSO Council, they need to approve the full slate. So, according to our plan, we hope to do that at the ccNSO Council September meeting. I believe the same applies to GNSO Council. So we’ll just keep that in mind, so we have to be done by 1st October.

A second thing that we wanted to do, just a heads up on, it's regarding the recent adoption of Financial Year 21 Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan. Although we fully recognize and we agree that those changes had to be done, the budget had to be adjusted, so no problems with that. However, we were not happy with the process. We

believe that, as it's explained in the Board's rationale, the fact that there were two webinars to discuss it and there are no comments received during those two webinars is hardly the right process to move forward. So, we're going to flag that in our letter. The letter is almost ready. It will be discussed later today during the ccNSO Council meeting. So yeah, this is something that we just want to flag.

I think that probably maybe we need some expedited procedure for cases like that and we need to make really quick changes and adjust the budget following the situation. So, that's just a heads up.

Talking about ccPDP 4 IDN ccTLD strings. As I mentioned, we have a presentation on that. So, may I give the floor to Bart, he's our issue manager, they [already] have an issue report. He will walk you through the process and where we are and what we're going to do. So, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thanks, Katrina. I you can hear me well, so I'll go through it very quickly. So, IDN variance is part of a ccPDP 4. Next slide, please.

So, I'll just go a little bit into the background of this ccPDP 4, why it was launched. And to understand this, I want to allude to the current state of play. Next slide, please.

As you will probably all know, there is something called the IDN Fast Track process. Currently there are 62 IDN ccTLDs from 43 countries that successfully have been evaluated according to the criteria. And, yeah, unfortunately for them, they can't become member of the ccNSO. This was envisioned in the second policy development

process. However, that process never came to fruition in the sense of the final report was submitted in 2013. But, by mutual agreement between the Board and the ccNSO, it was never adopted or discussed at the time. Next slide, please.

One of the reasons for not adopting it was effectively the evolution of the fast track process was not complete. As you recall from the Kobe meeting, I think that's when we discussed it, the confusing similarity evaluation was still evolving, and has just been recently completed with the addition of a risk mitigation panel. So, it's quite extensive and it deviates from the original and what was developed under the ccPDP 2.

Another open issue that the ccNSO was very aware of was, as you alluded to, Keith, the variant management. In the PDP 2, there was a placeholder and, yeah, given the request from the Board and the letter from the Board, yeah, this was the opportunity to address it as well. So, these two reasons were start of the discussion in the ccNSO. Next slide, please.

And then a third one that is part of ccPDP 3 is the retirement of IDN ccTLDs. The third ccNSO Policy Development Process focuses on the retirement of ccTLDs. However, that working group came to the conclusion that they were not in a position to define what is called the trigger event for retirement given the special requirements. So, I'll not go into details, that's for later concern. So, next slide please.

So, in order to address these major issues, and also allow the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO, the ccNSO discussed a roadmap. Next slide, please.

And the roadmap is getting from the fast track process and the overall IDN ccTLD proposals, so that's on the string selection that would replace the fast track and the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs into the ccNSO to a policy for the selection of IDN ccTLDs. So, that would replace the fast track, and an amended article 10 of the ICANN bylaws. So, next slide, please.

So, starting in Kobe, there have been exchanges with the ICANN Board and consultation with the broader community. So, ccPDP 2, the one originally submitted in 2013, is now closed, and the evolution of the fast track process has stopped. The ccNSO conducted a gap analysis of the overall IDN policy process, so ccPDP 2, which was completed in June 2019. And based on that gap analysis, there were some recommendations.

First of all, to replace [inaudible] ccPDP with a bylaw change, and secondly to launch a new policy development building on the original policy development process to replace the fast track process in time.

Regarding this fourth policy development process, as Katrina already said, the issue report was adopted in May 20. So, very recently, and—next slide, please—that includes the topic of IDN variant management and to develop policy recommendations around it. Next slide, please.

The way it is envisioned, say ccPDP 4, is to have one working group. The call for volunteers will go out somewhere in July, but before that, there will be a webinar explaining in more detail the scope and working methods.

And going back to the potential of coordination between the GNSO and the ccNSO and other groups, there will be at least two subgroups created under this working group. One focusing on confusing similarity and the review of the process, and the second one is, you can guess it, on variant management of IDN ccTLDs. These subgroups will, from a ccNSO perspective, submit their recommendations to the working group, who will then continue their work. Next slide, please.

But the envisioned coordination will be through the subgroups. So, why create the subgroups and why invite members from the GNSO to these subgroups? First of all, as requested, coordinate the policy efforts undertaken by both ccNSO and GNSO in these two areas and it's probably the easiest and lightest way of coordinating in the sense that the outcome of what is happening in the subgroups can be used both in the ccNSO processes and also in the GNSO processes.

For your information, one of the discussion points by the review group was whether or not to create a cross community working group. But, as you will probably all recall, the cross community working groups, first of all, are not supposed to develop policy. And secondly, that's what we learned with the cross community working group on the use of country and territory names. They're not very successful. They're

probably too heavy handed to come up with a unified approach and to be used in policy development processes. Next slide, please.

So, reference material that is included in the issue report, and which the subgroups are referred to, is the Board resolution, of course, and then, following this, the variant management and relevant material and other material that the working group and the sub working group deems relevant. Next slide, I think that was the final one. Back to you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Bart. Thank you. Keith, I don't know if that's what you wanted to hear from us?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Katrina. And hi again, everybody. So, thank you, Bart, very much for the presentation and the overview. I think that's extremely helpful to us on the GNSO side and the GNSO Council because we are currently and in process of considering our next steps in terms of the initiation of GNSO PDP to look at some of the corresponding issues.

Following our acknowledgement last year that there was a concern here about potential guidelines being developed and being incorporated in contracts and potential overlap with some of the string similarity issues and other work going on in other GNSO PDPs, including the subsequent procedures PDP, that we needed to sort of take a quick pause and look at how we handle this and tackle this very complex issue in an appropriate way.

So, we as the GNSO Council, we had actually initiated a scoping team of experts, people that have the requisite knowledge and expertise to be able to advise the GNSO Council on possible next steps. That group concluded its work earlier this year in February, if I recall correctly, and it is one of the things that the GNSO Council is looking at now, those recommendations, in terms of how we prioritize that with all of the other work that we have on our plate.

And so, in a moment, I'll hand it over to Steve Chan from GNSO policy staff to give us a little bit more context in terms of process and where things are right now. But I did just want to thank you very much for the presentation, and particularly that slide where it indicated that there's an opportunity for us to coordinate and collaborate between the GNSO and ccNSO communities on this very important topic that impacts both of us.

So, with that, Steve, if I could help hand it over to you for just a brief update or summary or overview on where things are going.

STEVE CHAN:

Sure, thanks, Keith. And indeed, so Keith covered some of what I probably would have mentioned is that there was a scoping team established and they delivered their final report. And thanks, Ariel, for putting that into the chat.

And so, part of their findings were to basically create two tracks. One was related to operational issues and consistency between contracts and things like that and the IDN variant tables. The other part is about

substantive policy development as it relates to IDN variance primarily. And so, that would be the work track two.

So, as Keith mentioned, that part is still in the queue for the Council to determine when it wants to initiate that work, but I guess what I would also add to that, as the council considers when it wants to initiate that work, is that the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP has also looked at IDN variants to some degree.

And so, so what they have done is looked at the IDN variant implementation framework, or management framework, I can't remember the exact name. What they've done is essentially—well, I guess they haven't decided quite yet—but where they have settled on draft final recommendations is in-line primarily with those findings.

So, where that primarily lines up is around the reliance on the root zone label generation rules to establish IDN variants, and then also basically settling on the same entity requirements for both the operator of the IDN variants as well as the second level registrants for IDN variants.

So, the expectation is that the subsequent effort by the Council, if and whenever it is initiated, would complement more than likely the recommendations coming out of the Sub Pro PDP. Or if there's a need to replace them, then they would replace them, too. But, these recommendations from Sub Pro are expected to stand on their own and then, as I was mentioning, just be supplemented by the future effort initiated by the Council.

So, hopefully that helps. And Keith, I'm not sure if you wanted to hear anything else, but happy to chime in [a little], thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Steve. No, that's really helpful, I appreciate that. And I do see that there's a question in the Q & A pod from Edmon Chung, who is the chair of our scoping team on the GNSO side. And, Edmon, I'll read this out and then we can have a little discussion here.

So, the question from Edmon, it says, "Question to ccNSO first and then GNSO. On the invitation for GNSO to participate, should GNSO look to appoint liaisons or participants to the ccNSO PDP before the GNSO's PDP is actually initiated?"

And that's a really good question. I think the question was first directed to ccNSO colleagues, and then I'm happy to chime in as well. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. I see Max already took it as the one he's going to answer live. So, Maxim, if you volunteered, maybe you'd like to take the first stab at it? Okay, he believes that some [think] might be needed.

Yeah, well, I don't know how to respond here because I don't think it's up to the ccNSO to decide whether you want to appoint liaisons before you start your PDP. For us, it wouldn't matter much so you can

appoint liaisons either before or after you start your PDP. Of course, I think from a practical perspective, perhaps it's better to have a GNSO PDP created first so we can ... But at the same time, as Bart already mentioned, we start looking at populating this working group that is going to work on this ccPDP 4 in July.

So, again, it depends on timing. How long would it take for the GNSO to start their effort? So, probably I missed that in Steve's explanation of the process. Did you did you have any specific dates?

KEITH DRAZEK: So, is that a question back to me, Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes, thank you, okay. So, we do not currently have a target date. That is something that the GNSO Council is considering, as I noted in the context of all of the other work that we have going on and the other existing PDPs that are in play.

But, perhaps the next step might be to, rather than appointing a formal liaison between our respective PDPs, that we perhaps identify, informally, somebody who might participate or at least attend or listen to the discussions. So, there's an establishment of lines of communication that are open. And then once we do finally, initiate

our PDP, that we could formalize that relationship as it relates to a liaison or whatever term we're going to use.

And so, I know that we at the council, in the GNSO, have had conversations about the terminology and the meaning of the word liaison. Historically that typically would be a liaison from the GNSO Council, and we might need to come up with another term, but I think the idea is that in order for us to collaborate and to coordinate our respective efforts, I think we do need to make sure that there's regular lines of communication and an interaction from both groups.

So, we'll take that on and come back to you with maybe a more concrete recommendation of how we can move that forward.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Absolutely. Thank you, Keith. We can start the work in these subgroups later. It's not necessarily not an issue. [Clearly] can coordinate on that. Maybe I'll ask Bart to comment more on the process.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes, thanks, Katrina. So, as you could have seen from the slides, there will be two subgroups, and for each of these subgroups the GNSO will be asked to participate. And we've had the discussion, I believe it was in Montreal, I know, say for example, that SSAC is also very interested, at least in the bit about the confusing similarity.

So, others will be invited as well. And I think, and this is more the practicality of things, is that the people with enough knowledge and interest in IDN variants are very limited on both sides.

So, that small group, because I assume it will be a small group, if they meet and talk, they will learn from each other and they know what is happening. And just by creating this group and participating, either in both or just in one, they will be informed and coordinate whatever outcome they need in both PDPs. Because that's, that's the advantage of having a subgroup, it goes back into the working group, and then it goes back into the whole decision making process around the results of a PDP.

That's a way to ensure that both the GNSO and ccNSO are taking into account what others are doing, what the other group is doing, but also develop the policy according to their own rules and procedures. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, thank you very much, Bart. Are there any other comments regarding the process or coordination? So, last one was Keith's suggestion, how to move forward? So, it seems very rational and I think we can take it on board, then just continue working on it.

KEITH DRAZEK:

So, thank you, Katrina, and thank you, Bart. I think that makes sense. I guess we could pause and see if there are any other comments or questions on the topic of the respective IDN policy work going on. But I

think the key point here for everybody's takeaway is that, as we noted at the outset of the call, the ICANN Board back in Kobe passed a resolution that called on these two groups, the GNSO and the ccNSO to coordinate our work, to make sure that we're informed of each other's work in our respective policy tracks, to try to ensure as much consistency as possible, and that's essentially what we're talking about today and what we fully intend to do.

So, any questions or comments? And I don't see any. So, Katrina, maybe back to you if there's anything else that that you'd like to raise?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, no, we've seamlessly moved to AOB. Is there any other business from anyone? Because I have one question I really wanted to ask.

Because earlier today, we already mentioned how much we miss this face to face interactions and the face to face meetings that have completely different dynamics. In our community, we are in a very early state of discussing that draft paper on return to face to face meetings. So, I'm still not in a position to share any feedback from us. So far, what I've heard was, yeah, it looks like a sound plan. Is there any feedback from your communities or what do you think? What's your take on that?

KEITH DRAZEK:

So, thank you, Katrina. So, we have not had any discussion of ICANN's paper on the four phased approach related to the current situation and engagement and the possible and eventual return to face to face

meetings at the GNSO council level. So, I would probably defer any assessment on that. I know that it's being discussed at our stakeholder group and constituency level. I know that the registry stakeholder group and the contracted parties have started discussions on it. But it's probably a bit premature to indicate sort of like how people are feeling about it.

I think the one thing, speaking personally, that I would note is that the phased approach seems to be logical. The question is I think also about timing and urgency, and I don't think that the paper lays out specific timeframes, as I recall, but it's more sort of the framework that we would consider moving back to face to face engagement.

So, I guess there's some question about urgency and is it a push to achieve this? Or is it simply a framework that ICANN Org will be considering and utilizing as events permit? So, I think we probably need to defer any further sort of like sense of the room because we simply have not had that conversation at the GNSO Council yet. I see Michele has his hand up. So, Michele, over to you.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Keith. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, whatever. Now just on this entire thing around the phased approach, I think, as Keith said, at the GNSO Council level, we haven't had any opportunity to discuss this at all. Yes. I'm not sure whether we are going to be able to do that during the brief time that we have together as a group this week.

Further down within the stack of groups that make up the ICANN circus, I know that within the Registrar Stakeholder Group, we haven't had any opportunity to discuss the ICANN paper, but there definitely has been conversations between many of us around dealing with what we're currently dealing with and the potential return to some vague semblance of normality. And I think there's definitely, just speaking from my own experience of what I've seen as somebody who used to spend about half the year in an airport, I am now spending a ridiculous amount of time at home and I'm now noticing things like my front porch needs to be sanded and painted.

I don't see a full return to what we were dealing with previously between now and early next year for one very simple and practical reason, which is at the moment the number of travel restrictions imposed on us all is such that it's an absolute patchwork mess and the goalposts keep moving and I don't think any of us know whether we'll be able to book a flight, never mind actually attend a meeting in person, in two or three weeks' time, never mind in six months' time.

So, I think the idea of having the conversation and exploring it and everything else has merit, but I don't think it's practical or realistic for anybody to believe that they can make firm plans at this juncture because we do not know. In fact, speaking in here in Ireland, our government published plans, and then revised them and then revised them again. And that's all in the space of 48 hours.

And I suspect that in other countries we're seeing similar types of activities. So, I think at this juncture, it's really, really hard to have that conversation. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Michele. And I'll note that Mary Wong has put into the chat a couple of points that I'll just summarize. That this is a topic that it will be available for discussion during the third plenary session tomorrow, and also that ICANN Org is looking for feedback from the community on the proposed phases. But understand obviously, that much of the feedback will need to come after ICANN 68. So, just to note that this is out there for comment and for consideration and feedback. So, we should all obviously take the opportunity to do that.

Yeah, and Michele, to your point, I think this is obviously a moving target and we're going to have to be flexible. I think the framework, the document that was put out with the four phases I think is, as I said, a framework but it's not a plan that we execute against specific dates or specific targets, right? I think it's really more a, "Hey, is this a smart way to look at this and consider this as we move forward?" And that's where I think we ought to be providing that feedback.

So, I hope that was somewhat helpful. Katrina, I'll hand it back to you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, thank you very much. Thanks, that was very helpful indeed because, as I said, we're going to discuss it later today. Again, really, very initial discussions, very general ones just to have some initial

feedback from our community. So, thanks for that. It'll be very interesting to know how people feel. We'll miss each other but still are quite reluctant to hug them in person, which is a fair approach. Okay. Any other business? Any other questions? Yes, Michele, hugging.

KEITH DRAZEK: I don't see any other questions or comments. So, perhaps this is point we can wrap up maybe a bit early, give folks a few minutes back of their day.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you very much. I have never counted the number of people in the room when we have face to face meeting, but here we have 120. I think it's a very good number. Next time we meet in person, I'll have to do the counting.

Okay, thank you very much. Thanks a lot for keeping this line of communication open. We can exchange information any time. Hopefully see you virtually during ICANN 69.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Katrina, and thanks to everybody for joining and we'll talk again soon.

KATRINA SATAKI: Bye. Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]