**Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
Joint Meeting: ccNSO & GNSO Councils
Monday, 12 March 2018 at 12:15 AST**
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much. So this is the joint ccNSO GNSO Council lunch meeting. Councilors, it looks like most councilors have been to the lunch tables here on the side. Please feel free to help yourselves. And once councilors have all had something to eat everyone in the room is welcome to do so.

On behalf of the GNSO Council and Council leadership team welcome from me. And I suppose really only one opening remark and it's one of an extraordinarily difficult and unfortunate one, which is to say that, you know, this is the right forum to express some tremendous sadness around the loss of Ben Fuller, who was a member of the ccNSO of course and a member of the GNSO Council as ccNSO liaison. We were extraordinarily disappointed to receive that news. And I understand – I thank you, Nigel, for being a point of contact and do you have the book with you, Nigel? Yes.

Nigel Roberts: Thank you. I was very sorry to learn about passing of Ben just after it happened on Friday. We have a, as you said, a book of condolences which is

here for Ben's family. And I'd very much appreciate it if councilors and community members who knew Ben would leave a message of sympathy for Ben's family. And if you don't get a chance to do it here or you want to do it in a little bit more quiet of an area come and find me anytime.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much for these kind words. Ben was really very – one of those quiet contributors who maybe didn't speak much but he did a lot. And actually, yes, he sent his latest report about what's going on on the GNSO Council on Friday and later that day we learned that unfortunately he had passed away. Yes so it will be difficult to replace him.

Okay so thank you very much. It's always a pleasure to be here with you over a nice lunch (unintelligible). So and with that let's move forward with our agenda. It's a pretty packed. And the first topic that we have is about us being decisional participants about EC procedures and processes. So far, yes, we have worked on our internal guidelines. We have prepared and discussed within the community approval action guideline, rejection action guideline and tried to define who can submit guideline, what are criteria and how we're – how to squeeze our own processes into the tight timelines defined in the Bylaws.

I will ask my colleague, Stephen, who is our representative on the EC administration, to tell you probably more about our – how we address rejection actions. Stephen.

Stephen Deerhake: Hi there. Stephen Deerhake for the record. We have drafted, and it's pretty near completion, a 20-some page guideline that describes in great detail the procedures that the ccNSO would follow if we are confronted with the submission of a rejection action petition by a member of our community, which can be a ccTLD whether or not they're a ccNSO member, and also one of our regional organizations could also submit for Council's consideration.

As you well know, there's some very tight timeframes in Annex D, Section 2, which describes the rejection procedures. And at any point along the way if the community stumbles it's game over and ICANN prevails. And we have a rather rigid decision making process in the ccNSO which has caused us to put aside our traditional decision making procedures for basically all the intermediate steps. And I don't know what your decision making procedures are but you may come down that path yourself as you progress in this.

One of the things that we also put in this guideline was the notion of a rejection action manager, in other words, a single point of contact whose responsibility is to interface between the ECA and interface with the Council and make sure because of all these tight deadlines that the paperwork gets thrown back and forth as it's supposed to be to make sure that any inter-SO/AC communication is forwarded to the corporate secretary as mandated in the Bylaws, etcetera, etcetera.

We also put together – came up with this notion of a very small review committee that would pass judgment on any petition received from the community to ensure that it complies with the requirements that are set forth in Section 2 of Annex D, that it's, for example, tied to a public comment that was submitted during the previous – the prior public comment period, in other words, to not engage the Council on any proposed rejection action until it looks like it's going to pass muster with the ECA and with ICANN Legal.

And to combine any too similar-looking rejection action petitions that cover essentially the same subject and so on and so forth. And I'd be happy to help you guys on whatever areas you want help on as you – I'm not sure where you guys are in development of your stuff but that's where we are. We are close to getting this approved by Council, are we not? Yes. Happy to take questions.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much, Stephen. If there are any questions, yes, we'll be happy to answer them. If no, really love to hear what you are doing and how you are addressing all those tight timelines and all those issues.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. And thank you very much to Stephen. I think we've – we have been I suppose a bit behind your work effort, and very much benefitting from the effort that's been happening in the ccNSO. What we have done most recently, I'll come around to rejection notices in a moment but we've done most recently a comprehensive review of the Bylaws and Operating Procedures in terms of actualizing our responsibilities as members of the empowered community. And we're able to do that in the course of our three-day strategic planning session which took place at the end of January.

And the logic behind pulling that out and into a sort of dedicated environment for us to discuss is really multifold. We have a number of new councilors who've just joined the GNSO Council as of the AGM and wanted to take that opportunity to be much more robust in our understanding of the Bylaws and what was expected of us.

We have members of the Council who have joined and indeed members of the GNSO community who have joined essentially as a result of the IANA transition process and so are not necessarily as fully aware of the GNSO specific aspects of the Bylaws. So we sat down for a full day and went over Article 11 and the various, if you like, constituent parts of Article 11 that come out of the GNSO Operating Procedures.

One very tangible aspect of development is that we had a – we formed a working group within the GNSO Council right about this time last year that went through the Bylaws, went through the Operating Procedures in order to identify areas that needed immediate change, areas in which we had direct conflict with our own Operating Procedures and the ability to carry out our responsibilities.

One area of tangible change is now before the ICANN Board because it is a change to the GNSO – or excuse me, to the ICANN Bylaws, to Article 11, is the requirement for all decisions from the Council to be made in relation to EC responsibilities not by the normal voting standard of simple majority but by a higher voting threshold. That is something that was passed by the GNSO Council in its meeting in January which took place as a part of the strategic planning session and is sitting before the ICANN Board.

What I will say as a more general matter is another decision that was taken at that time was that the Council – the GNSO Council is the rightful body to be, if you like, carrying out these responsibilities. That may seem like a very basic thing in essence but it does underlie a certain degree of understanding of the GNSO as very much made up of a number of constituent parts, different stakeholder groups and constituencies. And there has long been the discussion within that working group and then within the broader Council as to whether it truly was Council that was the best body to do this, so whether this ought to come down through the SGs and Cs.

And various views expressed on that, ultimately Council did vote that it should be Council that take that on. So in terms of rejection notices and specifics around that, what I can say is it's Council's responsibility to manage that process. That again, seems a fairly basic decision but for us it took quite some time to come to an agreement. And we, I think again will benefit in a very significant way from your fine precision on actual processes of actualizing that. We're not there yet but that's a work in progress. Thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Okay thank you very much. Are there any questions? So how do you feel about rejection actions? Any upcoming rejection action? Anything you anticipate? No? Okay. Yes, Stephen, please.

Stephen Deerhake: As you know the FY'19 budget public comment period came to conclusion late last week. There are 41 comments submitted, if I recall correctly. They center mostly on the de-funding of ICANN wiki and the

slashing by 50% of the next gen budget in terms of airfare and hotels and number of participants. It's entirely possible that we might well see from part of this community a rejection action petition filed. And I did the math on this and based on the Board probable dates of the Board's adoption of the budget which will either occur around the middle of May o depending on who you ask in staff at the end of May, this would initiate a rejection action petition period.

And the timing is such if the Board votes any time after about the 10th of May, we would not be far enough along in the process to actually hold a public forum in Panama, which is unfortunate.

So I've actually initiated a discussion with ICANN suggesting that they possibly try to move the Board vote earlier into May so that if we do have something that does get filed in response to the Board action with regards to adoption of the budget and it does get support of a supporting decisional participant, that we could go into the Panama meeting and hold a public forum on that action should one be submitted at that meeting, and I think that would be much, much better for the community than having to hold such a public forum via teleconference sometime after the Panama meeting, so that's the prospective scheduling I'm seeing.

It's pure speculation on my part; I don't know if anybody is going to file anything or not, but based on the timing of the Board vote the math suggests that if they vote much past the 10th we will not be able to hold a public forum which, I think would be really detrimental to the organization if we have that big of an issue so.

Katrina Sataki: Okay thank you very much. Anything else, any other questions? Yes?

Heather Forrest: Can I respond to that? Heather Forrest. Stephen, thank you. That's not – so we have had our ear to the ground to think about this and have thought about rejection actions only in a sort of speculative sense; hadn't really heard

anything tangible and so this is very much news to me. I suspect it is for colleagues but I'm not sure.

It concerns me that we might be putting in a rejection action on – or not we but someone might file a rejection action on the basis of something like travel support or some of these programs. I mean, I essentially would say 41 comments on the budget and they all center around one thing and I can say we formed a standing committee on the budget very much, you know, taking guidance from the way the ccNSO has done things. And that group of course, you know, very robust discussions over quit a tight timeframe on putting together a comment.

The comment that came from the GNSO Council really it was intended to sit alongside and not supersede in any way the comments that were submitted individually by stakeholder groups and constituencies. The Council saw fit to focus its energies on things that directly related to Council's remit, which is the policy development process. So while we did make some comments about other things, aspects that you've raised here that could be the basis of a rejection action, I can certainly say that wasn't – while they were noted in the comment, they weren't noted in that spirit, let's say.

So this gives us something now and Ayden is nodding his head. Ayden, as chair of our SCBO, I wonder – forgive me for putting you on the spot but I'm a little bit stunned here. Any thoughts on what Stephen has said and how we might take that forward within the GNSO?

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks for that, Heather. Hi, everyone. Ayden Férdeline for the record. We've certainly had no conversations like that amongst the GNSO Council standing committee but I can take that feedback back. I think broadly the idea of being cognizant of that date and the opportunity to have a public forum, I imagine there could be support for that.

But the conversations that we've had internally we've not even discussed ICANN wiki. And in terms of reduced travel support, that hasn't been the substantial basis of our comments. I would say that a majority of our comments are focused on whether the resources allocated for policy development were adequate of what we can foresee happening and also we did make a general comment about the overall size of the organization and the percentage of spend on personnel and professional services. Thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you. Stephen, is it still about the – yes, please.

Stephen Deerhake: Quick clarification, this – I wasn't trying to imply that I know that there's something coming along. I do not know. But putting my ECA hat on I thought well, if something does come along what would the timing look like? And that's kind of where I was going with all that is like – and I just thought in the interest of the community we really should try to get – if something comes from somewhere and gets support from a supporting decisional participant what the timing of all this would look like, and I thought I just put it out there on the record basically.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much. And we've already heard some substance of your comments on the budget and now we're swiftly moving to the next agenda item which is proposed FY'19 budget. And so we could change our views. We have this, SOPC, Strategic and Operations Planning Committee Group. And they have been reviewing all those budget and strategic planning documents for years now, always providing substantial comments to the document, all the documents.

And well, the chair of the SOP is not here but I will ask other members of our group to provide some short comments, short overview of the substance of the document that we have submitted. Oh, Debbie, or Stephen? They're pointing at each other.

Debbie Monahan: Thank you. Debbie Monahan, dotNZ. Thanks, Giovanni, for not being here. Not quite sure what focus the Italian would want put on everything, but I think for those who've read our comments, the SOP now committee, in Giovanni's words, we've grown up and been led to (unintelligible) so no longer a working group but a committee. Operated per usual in that we go out to groups and we actually review the entire budget and document and so our comments are quite ranging – broad-ranging.

But I think a common theme is the, if you like, the level of staffing and the cost of salaries and other such things going up and the continual how do you relate the resources going into staff with the projects and what's actually being done and how they're prioritized and how do you put measures and metrics on them? And so we raised those general concerns and when we met, was it yesterday, Sunday, yesterday we were joined by ICANN staff and we acknowledged that Xavier and his team do a fantastic job.

And they were very open and honest with us and committed that every single comment will get reviewed and there'll be comments on our comments in the standard way when they summarize them back. They walked us through some of if you like the staff matters and have some of the staffing numbers they've actually calculated and in some situations we (unintelligible) increase, there's actually been a decrease in other such things and so some of it comes down to presentation of the data and the information.

One comment which got referred to in the opening ceremony today but we were also briefed on it yesterday was the move towards the strategic plan having financials linked to it. And what they linked to strategic objectives will be costed and so there will be a lot more – it'll be much easier for the community to actually be able to, if you like, evaluate what those objectives are and the cost of each of those and be able to say well is the cost of that, you know, of true benefit to the community.

And I think one of those things is – a point was raised that the communities are rather broad and the multistakeholder approach means a number of different constituencies and what might be a priority for one constituency is not on the list at all for other and other such things. And there's going to be something that we as a community need to work through.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much, Debbie. I think Michele had a question.

Michele Neylon: It's Michele – and no, it wasn't a question, it was more of a comment. Just because I think one of the – I think there's a lot of alignment with the comments that ccNSO put in the GNSO as Council put in but also what most of our stakeholder groups would have put in independently of that. I note from going through, I mean, there's – the comments seem to be in three broad groups. There's – it's kind of save ICANN wiki, then there's save the fellows, save the planet, kind of to terribly paraphrase that, I mean, do you remember that TV show? It was awful. But yes, anyway.

And then there's comments from groups and people that are taking a much more holistic approach and looking at the entire budget and how that aligns with ICANN's mission. Now as GNSO Council as our glorious leader pointed out, we as Council are only going to submit comments on things that fall within our quite narrow remit. Our respective stakeholder groups and constituencies however will go much further in.

So we definitely have kind of overarching things like ICANN being fiscally prudent, in other words, don't spend money you don't have, within this constituency the Registrars and the Registries have pointed out major shortcomings with ICANN's predictions around future revenue. We feel that their predictions are diplomatically I would say optimistic; less diplomatically I would say completely out of whack with reality.

Other areas as well, I mean, there's a lot of projects and things that they'll be spending money on and we are at a loss to understand how they are linked to

what we're meant to be doing. And the concerns we've tried to raise in the GNSO Council submission in particular is making sure that there is funding there and resources there for the policy work which is what we're meant to be doing.

Just one thing as well is that we did discuss in our strategy meeting back in January in Los Angeles was we did have some discussion with ICANN staff, ourselves and others around trying to get a little bit more transparency on the cost to run PDPs because at the moment we have no visibility; we don't know how much it's costing them in terms of man hours, resources, I mean, you know, providing a phone line or a conference call, how much does that cost an hour?

If you need to transcribe the – that meeting, there's a cost. If Marika has to sign onto the call and Nathalie and a few other people, you know, they don't work for free and I wouldn't expect them to. So there's, you know, this has to be kind of built in there and looking at some of the stuff maybe on a more kind of professional basis as kind of projects that have costs, have budgets, etcetera, etcetera. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Katrina. Donna Austin. I just want to pick up on something that Debbie said, and it was something that was discussed with a meeting of Göran and Cherine and some of the SO/AC leaders earlier this week, and that is that we all look at the budget from our respective groups but in considering the budget as a whole how are we going to do that as a community because there – whether it's horse trading that needs to be done, I'm not really sure, but I think we need to find a mechanism for the community to have that discussion about, you know, what's important in terms of ICANN's mission and what it does? Does it have the budget allocation to support that?

And then how do we work down to understand you know, what else is, I mean, in my mind it's identify what is mission critical and how do you make sure that budget is allocated for that and then how do we fit in the rest of the activities and programs that have come up over the last few years?

So I think it's a discussion we probably need to have is how do we as a community have that conversation because I don't think it's something that should fall back to the SO/AC chairs. I'm very cognizant that the ccNSO has been looking at the budget in a very methodical way for a long period of time so you probably have a better understanding of the budget than most of us. We've only just recently set up a committee within the Council.

I'm not sure how the other ACs – SO/ACs work or the SG Cs but I think really that's an important conversation that we have to have. How as a community are we going to do that whether we can – ccNSO and GNSO work together to try to lead that, to try to find a mechanism to do that, maybe there's an opportunity to do that. But I think it is something that we need to probably need to get started on sooner rather than later. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much. Any immediate comments from our SOP working group members? SOPC, it's not working group, sorry. SOP Committee members? They have grown up. No. Okay, thank you. But, yes, I think I already mentioned during our last meeting in wherever it was, oh, Abu Dhabi, yes, if there's anything we can help with our experience, I think our SOPC will be happy to share. And yes, I agree, working together would be a really good thing and could add to the process so that we could do it better. Okay and help ICANN to do it better, which is probably even more important. Thank you.

Can we move forward then to Customer Standing Committee and the topics related to that? First is a charter review, another review that we have to do. Yes, maybe let's talk about the work of the CSC as such and the chair of the CSC is here. Byron.

Byron Holland: Thanks, Katrina. Do we want to start with the review process or just an update on CSC overall?

Katrina Sataki: I think let's start with short update and then we move to the process.

Byron Holland: Okay. So the CSC met over the weekend and we're focused on a couple of things, one in particular is remedial action procedures and developing those. So that's where there is a systemic issue that has been identified and at a certain point in time has not been corrected. And what we have worked on is the procedure to escalate that systemic issue towards resolution. And that's been a body of that work that the CSC has been engaged on separate and distinct from our regular monthly reporting.

We are at the final stage in terms of having developed the proposed procedure. We had hoped that the PTI Board would have been able to review it prior to this meeting, however they're unable to get to it prior to the meeting and will be reviewing it on Tuesday or tomorrow. It's certainly our expectation given that we've worked with that that we don't see any speed bumps to coming to resolution and that will be one of the final sort of major pieces of work that the CSC has to put in place. So expect to see that completed by the time we get together again in Panama.

The other thing that we've been looking at is around service level expectations and ways to modify those. As we have put this whole thing into production over the past year and a half, it's certainly come to our attention that there are some minor what we would consider minor tweaks and changes that could be made that are not substantive and certainly don't warrant a full review process, so how do we do that in an effective and efficient way without triggering a material review? And I think we're coming to the short strokes on that as well so I would hope that those will be fully in place for the next meeting.

The other final thing to note is that there was an election for chair, which I was the successful, and I'll say, the only candidate so I won, yes. Beat out all the competition of, well, one. Anyway I will be the chair again. The chair is a one-year position and comes up for election every year. As is noted on the agenda on the screen, both the ccNSO and the GNSO in the coming months will be responsible for putting forward new candidates or renewing their existing candidates from membership of the CSC, so stay tuned, that's coming to each of our communities shortly.

And then of course the final thing we've been paying close attention to is the charter review team and thinking about the couple of other reviews that will be headed our way in the coming year. But maybe with that, unless there are any questions, I'll hand it over to Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Byron. I am a member of the Customer Standing Committee Review Team, Abdalla and Martin Boyle from the ccNSO are also members and Keith Drazek is – joins me from the Registry side so the CSC Review Team is two members from the Registry Stakeholder Group, two members from the ccNSO and the CSC appointed a liaison so Elaine Pruis is the liaison to that group.

So we've been doing some work probably over the last 12 months just reviewing the charter, that was required in the charter itself and it was developed as part of the IANA transition, and it was ratified in the ICANN Bylaws so it was something that we had to kick off 12 months after the CSC had had its first meeting.

We're a fair way into the process and we hope to have a report posted maybe within two weeks of going home from the meeting. We're pretty – there won't be any substantive changes to the charter or we're not recommending any substantive changes to the charter. It seems that, you know, what was drafted as part of the IANA transition has worked pretty well.

A couple of things picking up on what Byron mentioned within the charter itself are currently references the remedial action procedures and there was a draft version of those provided in the existing charter for illustrative purposes, so it's our hope now that those will be signed off and we can just provide reference to those now rather than just using the ones that are there as illustrative.

We will, I think, be making a recommendation to pick up on that SLE change within the charter that gives the CSC some flexibility to deal with the smaller changes to recommendations to SLEs. And my understanding of that is that in the work that's been done over the past 12 months there are some SLEs that were close to target but if we – if you move the timing a little bit then that means that IANA is in compliance. So it's just a tweak here and there; it's nothing substantive.

For the – so once we go through the public comment period there will be a requirement for the ccNSO and GNSO Councils to sign off on the amended chatter. There is no role for the Board in this so we – our respective Councils have the final say on this one. Picking up on the other reviews that are coming up so the CSC – part of the charter there is an effectiveness – CSC effectiveness review that is supposed to kick off two years after they started their work so that would be October. And there's not a process for that yet, I think that has to be developed. But the IANA function review kicks off around the same time and there is the possibility of significant overlap with that.

So one of the – while it's out of scope for the work that we're doing we will actually be recommending that there be some – that somebody, I'm not sure who that – who is responsible for that but they have a look at that overlap and try to, you know, take away the duplication or deal with it in a kind of efficient manner rather than having the CSC – too big a burden on the CSC. So that's where we are on that. So hopefully in the next couple weeks we'll have that posted for public comment.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. Heather Forrest. May I ask a question, and in essence we have this perhaps broader underlying question of reviews. And although you say there's nothing major and substantive that comes out of the review, there are a number of things to make the CSC more effective, let's say. In your view, was the timing right on this 12 months after or was it too soon? Is there nothing, let's say, major substantive coming out because of the timing or…?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. So just to be clear, this review is of the charter only; it's not about – the CSC effectiveness is one to come later. But I think the timing was good. And I was part of the drafting team that developed the charter through the IANA process. And I think we always recognized that, you know, you can develop something in theory but you're never really sure how it's going to work in practice. So we thought 12 months was good timing. I think it has – it's proved to be the case that 12 months was good.

And Byron, you can comment on this, but I think the charter has served you well initially. There's probably the one major addition we will have is that we've recognized through this process that if a representative of the CSC changes its affiliation so you had Jay Daly had a change in job, so did Elaine Pruis that was appointed by the Registry Stakeholder Group, there's no process in the charter at the moment for that situation. So we've developed a process that will be included in the charter moving forward.

So I think the timing has been good. And Abdalla can speak to this or Martin, if he's in the room or Keith, but it seems that the charter as it is has served the team pretty well.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. Apologies, Heather Forrest, a quick follow up question. Is there a provision – is a rolling review cycle of the charter? What happens next?

Donna Austin: So the charter can be reviewed at the request I think – Bart, I'm looking at you – at the request of the Registry Stakeholder Group or the ccNSO as the

direct customers. I think the GNSO can also pull the trigger too and the CSC itself, yes, yes.

Katrina Sataki: And about the…

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: But there is provision for that to be done.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you. And so the upcoming effectiveness review, clearly we need a process for that. How we kick off this process as well with the quite ambitious goal perhaps to develop a proposed process by Panama meeting.

Donna Austin: Can we take that on notice?

Katrina Sataki: Bart I think wanted to say something? Yes, please, there is the mic.

Bart Boswinkel: Just – Bart Boswinkel for the record. I'm supporting the charter review team. One of the observations of the charter review team will be to avoid overlap between the effectiveness review and the upcoming first IANA functions review which will run at the same time, unfortunately. That's one of the outcomes of the whole transition process.

I think what is – and I think that will be the recommendation for the – from the charter review team at least in the document right now is that the ccNSO and GNSO Council because they have the ability to set the terms of reference of the effectiveness review, that they match and avoid overlap with the IANA functions review. So but so that means effectively that there needs to be a discussion between the ccNSO and the GNSO on how they want – GNSO Council how they want to run it.

And probably Panama would be a very good time because by that time ICANN Org will start organizing and looking into the IANA functions review as

well. So there are some moving pieces and maybe it's an idea that this small group of both councils sit down and maybe even with the RSIG how they want to run the two effective – or the two reviews because at the end of the day you have a small pool of people who will be interested in doing this, so that was the observation.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Bart. And Katrina, based on that information I'll – I won't take this on notice, I'll say that it's a definite action item that we need to have a conversation about. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Okay thank you. And as we see after Panama we'll have to address the issue of elections of CSC members so one of the member per group will have to be reelected or elected as well as the liaisons. And, yes, remembering the process how difficult it was two years ago. I think it won't be any easier this time because one of the requirements were diversity and as we know, it is first of all is difficult and second, yes, this is for ccNSO and for RySG as we are direct customers of IANA it's really important to have the best people on this committee. Yes, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Katrina. So Byron, I think you've got staggered terms so it will only be one person from the Registry and one person from ccNSO that needs to be replaced?

Byron Holland: That's correct. The initial terms were three years and two years, one of each, from each the GNSO and ccNSO and the idea is that after that first two year cycle they would alternate on two year terms, but we are staggered for this first election which will be in the October meeting timeframe.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, a lot of work to do. Next agenda item doesn't make it any easier. Okay, Work Track 5, participation of the ccNSO in your PDP. It's kind of new for us so the pace is really very fast, loads of opinions and everything. We're trying to do our best and thanks to – especially thanks to all the input from

Annebeth and her team. So Annebeth, may I ask you to share some of your initial thoughts, feedback? Okay, not initial anymore but…

Annebeth Lange: Sure. Thank you. Annebeth Lange for the record. I really am very positive how the work has proceeded. After two almost three years in the cross community working group this works very well with the four cochairs. So we have one from the GAC, Olga Cavalli; one from ALAC, Javier Rua; and Martin Sutton from the GNSO and me from ccNSO.

And we have been working to find a way to share the burden of leading meetings. As you know, all these meetings rotation and difficult times of the day and night so we try to find a way forward. And so far I think it works very well.

So what we do is that the last couple of meetings we have been sorted out and try to find a structured process to go through the different categories of geographic terms and try to define is it a geographic term or not? And we base that on what was contained in the Applicant Guidebook because that is a good place to start. The last time we used many years to get to the list we have there so instead of starting from scratch it's a good way to start with this list.

So what we do is to try to compare those names there or the categories there with the initial GNSO policies from 2007, 2008 and then go to 2012 and see what was the difference. So piece by piece we're going through and identifying the pros and cons essentially so that the positive and negative impact or what happened in 2012 since that was different for almost all the categories unless for the two letter codes.

The two letter codes, all two letter combinations, interestingly enough has been treated in the same way all through from the Reserve Names Working Group, the policy of the GNSO in 2007, also preliminary in the cross

community working group and in the 2012 that they should be left for CCs, those who are there and those who might come in the future.

All the others are much worse because it's differences between what was – what was the result in the Applicant Guidebook. So we are – will be looking how we may want to consider either doing the same thing in the future that was decided in 2012, but since that is not a policy but an implementation we have to do something to make it a policy.

So should we do the same thing in the future? Or changing what was in the Applicant Guidebook but addressing any sorts of relations between the initial policy and what was final implementation in the Applicant Guidebook. And that could be that something should be deleted, something should be added, and something could be changed or we find that it's good as it is. That remains to be seen.

So as we complete that we will then move onto what was not contained within the Applicant Guidebook to consider any other categories of geographic terms, that this group should consider because as we now, the main problems in the last round arrived around names that were not on that list like Amazon, Patagonia, those names, those kind of names.

So we have – do have a session dedicated to Work Track 5 on Wednesday in the morning. It is a collation but for the first time of the membership on Wednesday in the ccNSO meeting, unfortunately, but that's difficult to avoid here. So you're all welcome to join us. It will be a working session but we will try to inform those who have not been involved in it what has been happening.

It's quite many members there, it's about 114 members' altogether, 81 observers. The majority of the participants from GNSO and naturally enough because they consist of many stakeholder groups as well. But we are 28 from ccNSO all together and that's quite good.

So if there are any questions, I'm here, so please.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much, Annebeth. So no comments from GNSO either, yes.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. Heather Forrest. So thanks very much, Annebeth, for your very helpful summary. I think the only one thing I would add, you know, from a comment perspective I think we're delighted to hear that things are going well. Fantastic to hear that we have participants engaging with the process. Whatever we can do to facilitate that and strengthen that, let's, you know, don't hesitate to say so.

I think as I read this and Annebeth, you said, you know, ways for the ccNSO to express its views in this process, one thing I've pushed hard for, of course near and dear to both of our hearts, Annebeth is all that work that we did in the cross community working group that that's not forgotten, that that doesn't have to be repeated by Work Track 5, and that of course does have something to say about two letter codes that you've raised and I think is a helpful baseline for that group, so certainly the ccNSO had a very strong role in that process and that has fed into where we are now as a starting point so I think that's excellent.

Whatever we can do to encourage you know, and continue to facilitate your participation, you have to let us know.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. I might add one thing and that is the timeline because the Work Track 1-4 which is the other part or the former part of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, they plan to have an initial report ready already in April. And since we started at the later point but at the same time we have one focused issue to discuss, we will try as much as we can to keep up. And the plan is to have an initial report in July if we can. It might be too early but as soon as we can.

It's much easier for people to comment on thing when they have something in writing. It's out there now in a Google Doc that we made so it's possible for everyone to feed in with comments on what they think was good and what was bad with how they were treated in 2012, it's still there and open. And if you're not familiar with Google Doc you can always send your comments to the GNSO secretariat list. So I think that's all.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much, Annebeth. Let's move to the next one, which is one of the easiest, specific reviews. Yes, and together with other reviews there's a lot of them. We submitted our comments on operating standards and on Sunday our Guidelines Review Committee met with MMSI team and discussed all the comments, well, they tried to summarize all the comments received. Well it seems that we are the only ones who supported setting the scope of review team in advance so before we should call for volunteers. So we believed the scope should have been set before, apparently other groups disagree, okay.

We also submitted some other comments regarding operating standards and apparently there will be a next draft out there for public comments again. I hope that we will all participate and comment. Anything you'd like to add?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. Heather Forrest. So as you're aware, the GNSO Council likewise submitted comments in relation to the draft operating standards. And I wonder – we have – maybe we could isolate a few particular points. I'm not sure, Donna, you led that effort, I put you on the spot and I apologize for that. The operating standards, our draft comment. I mean, let's say we're all…

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Yes, that one. That one. That one. Sorry, I apologize for doing that. Let's say if we can distill out maybe the top one or two points from our comments. I know we had quite a few comments that went through but there were some key points, and I don't want to mischaracterize those.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. I'll try to remember what they were. So I think one of the problems we had was that there was a separate drafting team for the scope, I think that's what was proposed and we thought that was duplicating an effort and didn't make much sense. We felt that the review team itself should be responsible for developing its own scope.

But there should be the ability for comment from the Board and SOs and ACs during that development process. So I think we felt that there was, you know, basically losing 12 months by pulling together yet another team to draft the scope and then that has to feed into the actual review team itself and then the review team could possibly override that anyway. So I think that was a big issue that we had with operating standards.

We also took issue with the suggestions that were in the document for removing somebody from a review team because it seemed to be based on – it didn't have an objective test to it. So we provided some comments that we felt that if there are issues with any members of the review team then it is the responsibility of the chairs to deal with that and, you know, I think we gave some guidance as to possible process that you could use on that.

And then if there was a problem with the chairs themselves then some other kind of process would need to be developed. Darcy, I'm looking at you, I don't know – and Susan as well, who are involved in the – in developing the comments. They're the two key ones that stick out for me.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. It's Heather. I think the one that I might suggest that we add because it aligns here and interestingly enough it's not on our agenda but I do think we ought to mention it, is we did also talk about the call for volunteers and the need for a review team to come back to the SOs and ACs if the – if the membership wasn't sufficiently diverse or if there were gaps or this sort of thing. And that of course leads us to our favorite topic which is

SSR2. But that's, let's say in light of SSR2 I think it's important that we call that one out too.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, okay. Thank you – yes.

Heather Forrest: Susan. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi for the record. One other comment we made was the fact that, you know, the review team selection process should be timely and that we should – the SOs and ACs working together should seat a full team because we are quite light on some of the – the RDS team is pretty light. It's doable but – and then the, you know, obviously the SSR2 has had people come and go too so.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. One of our comments was related to the number of different reviews we have to participate in, that included those specific reviews, then our own organizational review, now CSC charter review, CSC effectiveness review and many other reviews. I don't know if you guys have any time to do policy work, well great. For us it's clear that we also tried to analyze a number of our volunteers and while it's not sufficient to do all the work that is – that needs to be done, so that was one of the comments.

And actually MMSI team showed us one slide and those were only specific reviews and organizational reviews that need to be done; it did not include all other reviews that are mandated by bylaws or were – have to be done for other reasons. So and that slide was scary. And as we learned on Friday each of the reviews costs an arm and a leg so basically there many arms and legs in one slide.

So that was, yes, and this is something that probably needs to be addressed. Do we really need so many reviews? And maybe we as SOs should come with some suggestions to lighten the burden of the community. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. Heather Forrest. So I might say that we raised this with the Board in our meeting with them yesterday, lunchtime yesterday. And Göran was quite quick to jump on that very much as he was in the SO/AC chairs' meeting on Friday to say well, ask me and I pushed back a little and said, ask you what? The challenge is we don't really have a process for kicking off changes to the bylaws in that fashion. So I think we as a community need to try and focus our efforts as to what the ask should be and how we participate in that. So I think to the extent that we can put our heads together on how we think that ought to go forward rather than just kick it off and ask for something that we don't know what we're asking for. So I think some creative thinking is helpful there.

Katrina Sataki: I propose we add it as one of the action items that we should work on so that we can really move forward. It should be possible to change the bylaws. And if we see that we just have review after review after review and many others in parallel and those recommendations need to be implemented at some point as well.

Okay, next agenda item then, Internet governance and engagement group proposed charter. Currently – oh unfortunately we didn't have much time to review the proposed charter for various reasons, but that is – the fact I just read it quickly and I hope that my other colleagues also had opportunity to quickly review the proposal. So maybe if we still have one minute. Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Katrina. So I mean, just to be concise, we were tasked by the GNSO Council to come up with a new vehicle to replace the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance. And we took into account concerns about accountability, reporting, scope, mission and so on. So what we tried to do basically first is really to change the name since I think the Cross Community Working Group had kind of specific meaning and embeds some maybe some connotation that can arise concerns. And then we tried to review the charter trying to elaborate or articulate more the mission and objectives.

I understand maybe that needs some changes and I think in term of process now is for the maybe the chartering organization to kind of coordinate and if there need – if any revision or changes that we can get that back and try to provide a new version. So I think what first we selected totally new, Cross Community Engagement Group adding (newbies) to the ICANN ecosystem, but, yes, so it's really we need to maybe clarify more about the objectives. We understand about the issue about the timeline and the work plan. We tried to work around that. The problem is like Internet governance issue are kind of – something and going, it's not like you have specific deliverables, specific timeline, so if we need to work more on that I think we welcome more – more input.

And but just maybe the question for – between the GNSO Council and ccNSO is how we will deal with that in term of process because also we need to coordinate with the ALAC and if we get the final revised version or we – if we agree also about the – this new vehicle how that we will do that in the future and the next month so.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. Yes, I agree with your assessment of the part about problem statement, goals and objectives and scope, it's – I think it should be more elaborate and currently it's not convincing, that's one thing. Another thing you speak about the support that you will need for this engagement group, I mean, staff support and other things, I think it will be really interesting to see some estimates. Is it another arm or leg or something?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, so this is something we know that there are always concern about, the resourcing. I mean, there is no expectation that the chartering organization will provide any kind of support or resource on that, you know, we're not going to take from policy development to support this. Because there is already the, how to say it, within the GAC and that the government engagement team, they are providing some level of support and just we will keep using that.

So I think it's – we want maybe more clarity about the budget, I mean, we can ask and to get more details but there is no expectation that the chartering organization to provide any kind of in-kind support.

Katrina Sataki: Okay thank you very much. Heather allowed us to use a little bit extra time, a little bit. Sorry for dropping you (unintelligible). And we have AOB and – yes, about Rafik's question how we proceed, I think we clearly need to discuss it within our Council. I see Joke, did you want to say something about…

Joke Braeken: I see that Michele has his hand up.

Katrina Sataki: Sorry, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Katrina. Michele for the record. No, just on this thing with the – what are they calling it now – sorry, it keeps changing names – Rafik's little group. The Internet Governance Engagement Group, that's a wonderful acronym. I have no issue if there's no extra spend, but to say that it has no impact on anything thing else if there is expenditure is disingenuous; anything that requires resources equals money, money has to come from somewhere so it does have an impact on the budget. That's just basically a statement. I mean, there's no point in litigating with me, Rafik, because I mean, ultimately that's just a reality. You know, there is a cost.

As long as there no expectation of travel support funding or anything like that that's fine by me but if this is being used as some way to get travel support to go off and attend events that aren't core to ICANN's mission then I probably with it personally.

Rafik Dammak: Can I respond quickly to this, the last – I mean, there was never any travel support for the working group members to attend any Internet governance event so. And there is no expectation to have that in future anyway.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, please.

Tatiana Tropina: Sorry, just to add to this. Tatiana Tropina for the record, little time. I believe that in a way ICANN doesn't exist in vacuum and the small support we have from GSE and staff just in terms of, you know, managing (unintelligible) in the calls will cost much less than arm and leg which ICANN will have to spend if we miss some, you know, big shift for example, in regulation in (AG) or something like this, you know, better safe than sorry sometimes.

Katrina Sataki: Another comment?

Stephanie Perrin: Hi, Stephanie Perrin, NCSG for the record. I have a lot of concerns about some of these programs but I also have concerns about the way things were cut without proper metrics. I want better metrics on the ROI for these – all of these efforts, you know, the fellows, the training, the CROP. But I don't think we should cut it, I think we should have more rigor. And I'm deeply concerned that our chance to bring, you know, our global representatives up to speed is being cut; what we really need is to make sure that they're actually getting up to speed, that's what we need so that we can do the work here. Thanks.

Man: I suggest to move this conversation to Room 102 where there is a meeting on the Internet Governance Engagement Group.

Katrina Sataki: Okay thank you. So let's move to AOB then. There are a couple of questions from me, one is the Board has asked both groups of GNSO and ccNSO to look into emoji thing so have you done anything? No. Thank you. That was very quick.

                   Second apparently you had a meeting with the Board and another thing that the Board asked us was about some – how we're proceeding with vetting of candidates that we appoint to the Board, so what is your procedure? How are you planning to address that?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. So that came up in our lunch with the Board yesterday only very briefly because we got sort of buried into other questions. And Cherine proposed that at least it's the Board's thinking that a robust process should be carried out in relation to all Board members, not just select Board members. We raised no initial objections to that suggestion but of course need to follow up then in terms of actually doing something about that. Yes, but in principle I don't think any of us would object to ensuring that our Board members are duly qualified and able to serve, so, in principle I think that's fine.

I would like to add as an AOB item I think it behooves Katrina and I to give an update in relation to SSR2. We actually haven't met formally as the SO/AC chairs to discuss SSR2 this week, however, we do understand – I'm going to say "we" – Katrina and I at least do understand that there's an urgency here in terms of communicating with the community as to what's happening. We have a draft in progress that will be a response to the letter that we received from the Organizational Effectiveness Committee with questions about the role of the facilitator and how that – how the appointment process would take place.

We, as I say, Katrina and I have been ready to have this draft go out for almost 24 hours now and unfortunately some of our SO/AC colleagues haven't yet had a chance to review it. So we're doing our very, very best. The other thing I think we need to say is that I've come out quite strongly and Kristina has supported me – sorry, Katrina – I'm sorry. I've done that 16 times, I'm so sorry, Katrina…

Katrina Sataki: Who's counting?

Heather Forrest: Thank you. I am. I am. Arms and legs. I think it's important that we tell our, you know, respective SOs – I came out quite strongly and said that I think we need to start including the SSR2 Review Team members in these discussions. We have nothing to hide. It's an opportune time to let the

community know what we're doing and let those review team members know what we're doing.

And our views are not shared by all of the – so Katrina came out very quickly to support that and I appreciate that. But our views are not universally shared amongst the other SOs and ACs so we're doing our very best to make something happen. Thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Are there any questions, comments? If no then thank you very much for hosting us and feeding us. And we have several action items that we will need to address.

Heather Forrest: We do. Thanks very much, Katrina, ccNSO colleagues. We can end this session. And we have two competing for your time and attention, different cross community sessions happening now in other rooms so thanks very much to everyone. Have a lovely week. Thank you for joining us.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you.

END