

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Hyderabad
ccNSO/GNSO Joint Council Meeting
Saturday, 05 November 2016 at 12:15 IST**

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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Woman: ICANN 57 Hyderabad, Hall 6, 12:15 to 13:45, ccNSO with GNSO Joint Council meeting. November 5, 2016.

Woman: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Okay, good afternoon and welcome to the Joint GNSO ccNSO Council lunch. I'm James Bladel. I'm the Chair of the GNSO. And to my right is...

Katrina Sasaki: Good afternoon. Katrina Sasaki, dotLV. CcNSO.

James Bladel: And maybe just start off we can go around the table for introductions. I know that we just met each other in Helsinki and we'll probably see each other

again through the week, but if we could start down here with Mr. Corwin if you don't mind, could you kick us off with introductions?

Phil Corwin: Hi. Philip Corwin, US representing the Business Constituency.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, Brazil representing the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady, IPC.

Darcy Southwell: Darcy Southwell, Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon, Registrar.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco, Business Constituency.

Becky Burr: Becky Burr, ccNSO Council.

Keith Drazek: Keith Drazek, Registry Stakeholder Group.

Ed Morris: Ed Morris, NCSG, GNSO Council.

Sarah Clayton: Sarah Clayton, standing in for Marilia Maciel, NCUC and GNSO Council.

Heather Forrest: Heather Forrest, IPC.

James Bladel: I'm James and I'm a Registrar.

Katrina Sataki: Katrina Sataki, ccNSO Council.

Stephen Deerhake: Stephen Deerhake, ccNSO Council.

Nigel Roberts: Nigel Roberts, ccNSO Council.

Abibu Ntahigiye: Abibu Ntahigiye, ccNSO Council.

Peter Vergote: Peter Vergote, ccNSO Council Europe Region.

Alejandra Reynoso: Alejandra Reynoso, ccNSO Council Lat Region.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin, Registry Stakeholder Group.

Debbie Monahan: Debbie Monahan, ccNSO Council.

Demi Getschko: Demi Getschko, ccNSO Council.

Man: (Unintelligible) ccNSO Council.

Byron Holland: Byron Holland, ccNSO Council.

Young Eum Lee: Young Eum Lee, ccNSO Council in the AP Region.

Hirofumi Hotta: Hiro Hotta, ccNSO Council from AP Region.

Ching Chiao: Ching Chiao, NomComm appointee, ccNSO Council.

Woman: (Unintelligible), ccNSO Council.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi, BC.

Stefania Milan: Stefania Milan, GNSO Council.

James Bladel: Thanks. And thank you for folks who are maybe newcomers and folks that we know very well. Welcome back, Ching. Good to see you again.

So we have an agenda that's on the screen here that was circulated a little bit in advance of this meeting. We can go through Item 2 which is a discussion of items of overlapping interest between the GNSO and the ccNSO, particularly cross community working group efforts. We have a number of active community working groups that we can discuss and then I was – if there are no objections we can dive right into the first one which is the CWG principles.

My understanding is that that is from the GNSO side that we've wrapped up that – the adoption of the CWG principles. And that we are excited about having those principles applied to future CCWGs.

Katrina Sataki: Okay, thank you. May I ask Becky to give a little update from our side?

Becky Burr: I believe we're going to consider those while we're here. Is that right, Bart? I think it's on the agenda.

Bart Boswinkel: That's correct.

Bb: And I think they will be a useful way forward. I think it was a really nice joint effort between the ccNSO and the GNSO. So let's move forward with them.

James Bladel: And I think from the GNSO perspective, at least some of us, I think it's a shared perspective, we were glad to see that there were specific provisions in those principles and that framework to ensure that a cross community working group doesn't stray into policy development activities or topics that would fall within the remit of a policy development organization like the GNSO or the ccNSO. So I think we were encouraged to see those in there as well.

We can open the queue on each topic. If there's anyone who's finished with lunch and has a burning desire to weigh in on these. No? Okay, the next one I might actually lean on Heather a little bit more for, this is the cross community working group for framework on the use of country and territory

names as TLDs. Heather is one of the chairs, cochairs, vice chairs, yes, so perhaps you can give us an update on the state of that CCWG.

Heather Forrest: Happy to do so, James. Heather Forrest. I suspect some of my other cochairs, Annebeth Lange is there at the table, well done and Carlos Gutierrez is stuck in CCT so he sends his regards. And I don't think Paul Szyndler made it to this meeting.

So we have a meeting on this afternoon and in fact the exact sort of two minutes that I'm about to say here I'll say again in the New gTLD Program Review session that immediately follows this one. And then after that our own CWG meeting will take place at 3:45 in the afternoon in Room – as I look to my paper schedule – never mind, I'll come back put that in the chat. Oh sorry, 3:15 in G0102.

So the group has been working for some two years now on a charter that requires it to consider the feasibility of developing a framework for the use of two-letter codes, three-letter codes and country and territory names at the top level.

And what the group has decided after some time at work looking at two-letter codes and then reaching a bit of an impasse in three-letter codes is that the group is probably not best situated for all sorts of structural and other reasons to tackle the question of whether a uniform framework is possible given that the group was chartered with a very, very narrow remit, which is, as I say, the use of country and territory names as those have just been let's say outlined, two-letter, three-letter and names and only at the top level.

And many in the group have expressed concern that that very narrow scope doesn't really permit the group to answer the question that's it's been chartered to answer which is a uniform framework possible?

Anyone who was able to attend the session that we had in Marrakesh, the first time that we did these sort of policy forum dialogues, would have walked away from that with an understanding of the very complicated issues that face the group.

The group is at the point of having prepared a draft interim report that sets out its work to date and its rationale for why it isn't or why it feels it's not the best in the best form to continue. And begins to think about what we might do to carry this working group forward. In no way shape or form do the conclusions at this point suggest that the CWG members have the answer to how best to take this forward. But they do recognize the need to do so and to do so in the most community-inclusive way possible.

So we – I'll put a link in the chat to – in the Adobe chat to our document so that you can see those. And I encourage anyone interested from the CC and G side in this question of geographic names and their use in the DNS to attend the session this afternoon at 3:15.

Annebeth and I are here and I'm sure we'll be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. Annebeth, is there anything you'd like to add?

Annebeth Lange: No, not actually, just encourage people to come to the meeting if you're interested in this issue. And Annebeth Lange for the record. And working together with Heather and Carlos on this, so we haven't managed to achieve a common framework but we really want to find a solution for this together.

James Bladel: Thank you, Heather and Annebeth. Any questions or comments from the table? I see that the queue is clear in the chat room. No strong feelings on the CWG country and territory names. Okay, so again, involvement and engagement is key and look forward to further developments there.

The next agenda item is the CWG on Internet Governance. And where we're currently – our situation currently in the GNSO is that we have a pending motion for our consideration during our meeting on Monday that would withdraw our support as a chartering organization for this CWG.

The support from chartering organizations must be reconfirmed on an annual basis is my understanding on how this CWG was structured. The rationale for withdrawal is not any indication on – of our opinion of the work of this group, which we believe is very important or the conduct of the team itself, which I believe is doing exemplary work. It's more a recognition that the CWG is probably not the correct vehicle for an ongoing and open-ended engagement in Internet governance.

That particularly in light of recently adopted CWG principles that a CWG would have a defined beginning, middle and end resulting in some sort of a tangible work product as an output. And that the function of Internet governance, by its nature, is ongoing and is also – has a component of an outward facing component. So we're open to the idea that this work should continue and that the individuals that are taking a leadership role in this function should continue to participate in Internet governance. However, we'd like to find an alternative mechanism to a CWG for carrying out this work.

That's currently what's under discussion. I don't present that as a monolithic GNSO position. I'm just kind of setting the table for the discussion. And I think I would welcome particularly those from the GNSO and others from the ccNSO who may want to weigh in on this. And we'd certainly be interested in knowing what your thoughts are and your intentions relative to the renewal, because I understand that all SO and AC chartering organizations need to express by this meeting in Hyderabad, their indication to continue support for this group.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you, James, for this overview. We also discussed this issue during our prep meeting yesterday. And even though we agree that cross community

working group might not be the right vehicle to address these issues, we still believe that the issues are too important and we cannot and we should not allow them to – just to be unaddressed by any vehicle.

So I also spoke to representatives from ALAC, so my understanding is that currently there are other chartering organizations are ccNSO, GNSO, ALAC and SSAC. So if GNSO decides to withdraw from this working group, there will be three of us remaining and well ALAC definitely is willing to continue. And we also feel that killing off working group before we have another vehicle in place might be too dangerous a step to make.

Our cochairs, Young Eum on this working group probably could add something.

Young Eum Lee: Yes, yes thank you, Katrina. This is Young Eum Lee, from dotKR. I have joined this group, actually from the beginning I participated in the meetings, but then eventually took the role of a cochair. My observation of this group is that, yes, I do agree with the GNSO position that this group is not working in the regular sort of the cross community working group structure of the ICANN.

But I have noticed that many of the issues that this group was – has been involved in include issues outside of ICANN and that's why we haven't seen or heard much about the workings of this group. But there are serious issue that are being raised in other international meetings such as the ITU and the UN.

And most recently that a working group on enhanced cooperation was reformed and started to discuss this enhanced cooperation mechanism. And more recently the WTSC issue that was raised is – are some examples of some of the important issues that communities within ICANN cannot let go and/or cannot ignore.

Although we don't need to be concerned about it continuously, we do need some kind of a mechanism that deals with these issues. And the position of this group is not that this group is representing any sort of constituency or any part of, I mean, that it is not representing the ICANN community itself.

The goal that I see for this group is to provide assistance, cooperate with the ICANN core staff that deal with these external issues and provide support for them in terms of giving input into some of the issues that may be raised in external venues outside ICANN. And so, I mean, yes, the transition has happened and ICANN is going on its usual business. But, I mean, there are still significant movement outside of ICANN that is attempting to raise issues that eventually will be related with that or eventually can be related to ICANN issues.

And so those are issues that I don't think we can consider lightly. And so I mean, I don't think that, I mean, so I mean, that's basically my opinion that those are issues that we cannot ignore or that we cannot just let go. Thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much, Young Eum. Well just while we were discussing here I just told that, yes, okay, there are cross community working groups and well apparently this working group does not match the structure that is intended for these type of working groups.

But, probably, again, probably should not kill the working group just for technical reasons. That's one thing. Another thing, maybe we can come up with something like cross community monitoring group or if they're not working. But they do a lot of monitoring and they try to keep an eye on everything that's going on outside ICANN. And we definitely need somebody to keep an eye.

James Bladel: Thanks, Katrina. Thank you for your update as well. I have a queue starting here and we'll start with Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, James. Keith Drazek, Registry Stakeholder Group. So, you know, I do want to echo one of the things that James said earlier is that I think there is certainly the view that this is important work and that there is value in having the community be able to come together and to provide input to ICANN staff or ICANN Board on issues related to Internet governance.

But the challenge that we have here is the – this particular topic, the activities of the group and the nature of Internet governance really just don't fit the model of the currently-adopted CCWG structure. So I think we do have a challenge here.

And I think as we talk about, you know, sort of the topics that are discussed and the nature of the discussion in the CCWG IG, and I'm a participant and I've been monitoring the group and I think there has been good discussion. But there's no mechanism for that group to come together with a position and have that position referred back to the chartering organizations for review or approval or certification or anything.

So it's really more, in my view, sort of a discussion group or a discussion team that is doing important work but it doesn't have I think the – it doesn't fit the model in that it doesn't allow for the group to go through work, refer back to the chartering organizations, get an approval and then move forward with a message. So I think we really do need to look at an alternate structure. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Keith. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, James. Heather Forrest. I have a feeling we're in one of these positions within ICANN where we're actually saying the same thing and using different words. All of the concocters that I've heard from the ccNSO side mirror exactly the discussions that we're having in the GNSO. We likewise

have these concerns about whether or not this is the proper home for this exercise.

We of course, spoke to you in Marrakesh and raised questions in our meeting two meetings ago to say are you getting updates? Do you know really fully what's going on here? And do you know how this money is being spent from an accountability point of view? And those are the concerns we walked away from that meeting with you and said, well we're clearly not alone here. And those were the concerns that we tried to put into this motion.

And to pick up on points made by Keith, our intention is not to kill this thing fatally. It's not that we don't think it's a good idea. Keeping track of what happens outside of ICANN is indeed an excellent idea. However, given what we now know about CWGs and how they should be operating and the principles that we've agreed on with the ccNSO, we'd really like to come up with a solution here and meetings like this are excellent means of doing so, to find a mutually agreeable way of going about this, let's say.

We're not trying to kill it. We're trying to give it a more proper format so that we have better accountability, so that we have better oversight. So that we have a clearer structure that feeds into our day to day business and not just a discussion group as it were. So please understand the intention behind our motion is not malicious in a sense. It's not that we don't think this is worthy.

We intend to find it an immediate home but before we can do that we need to make our intentions clear of finding it a new home and so that the way that that happens is through a motion. We want this work to continue. It's valuable but we think it needs a different structure around it.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. Well, let me assure you we do not see any malicious intent forget about the Internet governance altogether. But if we all – all chartering organizations withdraw from this working group it will be dead. So it's – and probably that's not the right step before we have something else in

place. It was – I'm just trying to express some concerns we discussed yesterday.

James Bladel: So we have – I'm sorry, the gentlemen, was your name – please, we'll go to the floor first and then we'll go to you and then we'll go to Avri. So Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Greg Shatan for the record. Member of IPC and also member of the CWG on Internet Governance since the beginning, more active in the beginning. Initially the group was founded as a reaction to the then-impeding NetMundial. And prepared a series of I thought very good communications, comments into the NetMundial comment process, which in fact we did get input and approval from the community, at least that was my recollection.

So I don't know, Keith, maybe you weren't involved at that point, but we did have a mechanism to go back and get approval. I think that the group, as has been said, this is a critical concept, and it's more critical now that we're unmoored after the IANA transition. And in the – we are in the Internet governance ecosystem and need to be outward-looking as well as inward-looking.

That said, I think the group could use a reboot. I think we do need to have a clearer mandate. I think we need to do more in-reach. I think we need to inform the rest of the community on an ongoing basis about both the work of the group and the burning issues of Internet governance that are being monitored.

An internal discussion group is just a talk-shop. We don't need that. But this is a, as has been said, a critical thing, and we can take what we have here, reboot it, have a little existence kick in the pants from a potential withdrawal of support, and then try to, you know, shape it up so that it is something that is valuable to the community because many people on the community don't

pay a lot of attention to Internet governance beyond ICANN. I didn't until NetMundial.

Since then I've learned a huge amount just from being in this group and hearing from Nigel and (unintelligible) about what's going on. But I haven't done a good job to my own constituency, I'll admit, of telling them what I've learned. I do pass on emails and, you know, put them into the stream of 50,000 emails we all get.

So we need to rethink this. I think we're being a little formalistic in using the fact that it's not the CWG model. Let's just call it the standing group on Internet governance, say that it's got to have the outputs as well as inputs. And take it from there. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Greg. Good thoughts. Is it Peter?

Peter Vergote: (Unintelligible). Well, from what Keith, Heather and you have been saying, there is a very clear message conveyed that it's not about the relevance of the work, but just about the structure of the vehicle. Now I would be very interested to get some initial thoughts from the GNSO Council on what potential alternative there could be for a cross community working group and especially taking into account the important remark that any kind of alternative should at least be able to do some work that has an effective follow up so that it's not just a discussion group. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you. Avri.

Avri Doria: Avri Doria, excuse me, Avri Doria. I have been an observer in that group since the beginning, never one of its members. I think the idea of shutting it down is really mistaken and unfortunate. I think first of all, this notion that we've gotten into that now that we finally, between the two groups, gotten some notion of what a CCWG might be like, all of a sudden we've hardened

its shape and said oh, if you don't have the immediate configuration that we assume from CCWG definitions you can't be one.

So I think that that is another problematic view. I think that the group remains important and that almost every cross community working group needs to have its charter reviewed from time to time. I think the fact that we have abandoned it and we've allowed it to go without reviewing it, without reviewing its charter is a problem. And that should happen.

But I think to withdraw support as opposed to just indicate we want to review and rework the charter, is very problematic, somewhat sad and a mistake.
Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Avri. And anyone else want to speak onto this topic? Yes, please go ahead.

Young Eum Lee: I'd actually like to agree with what Avri just said. And would like to state that, I mean, basically I do agree with the concerns and the acknowledgement that it is a very important group. But – and your intentions of trying to I guess eventually the intentions of the GNSO and the ccNSO are basically I think very similar in that the issues are important and there needs to be some kind of a reboot or a reorganization or a re-recognition. And so that's – I would like to suggest that that would be a way forward rather than to put on the table withdrawing support as a phrase. Thank you.

James Bladel: Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Rafik Dammak. So speaking here as the cochairs for the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance from the GNSO side, we – I think we can understand all the concerns and maybe the kind of formal, say, the formal issue regarding the charter and so on. But I concur with the comment – the (unintelligible) comment that it's an opportunity maybe for charter review, for maybe restructuring or reorganizing.

The Internet governance issue are still ongoing. And we have an opportunity to get more the community involved. ICANN itself as an organization is participating in different forum. And the working group gave us the opportunity to get the community working with the staff.

If we shut down the working group, the staff will continue working on Internet governance issue and getting involved like lately in the (WTSA), and in Tunis. So let's use this an opportunity to review, maybe the word reform, restructure, the working group and not really to withdraw, I mean, not the GNSO withdrawing.

And just I want to highlight I don't think we have a position yet within the GNSO. We didn't discuss already this topic. And we have just the motion maybe to get vote. So just maybe to expand to the – our counterparty in the ccNSO that's still on topic and under discussion.

James Bladel: Thank you, Rafik. And that is an important correction that I had noted, I think it was one of the speakers from the ccNSO referred to the GNSO position. It is a motion that's on the table and under consideration by the GNSO, but it's not an adopted position. Next up I have Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. Picking up on Rafik's comments and the others that have been made, I wonder if the heart of this issue then is that we're finding we've come to this point and this group doesn't have, in our minds, clear deliverables that maybe that's the improvement that we need to make is we're not just having a group for the group sake but that the group has something that some sort of outcome that we want it to achieve.

I think that's our trouble with the notion of having this as a CWG, is a CWG is set up to do a particular task and report back on how it has achieved that particular task. So if that's maybe where we've – where we can make the

refinement here in whatever form that takes, maybe that's what we need to do. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay, I have Katrina, Nigel and then Byron. Katrina.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you. Just back to Heather's point, I think we shouldn't look at the cross community working group guideline as a normative standard. It's still a guideline. Probably shouldn't be so strict interpreting what it's saying. I'm not saying we should be too liberal with that but maybe we shouldn't be as strict as we try to be here. Yes, that's just a short comment and probably Nigel.

Nigel Hickson: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Nigel Hickson, ICANN staff. And of course I won't comment on the issue as such, all I wanted to say is that the Internet governance agenda, as other people have said, is all encompassing. I just came yesterday from Tunis where the ITU were having the World Telecommunications Standardization Assembly. And we were addressing a number of issues including whether the ITU should be involved in debating country cod names, sorry, debating geographical names, national names and other types of generic names.

So there is a number of issues going on. And being able to – if you like – discuss these in whatever forum, and having the input from the community is just so important from the staff, not just in terms of the words, but the feeling that when you are at these international negotiations, that there is something bigger than just the staff that the community does care about these issues. And I would like to thank the community because it's certainly helped us when we're at these discussions. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nigel. Byron and then Michele.

Byron Holland: Thank you. I think we should consider the environment that this working group came from. You know, it was the ghost of (WICIT), it was the – it was NetMundial, it was the transition. These were big, discrete, major existential

Internet governance issues. And it was perfectly reasonable for this group to be formed. I think if we look at the environment that we find ourselves in today, as Nigel just said, Internet governance is still certainly important but it's very different than the world we found ourselves in only a couple of years ago.

And I think as such, it's important to reflect on what is the right vehicle to provide input and feedback for these communities on this subject given the vehicle created is literally from a different era. And I think that as a result of that what we have today is probably not what we need going forward. We've heard comments around the structure of CWGs themselves not begin consistent with what the group is doing right now.

You know, I don't think we should let perfection be the enemy of the good. I think it's important for both communities to continue to pay attention and be involved in Internet governance even though the landscape has changed pretty dramatically. But it also I think is an appropriate time to reflect on the charter itself and what we expect. Certainly as a ccNSO Council member, my expectation is delivery of meaningful outcomes, be that in very informative reports, or recommendations for further participation in other parts of the ecosystem, etcetera. My expectation is hard deliverables.

But I think that it's probably important for both communities to have some kind of vehicle working group going forward with a reformatted charter that delivers on those kinds of outcomes. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Byron. Michele and then I believe Katrina is going to wrap us up.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. I think a lot of people have raised some very valid points around the importance of being able to discuss these topics, but as others have pointed out, it's possibly just a matter of the framing of that. I mean, there – I mean, I quite like Katrina's idea of – I don't know what the term was you used, but I think calling it something else.

I mean, ultimately if the – it's a mailing list, it's not – if it's just a mailing list where people are able to discuss things, there's no real resources involved. If it's under the current CCWG stuff then it becomes – it means extra resources and there are costs and everything associated with that. And I also agree with Byron, you know, deliverables and things like that are important.

I mean, for example, you know, could this group report to the GNSO Council on a regular basis and obviously to the ccNSO Council and others through some formal mechanism rather than some kind of haphazard oh I happened to read this on a mailing list, here's an update, which isn't particularly helpful.

I mean, I think the discussions are important but how that's done, it's not – it needs to be reframed. How you do that I'm not sure but that needs to happen. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you, Michele. And I'll pick up from your point, yes, I completely agree. We have to discuss how to proceed. And oh probably we at the ccNSO Council will try to look into the current charter and at least come up with some proposals that we could discuss with the GNSO Council on how to proceed, which new and other vehicle to choose, how to frame the work on that.

If the GNSO decides to withdraw from this working group, I'll just hope that all those members on this working group from the GNSO side who are currently on the working group will continue their – they will still be on the working group, they are welcome. And in any case I hope that we will find a way to ensure that this important work is being done and all the issues are addressed. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Katrina. And thanks to all who spoke on this topic. And just to be clear, we are not discussing necessarily withdrawing GNSO members from the working group, just withdrawing the GNSO's participation as a sponsoring – chartering organization for the charter. If that is indeed the decision of the

GNSO Council then we would certainly entertain either a rebooted charter or reformulated structure and potentially signing on as a chartering organization for that successor structure. But certainly it wouldn't have any impact on GNSO members who are currently participating.

Okay, that was a lively discussion. Thanks to all who contributed to that. And we can move on then to the CCWG on New gTLD Auction Proceeds. This charter and a motion for this charter has been put forward to the GNSO and it is part of our agenda on – my days are all mixed up – is it Monday? Okay, on Monday. And I think – I don't want to speculate necessarily but it looks like we're all systems go for this. But it is part of our discussions and we'd be interested in knowing what the status of this motion is on the ccNSO side.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much. As you may remember in March this year the ccNSO Council decided not to participate in the work on – of this cross community working group but later when we saw the charter we realized that actually many ccTLDs could contribute to the work of this working group because they have experience of dealing with some – no not just spending money, you know, spending money on very really good – a good thing. That makes a lot of difference.

So there are many, many ccTLDs that are involved in some community projects. So they could contribute to the work. So that's why we decided to be an active participate of this working group.

James Bladel: Sorry, so just to clarify the ccNSO has adopted the charter for the New gTLD Auction Proceeds or is considering it?

Katrina Sataki: We will adopt it, yes. We will adopt it.

James Bladel: Discussion? Seriously? Nobody? There's a lot of money on the table here. Yes, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Just give it all to me, that's all I want.

James Bladel: Okay. Well thank you for that update and I think we should have some more substantive news after our meeting on Monday. Next up, finally, we're out of the CCWG ocean and into non-CCWG hot topics. First one being future scheduling of ICANN meetings, block schedule and participation in high interest topics.

Just a note that we – and we had a bit of conversation yesterday during our GNSO working session that the scheduling for this particular meeting was an adventure, can I say that, in that, you know, we worked very hard internally within the GNSO to modify and open up our scheduling process for different sessions, and then when we rolled that up, and I think everyone who was aware, it our piece of the puzzle didn't fit because there were a number of discussions that had modified the structure of, for example, our Constituency Day, which is now scheduled for tomorrow.

And somehow that message was missed, and I would say it was my fault, but all seven of the stakeholder group and constituency chairs, including myself, all missed on that one. So somehow there was a breakdown in communication there that caused us to have to go back to the drawing board very late in the game. Some of us were getting on airplanes with still incomplete schedules.

And so I think the concern or at least the sentiment that was raised yesterday during our working sessions is that we've got to get our handle on this. There's clearly some things that are static from meeting to meeting and some things that change based on the current topics.

And how can we pin those down earlier so that it's not chaos at the 11th hour? And I think that we need to rally support not only within the GNSO and the ccNSO but across the entire community to take a more active role in

managing the scheduling of these meetings so that we can ensure that they're productive and effective.

And I'd be interested in knowing your thoughts on the scheduling and in particular in the high interest topics and how those were considered and scheduled and then we can just throw it open to the floor.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much, James. Well, well for us it came as a surprise that the GNSO was aware of block schedule. It really came as a surprise. Having said that, completely agree that the process was really messy. But at the same time I have to say that you, not noticing block schedule, add a little bit – added a quite a lot to the overall mess. So yes of course would be – we have to be more involved in the planning and say we need a timeline. We need a clear understanding of the – of the block schedules, common understanding.

And, yes, and I hope – I really hope that we can work out a way to ensure that we do – we're not in a mess, you know, two three weeks before the meeting or even, as you mentioned, still on a mess while traveling to the meeting.

But high interest topics, yes, again, it's not quite clear – well first actually yesterday we had a very interesting and fruitful discussion with ALAC. Of course they also noticed the mess and quite was impossible not to notice it. But and actually we came to a conclusion that probably high interest topics – topic is not a good term. Maybe we should use like cross community interest or common interest topic, not necessarily high interest topic. That's one thing.

Another thing yesterday we shouldn't discuss it in such a broad – and so many people involved. I know I think we should really limit the number of people who participate in the discussions. They can bring it back to their communities. But when there are – there are really enormous exchange of emails on topics like that, it's quite easy to miss the point that there is a block schedule or anything going on. It's well, yes, we get – I'm sure we can work

out a way to make it more efficient, less significant – significantly less messy. And, yes, ensure that there are really common interest topics.

So at least for us the Helsinki meeting most of the high interest topics were gTLD or GNSO-related. It's – I'm not saying it's not interesting but it probably it's not interesting for all of – so that would be interesting for all of us of course, yes, but we would like to have – to see some balance. Of course, gTLD is extremely important. New gTLDs, even more important. But again, for example Internet governance, how are we going to deal with these issues.

That could be one of the topics that we could come together and discuss for the right vehicle to ensure that we keep an eye on what's going on. Luckily at least at the ccNSO they have meetings program working group and the chair of the meetings program working group, Alejandra, she took care of everything. And I must say that it's really helpful to have one person who is responsible for keeping eye on everything that's going on. And definitely helps the structure.

Alejandra, anything you'd like to add about the process or any suggestions how to improve it?

Alejandra Reynoso: Yes, thank you, Katrina. Well, just to emphasize that in summary, the communication must be improved between the meeting strategy team and everyone else. For a while the email list was on, then they change it somehow and I, for example, got outside of the loop and started missing messages. And when I emailed them directly they wouldn't respond to my emails. I'm guessing they were overloaded with work and they had tons of emails also in their inbox. I'm not saying they were not doing anything. But I still didn't get any response from them.

I asked them what are you doing? How is the process for selecting the high interest topics going to be made? And until today I still don't have a response. But I think those are the key issues that need to be addressed. I think

communication and establishment of clear processes. For example, when we were talking about the high interest topics, they gave us three days to suggest high interest topics for our community in Thursday. And by Saturday they must be submitted. And I'm like, what am I going to do?

So of course I reach out and we managed to figure something out but it was a very, very, very tight timeframe. Then, it was not clear how they were – they will be selected. Should only one person per constituency vote? Should as many as possible vote? And how should we vote? When it was released, again in a very short time, I don't remember how short it was this time, they requested to select which high topics met the criteria of having a title, summary, background and sort of layout. But that doesn't mean that we were voting on subjects we were interested in. Only to see if they fit the criteria. So that make things a little hard also.

But other than that, if we can have a clear communication and clear procedures I think we can manage to have a better organization.

Katrina Sataki: And clear timeline probably known in advance...

((Crosstalk))

Katrina Sataki: ...so that we don't have to rush it in three days' time.

James Bladel: I have Michele and then Keith.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I mean, first off this – the actual title, you know, high interest topics, is really really misleading. I think it was probably appropriate when they first introduced it about a year and a half or so ago, I think there was this idea, you know, this is a big topic, we all want to talk about. At that time that made sense.

But now, there are so many it's become more like these are plenary sessions. So can we just call them something like that? I don't know, plenary sessions or big sessions or something else, I don't know. But the selection thing was completely insane. Several groups that I'm involved with put forward proposals. And then there seemed to be this completely arbitrary selection process. It wasn't clear as Alejandra says, how you were meant to do this. Was it meant to be the GNSO Council votes or was it that each stakeholder group has a single vote? Every member of the community has a single vote?

And then you end up with this list and it's like who chose? Oh wait a second, the GAC asked for it so they get it automatically? The rest of us ask for it we don't get it. Nobody ever thought about combining them. Now you would swear at times when you're looking at some of these things that ICANN is the only organization that ever organizes meetings. That nobody else ever organizes meetings, they couldn't possibly go and look at how South by Southwest has like, you know, things like their panel-picker, RIPE manages to organize meetings. (RN) organizes meetings.

They seem to do this without this conflict. Yet ICANN is incapable of organizing these things or coming up with a schedule without us all ending up with massive headaches. And it needs to stop because this high interest topic thing ended up where a bunch of them are up against topics where, you know, the Registrars can't attend because there's like the one and only time they get to talk with one particular group. So I don't know, something needs to be changed. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, James. Keith Drazek. Yes, so I'm not going to talk about the process, the selection process. It sounds like we have very similar experiences and experienced similar challenges. But I want to echo what Michele said about, you know, when the hot topics or high interest topics were, you know, this concept was introduced, I think the idea was, look,

there's a big issue that needs to be discussed, there's interest across the community. This is an opportunity to carve out some space in the schedule, in a very busy schedule, to bring the community together to have a discussion, to have, you know, input or, you know, and engagement.

And I think that that was fine then. It may be necessary in the future at some point. But I think unless there's a general sense, you know, among the community that there's a particular topic that should be discussed, then maybe we don't need the high interest or the hot topic sessions anymore; maybe it's on a, you know, meeting by meeting basis to assess the community. Say, you know, what are your top three issues, each group, top three issues. And then is there any consistency across the community on any of those issues? Maybe, then, you have the high interest session.

But I think the selection process was clearly flawed because we ended up with eight and that sort of I think – I think that shows in of itself that they are not necessarily high interest in the cross community sense. Thanks.

James Bladel: We'll go Ching and then Alejandra.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, James. This is Ching Chiao. I'd like to echo what Keith and also Michele just said especially for one of the high interest session I would like to personally attend to is actually directly in direct conflict the ccNSO Council session. So I would like to probably the topic a little bit back to the scheduling part.

I think the, I mean, the schedule itself we've been through the change this year so I think people that I personally speak to were very happy about like not very but at least generally happy about what happened in Helsinki, shorter meeting policy focus. People that I spoke to were happy about the GDD format held earlier this year, very business-driven focus meetings.

Are we benchmark those meetings to this longer version here? I mean, does the satisfactory rate higher in this meeting? Does any of the staff or, you know, people that's running the meetings get, you know, more compensated or less compensated because of the level of, I mean, the satisfactory of the participants? I'm just throwing some ideas out there. I guess this is a good trial for us. But since a longer meeting that creates even more messier processes than kind of a lower, I mean, satisfactory rate here, while we been through several shorter meetings that seems to be more productive.

But I mean so anyway personally I think it's good to have AGM but in this format or better arrange format could be a topic for future discussion. My two cents.

James Bladel: Thanks, Ching. Alejandra and then Jay.

Alejandra Reynoso: Yes thank you. This is Alejandra. Just picking up on these hot topics got to this meeting, I'm guessing that they're trying to mimic what happened in Helsinki, that you will have all the morning and a little bit of the afternoon for your constituency meetings, and then cross community sessions. I think that's what they aim.

Also, on the quantity and the scheduling of these high interest topics, it was to me a mystery until the very – until they were selected, then we knew there were going to be eight. And then we knew when they were going to be placed in this schedule. So I agree, it must be improved. How many of those are needed, and know beforehand when they're going to take place so we can schedule accordingly.

James Bladel: Thank you. Jay.

Jay Daly: Thank you. So I speak first as a – as somebody who has got a high interest topic onto the agenda. Sorry, this is Jay Daley from dotNZ. So I'm running one which is the question and answer session with John Jeffery on ICANN

Legal and how it supports the multistakeholder community, which I'm sure you will all come to.

We have a very rigid very siloed structure within ICANN. And to – for any topic to get to the stage where it can be discussed, often requires a working group, well I can't even bother going through the process, a lengthy process to get something to the stage of discussion. So while I understand that the high interest topics were – could have been handled much better, could have been named better, could have been done better, it has, for one of the first times, provided an opportunity for almost spontaneous important topics to come forward.

And I'm not sure I could have got something such as a question and answer session with John Jeffery onto the main agenda if this opportunity hadn't arisen. So I'm pleased with it from that perspective, though I recognize that it is still a flawed process to have achieved that.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jay. The queue is clear. Does anyone else wish to speak to this topic? We have one more agenda topic here and about 10 minutes to cover it. The next item is the implementation of new bylaws. This is also something that the Council is expected to consider in its meeting on Monday. We had a team chaired by Steve DelBianco who is at the table to put together a report on how the new bylaws would be implemented at the GNSO.

Would be interested in hearing how the ccNSO addressed that and then any status update that you wish to share on how your integration of the new bylaws is proceeding.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you. We at the ccNSO we have a guidelines review committee. Initially when it was created it was tasked to review the existing documents and try to ensure that they match our current practices, because some were really obsolete.

When we had to start working on our internal processes for this transition, starting with selecting our members to the Customer Standing Committee and other things, so we used the existing vehicle to ensure that these documents are in place on time.

And probably now I would give the floor to Stephen, Stephen is – we actually selected Steven to be our representative on the EC administration. So he will tell you more. He's an active member of the guideline review committee.

Stephen Deerhake: Stephen Deerhake for the record. We are actively working on development of specific guideline in line with the guidelines that the review committee has been working on over the last year plus we have drafted and he has graciously agreed, our rapporteur from the CCWG, Jordan Carter, to help us with this since he's intimately involved with – knows the output of that.

And we expect to have draft document before the review committee at its next teleconference, which I believe is the 21st of November. And it should be adopted by the Board shortly thereafter – by the Council, rather, shortly thereafter. And I'm curious to hear from my counterpart, James, from the GNSO, how you guys are coming along.

James Bladel: Well I probably will lean on Steve as well. But just to note that we have that report from the drafting team. It is part of our consideration at this meeting. We have adopted some I guess interim steps to ensure that we're participating not only in the empowered community on an interim basis but also we have filled our slot for the registry and non-registry members for the CSC.

I think what we're looking for we've used I think similar to the ccNSO we've used our existing processes to fill those immediate concerns so that those were in place for the transition. But going forward we are examining more permanent processes and permanent structures to deal with those in the future.

Steve, I don't know if I can put you on the spot here if you'd like to address some of those or give us maybe the high level...

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco. The drafting team recommendations, which were consensus but not unanimous, are going to be considered by GNSO Council on Monday, but they would suggest that Council itself would speak for the GNSO and the – all the new rights and responsibilities of the bylaws. And there are some exceptions to that. So for instance, any of the constituencies and stakeholder groups within GNSO would be able to do a document request, one of our new rights, and that would pass right through Council; Council wouldn't say anything about it.

The nominations of members – potential members for the review teams, the new specific reviews, could be made by any of the seven stakeholder groups and constituencies in GNSO and they would each have up to one, which gives you a total of seven nominations.

But all the other significant powers would be decided by Council in its current structure and most of those would be by a majority of each house of Council. We didn't make a significant supermajority requirement except for about a dozen items where the ultimate point of escalation of a power like recalling the Board or blocking a bylaw. We tried to be liberal requiring only a majority for the steps leading up to the ultimate decision. So having a community forum, right, going to the next step, we wanted to be liberal about that because we're only one of the separate – the groups in the empowered community and we didn't want to be holding it up if we think a majority is enough to move ahead.

So that'll be voted on on Monday and then we have a process of changing GNSO's procedures as well as a small section of ICANN's bylaws where the GNSO Council voting methods are delineated.

Stephen Deerhake: If I may follow up? We are thinking along similar lines with regards to trying to avoid supermajority in the decision-making process as much as possible.

James Bladel: Thank you. Any other thoughts or comments from the floor? I notice that the queue is clear. And we're just about out of time but I think folks have probably talked about some of these enough. But just a note circling back to Item 3a, if you don't mind, we had a lot of discussion on meeting schedule. And there's been some discussion in the chat as well.

One recommendation would be that we use the SO AC opportunity to raise the proposal that we start working on the Copenhagen schedule now and have at least the block schedule in place before everyone starts to disappear for the holidays so that we can come back and it's not an 11th hour scramble to get that fleshed out, that we start that process as soon as possible after everyone's returned back from Hyderabad. And we'll just take that as an action item here so that we can have some concrete steps coming out of this discussion.

And I'm sure that we would find that that would be enthusiastically joined by some of the other SOs and ACs based on their experience for scheduling for this.

Katrina Sataki: Fully support this proposal. We really need clarity early in the process, otherwise that – it does get messy.

James Bladel: We have five minutes if anyone would like to take the floor and make any parting statements or anyone have any, you know, we heard a number of political jokes in the opening ceremonies, if anybody thinks they can top that. Otherwise we can break a little early and join one of the first high interest topic sessions I think is coming up next. You had one? Okay the second, sorry. But otherwise I'd like to thank, again, all of our colleagues from the ccNSO Council for joining us. I think these are good sessions for exchanging

views and I hope they continue. Let's make sure that we get those as a permanent...

Katrina Sataki: Yes.

James Bladel: ...entry on the block schedule.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much. It's been really, really helpful for us and this exchange on where you are, what are your concerns, how we can address them, it's really valuable to discuss on such a format. So thank you very much for having us here.

END