ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi
ccNSO/GNSO Joint Council Meeting
Monday, 30 October 2017 12:15 GST

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

On page: https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

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

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

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

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

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

And for that as you may know, we have this longstanding strategic and operational plan working group. And we're - currently we're updating the charter and they will be promoted from our working group, the standing committee. And they will be given - they are the ones who prepare our comments on budgets and all the plans. So they will be in the position to submit rejection action petition to the CCNSO council.

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

Steven: Steven (unintelligible) for the record. We completed the approval action guidelines and we are in I believe it's going to be draft number five of the rejection action guideline. One of the things we've been up against with the rejection actions guideline is the very tight timeframes that are embodied in

the bylaws. And I assuming you guys probably have a similar issue that you're looking at. One sec. There we go.

I don't have a slide deck for you yet. I have a slide deck in preparation for a session in the CCNSO on member's day two. I don't remember the time. But you're all welcome to come where I will be discussing both the timeframes that we're up against and also how the guideline is coming along and being structured.

Highlights of the draft of the rejection guideline are that we and we did this with the approval guideline as well. We basically appoint what we call rejection action manager. It's kind of like an issues manager. We have one person is responsible for receipt of the paperwork that comes from JJ and comes from the ECA and manages the process of getting - in the case for a rejection guideline getting the rejection petition from one of our community members and ensuring that our secretary gets it and council gets it, etcetera, etcetera.

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

We have just so you know there are upcoming rejection actions. The draft PTI and IANNA FY'19 operating plans and budget is currently out. They're both of those are currently out for public comment which closes on the 26th of November. And it's likely - well I wouldn't say it's likely. It's possible that there may be a displeasure with some aspect of it which might result in a public comment which might result in a rejection action petition from one of the ACSOs. So that part of the process is going to probably start up late - early December potentially.

And the second upcoming rejection action that I'm aware of at this point is the draft ICANN FY'19 operating plan and budget. I expect the board will be adopting that in mid-January which will open up a comment period which will run from mid-July until early March. And so we may see and I have my ACA hat on at this point. We may well see rejection petition surrounding the overall ICANN budget and/or operating plan.

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

James Bladel: Thank you Steven. So do you have any indication of which SOs and ACs are considering rejecting the budget? That's not a small undertaking. That is - could potentially be a very disruptive.

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

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

James Bladel: So your earlier statement wasn't a cagey way of saying that the CCNSO…

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

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

                   So we are struggling with some of the same issues. Late I believe it was
                   about this time last year, we commissioned a bylaws drafting team to look at
                   harmonizing the GNSOs bylaws and operating procedures to align them with
                   our new roles and responsibilities as decisional participants. That work was
                   completed and presented back to the council and the council - the GNSO
                   council is - we had a presentation on them this weekend in our Sunday
                   session yesterday.

                   There is a planned GNSO council workshop that will take place in January of
                   next year and the new bylaws will be front and center as part of that
                   workshop. The goal is - well I think first off we should note that we're not
                   rushing this process. We understand that we're tinkering fairly deeply under
                   the hood of how the GNSO operates. And so we're taking a look at
                   everything very closely. But we are trying to address some of the other
                   issues including the timelines that you mentioned and that we have aligning
                   the bylaws timelines with GNSO timelines is very challenging.

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

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. So any other questions or comments?

James Bladel: I'm sorry. I'm sorry for the second intervention. Your second part of your
                   question was asking about our new committee for a standing committee on

budget. That's something that we have not decided to do. It's something that we are considering. We are looking at charter composition. But it is a reflection of our role in examining the budget and submitting comments.

So it is - that's what's behind this getting earlier out in front of that. It was up until this point it's been done but at a very ad hoc. The various stakeholder groups and constituencies might have formal processes but the GNSO council's process was a bit - very ad hoc and we're looking at formalizing that. But it's not a foregone conclusion yet but that committee will be approved and will actually exist.

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

Michele Neylon: Thanks Katrina. Michele Neylon for the record. The - it's around the topic of budgets. I assume you guys were also approached by ICANN about the travel support budget and they're looking for feedback on that. And they've asked a number of questions and things about it. Now I'm not an accountant. I wouldn't pretend to be an accountant. I have a very good accountant who works for me. But when you look at the expenditure in that area, the trend is very much in the upwards graph. However, if you look at ICANN's income, it isn't.

So the expenditure just looking at travel support never mind anything else is I would humbly suggest slightly out of control. And the question that maybe needs to be asked is what kind of KPIs are they looking at when they assign some of this expenditure. How are they measuring the return of investment? And I mean the - for this particular budget I mean we're only be asked a couple of specific questions but some of this stuff will feed into the next

budget development process. And speaking personally and after having spoken to other people as well, some of us are really scratching our heads.

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

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you Michele Neylon. Certainly that's something that we should look into. And yes we received requests for some feedback. Haven't provided any yet but yes we will work on that as well. Thank you.

James Bladel: So Nigel and Steven.

Nigel: Thank you James Bladel. Listening to what Michele Neylon had to say with great interest not being an accountant myself either. I don't know what KPI is.

Michele Neylon: Key performance indicators.

Nigel: Oh yes. Well.

Michele Neylon: Or simply put Nigel, I spent ten euro, what did I get?

Nigel: Thanks. The CCNSO council I think over a period of many years has been doing its bit to keep costs down. It's probably not well known that councilors don't get funded for approximately 2/3 of the meetings they attend. We get funding one and three. Sometimes there's a little bit of wiggle room if other people don't come and so on. You said a little bit out of control. I'd just comment that's like saying a little bit pregnant.

Michele Neylon: A little bit what sorry?

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

Katrina Sataki: I think it's not just the seats assigned to SOACs. The travel funding also includes all the fellows, all the newcomers, all everyone who gets funding to come to meetings. So that's not just - we're not talking here only about seats for…

Nigel: Or as Michele Neylon and I might put it Uncle Tom (Cobbly) and all.

Katrina Sataki: Well you're not - Nigel sometimes we'll have to tell you your English is horrible.

James Bladel: Was that English? I - (Steve).

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

Each little working party working on whatever section of the budget and writes a report about what they think is a problem, what they think is okay. It goes back to (Giovanni) who collates. So we end up with a fairly substantial document.

And I'm sure we're going to be looking at this travel stuff as well because there is as you rightly point out Michele Neylon there's this growing trend between expenditures on the one side and income on the other. And given

their - yes given emergency reserve situation it's doubly of concern. So I'm sure they'll - I'm sure we will be commenting on that as we get into the actual ICANN FY'19 budget analysis process. Thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you. I think it's time for us to move to the next agenda item because we have only half an hour left for our meeting. And that's follow-up on the work of a cross community working group on the country and territory names used as top level domains. Yes as, you know, now we have moved to this work track five under your PDP.

And even though yes we appointed our co-chair, co-leader to that work track, (Annabeth), we still have some worries and we try to express them in our letter to you. So my understanding is that you are working on the answers. No? I'm going to provide any official feedback, something to calm us down and to ensure that we have very good collaboration.

James Bladel: Sure. So just generally and then I'll call on Heather Forrest to perhaps give some more context. First of all thank you for sending us a co-chair, a designated co-chair and thank you for sending us (Annabeth) in particular. I just would note that we are trying to - so we had a very similar conversation with the GAC yesterday which is folks are coming to a PDP but they have kind of a conditional. And the condition seems to be that we want to participate in your PDP as long as it doesn't operate too much like a PDP.

And we're having - so we're trying to reconcile that with our rules because our rules are not just arbitrary. They are what makes the outcome of the PDP enforceable in contrast for registries and registrars and to make sure that we can then later go and get them overturned on appeal or something like that. So we're trying to reconcile some of the requests that were in your letter and are in the GACs similar letter and I think some statements made by the ALAC.

Some of those are compatible with the PDP. Some of them are more restrictive, which I think what we're thinking is we can probably make it work with the PDP. But some of them are in opposition.

So we're trying to work through this because obviously we can't have the CCNSO co-chair working and the CCNSO conditions and the GAC co-chair under GAC conditions and the - and then, you know, it just.

We're trying to stitch it all together into a uniform shared set of expectations because I think that's what's going to foster some cooperation and work on this issue.

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

So as far as formal response, it is possible that we would have one. I think what we would probably put out is instead of responding to each SOAC co-chairs individually, we might put out sort of an overarching response of the framework or something as the work track five gets underway, something like that. But all of those are currently under consideration and something that we would do if.

I guess I would ask the question - turn it around and ask the question. Would we be - would it be - would the CCNSO take great offense if we responded to the GAC, the CCNSO and the ALAC jointly in a single communication as opposed to individually tailored response. Okay.

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

Heather Forrest: No you've said everything.

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

Woman: Are you?

James Bladel: Yes.

Woman: Okay.

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

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

James Bladel: Can I interrupt you for a second? Can we get the tech folks to take a look at the microphone or the speaker? (Teri)? (Teri)? Can we get the tech folks to take a look at the microphone and speaker? I think Rafik Dammak is getting quite a bit of feedback and he's not able to speak into the microphone and we can't hear him if he doesn't. And he's kind of. Okay thanks. Oh perfect. Thank you. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: So I think maybe the title can be misleading a little bit. We were not tasked to - it's not about charter change but it's more about creating a new vehicle to replace the CCWGIG. So what we did after the GNSO resolution on that

matter we had a small group and first we tried maybe to see if we can use any existing structure. We thought that not maybe it doesn't fit what we need.

And so what we did is just we said okay we will have maybe a cross community engagement group and from that to work on what is needed maybe onto the work the charter. So we tried, for example, to put some objective and target and similar requirement to respond to the concern from our charting organization.

So yes we are kind of moving backward. We say we will have - we should have a cross community engagement in the group and then we try to put all the specifics that respond to the concern. So we have kind of for now first draft. It's really zero draft. Let's say that. And just to - we are setting kind of timeline for us because we are supposed as a group to make proposal by I think by February. And so we have like a few months to do so. So this is the kind of the current status for the work going on in term of making a proposal for our charting organization.

And if there is any other input, it will be really helpful for us because we are kind of listing similar requirement because it's not just about creating a new structure. We have so many in ICANN space.

But it's - we have the challenge in how we work with other groups because we have like the board working group and internet governance. How we should work with the ICANN staff but also how we add more accountability and reporting mechanism to our charting organization so that we keep them informed about what we are doing in the different space.

And we are starting to do that more and hopefully we can create more say clear mechanism. So we are now producing analytics those activities report. We don't know if they are matching the expectation. But we can do more on that area.

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

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much Rafik Dammak. Yongim.

Yongim: Thanks Katrina. This is Yongim and we had a very similar discussion with the ALAC council yesterday. And I - continuing on with what Rafik Dammak has just said, I would actually kind of like to clarify a bit more what this group is doing or has been doing. Just because the name of this group has internet governance in it, it doesn't mean that we are concerned with things that govern the internet.

This group is more - the purpose of this group is more to enhance the understanding of the internet governance and make the work of ICANN more recognized and more understood by organizations outside of ICANN.

And as I think the council - the GNSO council also and the CCNSO council just received our report on what we have been doing and you will see that we have been mostly involved in activities outside of ICANN like the ITU, the IGF, the UN in trying to help them understand basically the role of ICANN in this world of internet governance.

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

Katrina Sataki: Thank you Yongim. James Bladel?

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

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks James Bladel. That's a fair question. So I think first the (unintelligible) it seems that matter to many in I think GNSO that if we use the cross community working group it has some meaning. It means also that we will supposedly follow with the framework and so on.

Soo we try to move from that and also to I think to emphasize that when we use like the engagement and in fact we are taking kind of inspiration from existing groups that was at least kindly shared by GNSO policy staff as the different structure that was created for specific reason with GNSO.

And we find like maybe should we need a standing committee. It can be an engagement group and so on. I thought engagement maybe that something that's more close what we are trying to achieve. And so as experiment, we put that as a name and said we will use it. And then at least all the requirement that we have to satisfy like that should be cross community because I think that's one of the needs and how we ensure that we are getting some resource because we don't have that and ensure that, for example, we get meeting and so on.

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

that. And also we heard a lot that all the issue about accountability and reporting. So we need to do more.

Maybe that's not - it won't be like for the CCWG. That's because it responds to different needs. So yes. I mean you are going ahead of the issue. We are trying to work all the specifics but that's the kind of input that can help us just a work situation that, you know, it would great. Something and oh that's what - that's not working it.

James Bladel: Thank you Rafik Dammak. I'm just noticing the time and we have well do I have my time here. Yes and we need to probably move on. We have a half an hour left. Would you be amenable to switching number five and number six? Because I don't think we have a whole lot to discuss with agenda item number five or at least from our side we don't have a lot to - useful stuff to contribute. But I think we want to leave that open in case you have something you'd like to ask of us.

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

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

I was not aware that for example the SSAC was going to send a letter specifically on SSR2. I wasn't aware that the board was planning to suspend

SSR2. So a lot of these things, these developments, happened I think very quickly.

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

I think there is - particularly in the GNSO, there is a concern we heard that we weren't even sure that the board could do this to a review team. Those are - if you recall, those were part of the AOC as established as independent oversight mechanisms. And so it challenges the idea that these are independent.

It may perfectly - it may be exactly the right move and the right decision in this specific instance, but I think it creates a concerning precedent for future review teams that might be operating in a way that a future board doesn't like. And so I think we're concerned about maybe setting a precedent that these independent review teams are in fact not independent, that they serve essentially at the pleasure of the board.

So these are all the topics that we were discussing yesterday, Sunday, and a little bit last night, a little bit this morning. And I would be very curious as to from the CCNSO side did you notice this coming. Did you see this train coming down the tracks? Were you able to jump out of the way? And what do you think more importantly perhaps, what do you think we need to do to get this restarted?

Katrina Sataki: Yes. Thank you very much James Bladel. First of all yes we saw SSACs letter. I don't know it sent it in September I guess. So we saw it. We knew about the board's intention to suspend the SSACs review team because they

told us that on Friday. Yes we didn't know that before but they certainly told it on Friday.

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

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

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

Then of course it's much easier for the - for us to select the right volunteers. It's much easier for volunteers to put their name forward to the particular review because at first they see what they're supposed to do. Second a skill set is more or less clear because you see what you have to do. And then it - you're - the time commitment that you have in front of you it's again it's clear because you see what you have to do. And (Brenda) you know how long - how much time you have for that.

So we had nothing of that yet we started the reviews. We cannot go back to a year back when we started it all and do it properly. So apparently we need to find a way to do it the right way now, how to move forward, right. Yes I think that probably it was the right decision. And by talking to various

members of - different members on that review team, apparently that had to be done.

We also learned our lessons, at least I certainly did. We should have asked for feedback from our appointed members on the review team long ago. We didn't do that. So the blame partly lays on us as well. I assume you didn't pay much attention either.

James Bladel: We had the exact same discovery yesterday. So I don't know if you wanted to say some more. Heather Forrest was in the queue and then any others…

Katrina Sataki: Yes, Heather Forrest.

James Bladel: Heather Forrest go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks James Bladel and thanks (Katrina). I think the concern, you know, that we've expressed within council is that somehow we've gone from general discussions as you've just said about scope and appointments and so on to specifically talking about SSRRT2. And the board seems to think that that jump was logical and/or anticipated.

And, you know, much of the discussion that we had at the end of Friday was general around how do we deal with these things going forward. How do we, you know, get ourselves out of a challenge where we're not sure that things fit right and so on.

So I think - yes I think we need to somehow in - either in dealing with the general, deal with the specific but not the other way around. Yes SSRRT2 is one of our activities that's underway and it's an activity that no question is related to all of these topics.

But I think, you know, to go from my understanding from James Bladel that the discussions up to this point were at that fairly high level amongst SO and

AC leaders and now suddenly there's an assumption that the community has endorsed this action in relation to SSRRT2 and the community has been talking about, you know, higher level principles let's say. Thanks.

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

Katrina Sataki: They're not here.

James Bladel: They're not here?

Katrina Sataki: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Okay. Yes.

James Bladel: Okay and we have a few folks as well. Oh (Susan).

Susan Kawaguchi Hi. Susan Kawaguchi for the record. And I just want to take this just a little - a step farther because I am a member of the RDF who is review team two. And we are also defining scope. And in our discussions there's always been, you know, and prior to the team being seated there was coming from and I need to go back and figure out really what part of the community that came from but there was a discussion. Someone had decided that the scope should be very narrow for the RDF's review team.

And actually the GNSO council decided to push back a little bit and provided a list of suggested topics to review which would - went beyond that initial scope that Alan Greenberg was - had provided. And I don't - didn't follow it enough six months, nine months ago to remember where those came from. Was that a suggestion of the board? And that's something I'll look into.

But then there was a perception when the team was formed that oh we have this narrow scope and now the team is trying to broaden it. So I think we

have a chicken and the egg situation. If - are we going to seat - we would to figure out the scope if you side on the scope, you would have to seat a team of individuals that have the expertise needed for that subject matter in my opinion to understand what the scope should be.

So therefore you've seated one team. And then you hand that off and say review team members we are now seating you and this is your scope. That seems like a lot of individuals to request time form. Maybe there could be some overlap but maybe not.

And so I think we definitely don't want scope creep. We want to be targeted in what we're doing and we don't want review teams going for years upon years. But having been a member of review team - the who is review team one, you know, it - I found it helpful at that time to define our own scope.

And on this review team, review team two, I feel like we do have a good selection of informed and experienced people to do the work. We would love to have the CCNSO join us. But even then, we're about four or five months into our work. How far down the road are we going to continue to accept new members? So the chicken and the egg, we've got to figure that out and I'm not sure what the answer is.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you very much (Keith).

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you Katrina. Keith Drazek for the transcript, registry stakeholder group. So just - I have a two part I guess comment, question or a question and comment. Going back to the SSR2 review team conversation, I think we have, you know, some actions ahead of, some discussions and debate in each of our respective groups ahead of us about recomposition and scope of this review team.

The board letter from the 28th of - just a couple of days ago, said that the - and I'm quoting, "the board has reviewed and carefully considered advice

from SSAC and feedback from a number of SO, AC chairs expressing concern about the composition process and structure of the SSR2 review currently underway."

So I think as James Bladel noted and Heather Forrest noted this letter from the board and this decision to pause the work of the SSR2 came as a surprise to us. We had seen the SSAC letter previously but, you know, we knew that there was this conversation that took place on Friday. But this was essentially a surprise.

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

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

So the question is we're going to have to look at the scope and determine whether the scope of this review team as it currently exists, as it was currently developed by the review team members, is consistent with the guidelines that are in the bylaws. And so that's step number one. And then following on is that still in sync with the expectations of the SOs and ACs that sent these people to participate? And so I just want to put down a marker and say these are the steps and the actions ahead of us I think in the fairly near future. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much (Keith). Your mike is one there too. Yes. Answering your first question again as I already mentioned, on Friday we see specifically told us that they are going to suspend the working group. So we - I cannot say it came as a surprise because they warned us the letter was coming. That's one thing.

Another thing if we had any indications before this thing. That's again as I already mentioned lesson learned. We did not ask for any feedback and as you know ignorance is bliss. So we lived under happy assumption that everything is going on very well. After discussions with our members on the team and some other members on the team, it turned out that no things were not going on well. And I think majority of the group thinks that things are not well on the group.

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

James Bladel: And to that I mean add one comment is that I still think that and I may be speaking personally here is that getting a 24 hour advance notice is not the same as being consulted.

Katrina Sataki: It was less than.

James Bladel: Yes less than 24 hours. And I think, you know, again not, you know, stepping back from the actual decision, which may be the right decision, but it feels like it's happening in a blind and it feels like it's - we get a letter from one of the five communities and therefore it's extrapolated to mean that all SOs and ACs have been consulted so this is what we're going to do. I think that's where we started to see a lot of confused looks from the GNSO.

But more importantly I think how do we go forward from here? We have a - kind of a bat phone or emergency SO, AC chairs call that happens without staff and almost every time we ask, you know, are there any topics.

Katrina Sataki: We discussed this topic.

James Bladel: Yes. Sorry?

Katrina Sataki: We discussed this SSR2 topic.

James Bladel: We did? I thought we cancelled the last meeting. Well we cancel a lot of those calls for lack of agenda topics. And I think this is…

Katrina Sataki: But you could not make it.

James Bladel: Well this is ideally the perfect sort of topic that we should maybe table for that. And when I say we, I mean Heather Forrest.

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

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

Heather Forrest: Yes we…

Katrina Sataki: Yes we need to talk.

James Bladel: Yes.

Heather Forrest: Sorry. Thanks James Bladel. (Heather Forest). I think, you know, on the one had we need to have a think about the fact that this is a self-scoping organization and doing this could have impacts on other things let's say to the extent that we step in on an SSR. Where else, you know, where do we draw that line?

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

Katrina Sataki: Yes and there's another thing to that. Today at quarter past three I think we have a cross community session where we're going to discuss operating standards. And in operating standards we have - not now we have a draft for some of the procedures that are going to guide future reviews. I'd really like to urge you all the participate there and with your feedback including this - the feedback on scope setting and other things. (Keith)?

Keith Drazek: Thank you Katrina. Yes so just to be clear when you're talking about the scope of specific reviews, these are outlined in the bylaws. It's actually for SSR it is section 4.6C where it actually goes into fairly good detail to say this is what is in scope for an SSR review team.

So I think what we need to do and yes the groups are supposed to be self-scoping to the point where, you know, the members say okay here's what the bylaws say and here's how we're going to, you know, adjust our work based on, you know, the realities of the day. So I think our job as the SO and ACs

is to review the current scope of the review team as it was defined by the review team members, compare that to what it's in the bylaws and to see if there's a discrepancy.

And I'm - frankly I'm a little bit concerned about the suggestion that, you know, the board would engage some third party to come in and help the review team fix its scope when it's not clear to me that the scope is broken. And maybe there is something that is - that needs to be adjusted. I'm not, you know, making an assumption one way or the other. But I think the bylaws are explicit and we should refer to the bylaws in this case. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Well I think the bylaws are not that clear. Well they give - definitely they give overall structure and guidance, but they do not go into much detail. And I think that the scope must be defined in more detail than is in the bylaws.

And I'm not sure that the team itself should be doing it especially in this case when we clearly see that there is a very big diversity of views on the scope. Some might say no it must be narrowed and another say - another group say no, no, no. It must be widened. So there needs to be a clarity on scope. Well at least I certainly believe that before we start the work, the scope must be defined.

James Bladel: Well thank you. I think that was helpful at least to get a different perspective on what was a very surprising development for us yesterday and Saturday. So if we can move on then to part B of this discussion of reviews. There is now an opportunity for review the meeting strategy, the meeting structure. And I think to Donna Austin I'm looking at our other vice chair who maybe thought she was going to escape this session without having to speak.

But she's been involved not only in some of the planning efforts for the GNSO and, you know, these sessions going back to our first experiments with meeting structure A in Marrakesh but also was involved in the meeting strategy working group prior to that. And I know she has some thoughts on

some - how this process could look and some of the things that we could perhaps examine as we go forward.

But I think generally thinking that we're now two years into this new, you know, routine and what's working, what isn't working and what are some of the tweaks that can be made to make it work better. So if you don't mind Donna, would - do you have any additional thoughts or things you'd like to table, questions for the CCNSO?

Donna Austin: Thanks James Bladel, Donna Austin. So I guess there's two parts to this and I'm sure Katrina and is it (Alejandra) that's involved from your group in this? ICANN has recently put out a document which is a suggested tweaks if you would like to the meeting strategy.

And in a call with (Göran) sometime ago -- I don't even remember when that was -- there was some suggestion that if the community wanted to make significant or substantive changes to the current meeting strategy then it would be up to them to get together to do that. That would not be something that would driven by ICANN.

I have certainly advocated that I think we can do better in using our time at these meetings. So I have some ideas.

So I guess to the extent that we could have a conversation with the CCNSO to see if there's any alignment there and whether we could take that forward as a community suggestion to, you know, look at, you know, as James Bladel said we're too using. Are there any improvements that we could make that would be considered substantive and how would we go about that?

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you very much Donna. So we have this meeting program working group that shapes our agenda for our meeting days. And now they also have to work on these cross community sessions and all the coordination work and

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

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

Currently the work is still ongoing. By the end of the year, we will have some clarity on that. Probably we will need some input and feedback from our community. But I think that - well your idea to have some joint discussion and attempt to find a way to make this work better, at this point it's still - it - the level of complexity of meeting planning has increased significantly.

We used to live happily and we expected to live happily ever after and then the new meeting strategy came and all of a sudden living happily ever after does not work anymore.

But yes we would really welcome any joint efforts, some discussions on this, because probably something that does not work for you works great for you and you can suggest how to make things work better. And if something works for us that doesn't work for you, again we can find some joint aspect to this discussion. So we would really be very glad and happy to collaborate on that. Thank you.

James Bladel: I completely agree that the complexity involved in planning these meetings has gone through the rough. Excuse me. And just as an example of that, I don't know how many folks are aware but the planning for the next ICANN meeting always begins on the last day of this ICANN meeting. That's exactly how much time it takes to put that calendar together is you have to start - have this meeting start planning for Puerto Rico.

Woman: Before this meeting ends. It's on the morning.

James Bladel: Yes it's on the morning of the last day. It's crazy. And this - and it's a reflection I think and certainly those of you who listen to me and why would you have heard me say that it's because ICANN has become this collection of meetings. It's really a conference with a lot of different tracks and a lot of different sub meetings.

Katrina Sataki: Blocks.

James Bladel: And blocks, right. Sometimes they'll overlap or intersect but for the most part it's people are coming in and not even - maybe they see each other at lunch or something but they're not even. It's not one big meeting anymore. It's a lot of small meetings operating under one heading. So I don't know if folks want to weigh in on this topic, have questions. Donna you said that there's a document out now for comments.

Donna Austin: Yes (Marie Carol) she might - I don't know who that document went to. I just can't remember. I don't - it wasn't posted as a public comment was it? It was circulated to SO, AC leaders I think, so the actual planning committee now, yes.

Katrina Sataki: It's just very, very much a draft and just a first attempt to summarize everything that was discussed during the call and…

Donna Austin: Right.

Katrina Sataki: …there will be many other discussions I'm sure. Yes quite experienced in ICANN environment already. So I know things do not happen overnight. Well apart when they need to suspend a review team. Then it's really quick. But otherwise no it takes time. So if there are no comments on that, maybe then the last item and maybe again Donna about CSC review.

Donna Austin: I guess just a quick update. So the CSC a customer standing committee and it's something that the CCNSO is very much aware of, probably something the - our councilors aren't so familiar with with the exception of the contracted parties house.

So the - as a result of the IANNA transition, the customer standing committee was established. And under the charter and also reflected in the bylaws there is a requirement that CSC charter be reviewed 12/19. And why 12/19? So the CCNSO and registry stakeholder group are responsible for conducting that review. (Case) and myself are the registry representatives on that group and Martin Boyle and (Adela) are represented in the CCNSO on that.

We have - we've had conversations with the CSC and also (Elise Garrick). We're aware that (Elise) is stepping down from her role in the near term. So we thought it would be helpful to have a conversation with her.

We have a session here I think on Wednesday that's a public session and we're also - we will have some discussion within the registry stakeholder group meeting on Tuesday. And I think you have it slated for a conversation later in the week within the CCNSO if I'm correct.

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

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

sure how things would stand up. So we built in that review 12 months in.
Thanks Katrina.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much Donna. I think that CSC is a very excellent example of
a committee that can work very efficiently and can be really very helpful and
do a great job. So I'd like to thank all our representatives on - members on
the CSC for their work, for their input. Maybe at some point we should think
about changing bylaws to reduce the number of reviews related at least to
this one.

Yes because it looks like there are too many of them. Something to think
about. Is that - thank you very much. If there are no more questions, maybe
yes - Byron the chair of CSC would like to say something.

Byron Holland: Yes thanks. I'll just - I'll be very brief. Byron Holland for the record. I'm from
the CCNSO and chair of the CSC. Essentially I just want to put a plug in for
the work yet to be done in the next couple of - in the next year in particular.
We've heard about the charter review but I would also just remind this group
because both the GNSO and the CCNSO have responsibility for the
effectiveness review which starts next year. So I'll just put that plug in that
the GNSO will need a shepherd to move that process through your
constituency.

And as well there is the IANNA functions review. That - the first one must
begin by October of next year. So I know it's a year away but I'll just put that
plug in to remind you because also we as the communities have the key role
in that. So there are three reviews around the CSC starting now and two
more a year from now.

And both of our communities need to participate actively in that. So that's my
plug. Think about it. Find your shepherd and be ready for the next two. And
thank you Donna and team for the work you're doing on the charter review
now.

James Bladel: Thank you Byron and these reviews always seem like a good idea when they're off in the future. But these reviews have now come home to roost. So we have to - yes Donna go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks James Bladel. If I could just make one final point. The reason the CSC is really important in the context of the IANNA transition is that if the CSC is doing their own scope and monitoring the performance of IANNA and if the performance of IANNA starts to go a little bit off the rails, the CSC has the ability to trigger additional reviews that could and with the end result possibly being that the IANNA function can be taken out of ICANN.

So I just wanted to make the point that the CSC is traveling along really well which is terrific, but it's narrow in scope deliberately. When we had some conversations around this in transition, CWG, but it is a, you know, if the IANNA starts to go off the rails it's the CSC that can trigger through the CCNSO and GNSO a review that could ultimately result in IANNA being taken out of ICANN.

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

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

I will note for those of you who aren't aware and I'm sure everyone is is this is my last meeting as chair. On Wednesday, there will be an election to designate the successor amongst the new councilors. And Heather Forrest

I'm pleased to report is running unopposed. So I - it will at least be someone who you know and love already. But all of that will take place later this week. So thank you very much for not just today but for all of your help and support over the years. And next time you see me, I'll be in the audience. Thank you.

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

END