KATRINA SATAKI: Welcome to the ccNSO Council meeting, 14 February 2019. We have received apologies from Margarita Valdes. No other apologies received. Please mute if you're not talking, because I can already hear some noises in Adobe room. Thank you.

Minutes from our January meeting were circulated on the mailing list. We haven't received any comments, so they are approved. Action items. First, secretariat to develop [inaudible] ccTLD world e-mail list is completed. We'll discuss it in agenda as item number six. Then those – we also have another one where we asked the chair of the ccNSO council along with Peter Vergote the secretariat to inform the community of this topic of moving the joint [inaudible] with the GAC to Sunday so that they can prepare their arguments. This is partly overtaken by events. We'll talk about them more when we talk about the meeting with GAC.

The next one, action item, inform relevant ICANN staff regarding [inaudible] That's done. Again, we had call for volunteers – yeah, Stephen has his hand up. Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. Is there [inaudible] the GAC got an itch about that we need to be prepared for, or it's just rescheduling?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, we'll maybe talk about that when we get to GAC.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]l.

KATRINA SATAKI: We'll talk about that in more detail.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Fine. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thanks. Then we have a call for volunteers for our liaison [inaudible] to ALAC. I just saw we're going to have a second round of voting for two competing candidates. Then there is – sorry, yeah, we have informed the community and submitted our statement. Then we have also the [GRC review proposed repository] of bylaw changes. We'll talk more detail later.

Then – yeah, actually, talk about what to do next. It's agenda item – again, the repository has been created. Discuss it later. Oh, surprisingly, we haven't had any interest [inaudible]. Yeah. Speaking about our liaisons again, we had one candidate for our liaison to ALAC, and [inaudible] that candidate goes forward, [inaudible] from dot-ng. And as I already mentioned, we had to go for a second round of voting on GNSO liaison.

So, the question to you, first, [inaudible] it looks like we are quorate, excellent. Should we go forward with appointing ALAC liaison now and

GNSO liaison? Intermeeting decision or you want to prefer to appoint both at the same time, which again means [inaudible] intermeeting decisions.

Any suggestions? Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Given that we've got a definite decision on one, let's go ahead and do that, and [inaudible] looks like it's going into a [run-up,] which is unprecedented, but [what the what?]

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Okay, I think I see that – thank you, Stephen, I see that Giovanni, Alejandra, yeah, and Peter, so there is support from you, which means that I have to ask for a mover. Anyone would like to move? [Alejandra,] and [Demi] seconded. Thank you. Anyone would like to [inaudible] there is anything? Demi, did you want to say something, or that's just your – yeah, that's your seconding hand.

Thank you. Yeah, you see the decision in front of you, just remove the line of the liaison to the GNSO, so any references to GNSO should be removed. Otherwise, this is a decision that we have [inaudible] liaison to ALAC, [inaudible] dot-ng. Anyone [vote again?] No. Anyone abstain? No, which means that [inaudible] appointed as our liaison. And he also should be invited to our onboarding session. That probably will take place on Tuesday during lunch time.

Okay, thank you. Let's move to the next agenda item. Reissue the call for volunteers to SOPC, and we received three applications from three

EN

volunteers. [There is a] proposal to appoint all of them to the SOPC. [inaudible] anyone would like to move? Hiro moves, Giovanni seconds. Thank you very much. So, anyone would like to say anything on that? I think the SOPC now is getting really big. I hope that Giovanni will be able to manage so many people. Not easy. So many documents to review. Giovanni, please.

GIOVANNIE SEPPIA: Yeah. Thank you, Katrina. I think it's also a matter not of just quality as well, so I hope the new volunteers will also participate proactively in the work. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. [inaudible]. So, let's go to voting then. Anyone would like – well, anyone is against? No. Anyone abstain? No, so I assume that everyone is in favor. Thank you very much.

Next agenda item, update to the ccTLD world e-mail list procedures. May I ask Joke to give a really brief intro to the proposals, to the nature of the proposals? Joke.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hi, Katrina. Thank you very much. So the [inaudible] of the proposals is actually divided into two parts. First of all, there is a proposal to edit the procedural documentation for the ccTLD world mailing list, and once that has been done, there is in the background documentation an overview of which steps would be needed in order to clean up the mailing list and to make sure that the list of subscribers is accurate and

EN

up to date and that everybody has agreed to the applicable rules regarding the privacy regulation. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:
Thank you very much. Are there any questions, suggestions or comments to the proposed amendment? So, if not, can we formally agree with the proposals and [inaudible] implement the procedures to ensure that the list of subscribers to this ccTLD world e-mail list is up to date? So I hope everybody supports that. Thank you very much.

Let's move forward then. So, ccNSO-related ICANN bylaw changes. First, you saw in the background materials [we have started] summarizing all the changes that we think are necessary for the [inaudible] the bylaws to make sure that everything works fine for the ccNSO and we are in line with [inaudible] bylaws.

So currently, there are two things. One thing is, if you remember, Stephen, in his capacity as the chair of PDP working group, informed us about the findings of the working group. They discovered that the definition of ccTLD could be changed, and that is one of the things that need to be corrected in the bylaws.

In the repository table, all those changes that we need, there's also – I only tried to highlight what should be the procedure for changes like that. And in case when the next agenda item, [IFRT,] that's for example the fundamental of bylaws, which means that we will need to go through approval, actually, [inaudible]. We need [inaudible] support from two more decisional participants, which means that we will need

to work proactively with our peers to make sure that they support the change.

Going back to the definition of the ccNSO membership, we see that we cannot go back to the wording that was used before the change, before this mentioned [inaudible] something that we do not want to have. So we definitely need to fix at least that part. The proposed way forward would be that we consult with the ccNSO members [inaudible] and ccTLDs during our meeting or even prior to that. So that [inaudible] ccTLD support [inaudible] change.

Next is the requirement for IFRT. [I'll probably finalize it] here. I will try to give a brief summary of the history, how it all [developed.] Remember when we worked on this IANA stewardship transition document, this was IFR, IANA function review, was one of the mechanisms in the bylaws to make sure that IANA naming function serves the purpose and [works happily.]

During the discussion, one of the things that was boasted as we have ccTLD communities represented by three members on this IANA function review team, so two would be representatives of ccTLDs that are members of the ccNSO, and one would be a representative from ccTLD that is not a member.

As you remember, this was really difficult for us to find this nonmember, because apparently, all active ccTLDs are already members and nobody stepped forward. And that is why we proposed to move forward with two members and one interim member, [inaudible] skilled

representative from a non-ccNSO member steps forward, then we will change the composition of our membership.

And we proposed this way forward. So before I go further into details how it all evolved, regardless of how it all evolved, we need to change that. It's clear that we need to change that, because in the future, it might be even more difficult to find non-ccNSO members as membership is growing, really growing. Yeah, so this is one of the changes that we need to [implement.] But again, this is a fundamental bylaw, which means that we approve of [this.]

So this is just for information. And going further about this [inaudible] if you remember, so we appointed these interim representatives, [informed] ICANN Org, and they [inaudible] clearly there's a need to seek opinion from other appointing groups, which means -Stephen, I see your hand, but let me finish first.

So, this comes from other appointing groups, which is Registry Stakeholder Group, they have two, and then there are other stakeholder groups [inaudible] members, and then there are members from ALAC, GAC, some of the [inaudible] members now. So again, we agreed that we write our explanatory notes to be added to the e-mail sent out by [Trang] to all other appointing groups.

I cannot confirm now, but it looks like one of the groups has an objection to this interim appointment because clearly, the bylaws say that we need to appoint a nonmember, and therefore interim member [appointment] would be against the bylaws.

EN

Technically, they are of course right, but at the same time, I would argue that the main issue – well, main idea of the composition is that ccTLDs are represented by three members, not two members, one, two ccNSO members and one member, which is, yeah, it's an additional requirement, but at the same time, if the decision would be that ccTLDs cannot have three representatives, then I think we need to strongly object to this [inaudible] moving forward, because clearly, ccTLDs need to be represented by three members. And it's not that we tried to hide the fact that – or we're not able to find a non-ccNSO member. On the contrary, we showed all our efforts or everything that we did to try to get one, and we failed, we proposed a way forward to [inaudible] and this proposal, yeah, unfortunately cannot have nonmember, but at the same time, it follows the requirement in the bylaws and it says the composition of the team shall – that each team shall consist of these representatives.

So yeah, I think that ccTLD must be represented by three [– we are direct customers of] IANA functions, therefore we need to be properly represented on this team. Of course, one of the [inaudible] ccNSO membership, and then when they [inaudible] but this would be really [inaudible] solution.

So that is where we are at the moment. Still, we haven't received any proposal from ICANN for how to move forward. I just tried to summarize the information and see what you think. Do you have any ideas, additional arguments that we could use if such a need arises? Stephen, you had your hand up. Do you still want to say anything?

EN

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. I'm good with what you said. Thank you, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Any other comments? No? Okay, then maybe going back to 7.1, what do you think about the proposed structure of this repository? Are you happy with that? You may want to add something, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, Katrina, I think it's fine idea. Actually, I have another one in my head, but [inaudible] out of my head, so I don't have it on top of my [head] at this point in time, but we are obviously coming up to a [decision] point to submit to the board several bylaw changes, and I think the repository is a great vehicle for documenting them and putting them out in front of the community, and as a result soliciting community input on them. And I think if there is a deficiency in what we're doing at this point in time, it's how we formally ask the community to respond to our proposed changes. So I think maybe we need to give some consideration to this, how that part of the process happens. But otherwise, I'm very pleased with this. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you very much, Stephen. Any other comments [inaudible] is it accessible? Stephen, [could you] lower your hand? Yeah, and so Demi's comment, [inaudible] non-ccNSO member, ccNSO is a body within ICANN structure, we are organized on like [inaudible]. So I think at the time, it was decision to have it.

Well, okay, so let's publish the repository on the Wiki page and declare it, we'll maintain it as directed by the council or chair or as soon as we receive any information about the need to change the bylaws.

Okay, thank you. If there are no more questions about this, let's move forward. Our next agenda item, as you remember when we decided to withdraw from the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance, we decided that we need to create this Internet governance liaison committee, and so in background materials, you can find the draft terms of reference for this committee.

Anyone would like to say anything about the draft terms of reference? Unfortunately, we don't have a decision here, but yeah, I'm sure we can all imagine [inaudible] resolution would be [inaudible] that we adopt the terms of reference and ask the secretariat to [inaudible] some representatives from the community but also two councilors [inaudible] if I remember correctly the numbers here. So, anyone would like to move? Pablo, thank you. Demi seconded. Thank you.

So, would u agree with the decision that we adopt the draft terms of reference for this committee and asks the secretariat to send out a call for volunteers? Anyone against? No. Anyone abstain? No. Thank you. One of the action items, [please] secretariat send out a call for volunteers for this committee.

Okay, thank you. Next one is a quick update about the risk mitigation [inaudible] fast track process. The working party developed documents and updated the guideline reviews, risk mitigation plan submitted by [EURid about the dot-eu in Greek] and also drafted the letter to the

board and we're waiting for feedback from the full SSAC, what hey think about it. If they are fine, then we can proceed, move forward with [inaudible] send it to the entire council. So, [please not that] you have materials [except] this risk mitigation [thing, because] at this stage, it would be a little bit premature to [send the] plan itself. This is just a quick update where we are. If everything moves according to plan, we will have you informed [inaudible]

Okay, so next one, CSC effectiveness review. Thanks all for your comments, your suggestions [inaudible] council statement, council comment on this draft report. [Debbie,] anything? Wake up, Debbie. Anything you'd like to [inaudible]

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I am still awake, Katrina. I think you did a great job summarizing it in the e-mail, and I [saw the] one-page comment that covers off everything that needs to be covered off, and I know that the review team will very much welcome the council making that sort of [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Thank you very much, and thanks again for being so efficient and not wasting time [and resources.] Thank you. [inaudible]. Yeah, so the statement, [inaudible] the efforts of the team for their findings, their recommendations. Any questions on this one? No? Thank you. Let's move to the next then.

PDP working group. Anything new from you, Stephen?

EN

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes. We actually have moved on into discussion of proposed written policy. We actually have a meeting coming up in a few hours. We kind of rotate around our time, so [inaudible] so occasionally, we bump up against the council meeting. I hope to have something finalized by the AGM in the fall. I suspect we may roll over one more meeting, so it will be another year, but we're making progress. We have actual facts that we're debating at this point in time. And if anybody wants further detail [inaudible] just contact me and I'll give you an update. And if you want to [listen in,] participate, etc., by all means. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Stephen. Any questions? Apparently not. Well, it takes longer than we hoped, but –

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I hope we get it done by the AGM. Let's put it that way.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thanks. Next agenda item ten, ccNSO organizational review. There is not much to report. We are waiting for some draft reports, and next week, we're going to have a call, the review working party will have a call with the independent reviewers. You'll see what they have discovered and what they want to recommend. Stephen, anything you want to add to this?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. Is that a definite that we'll be chatting with them on the 19th?

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, the call has been scheduled, but unless we decide that we don't need call, yes, we're going to have it. My understating is that they're going to send us a draft report, so if we think there's nothing much to discuss, we can cancel the call. But unless we cancel it, we [inaudible].

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Cheers. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: [inaudible] present draft findings. Yeah, so we'll have more for that in Kobe. And actually, in Kobe, we'll have a session dedicated to all these findings and [inaudible] want to present them to the community and discuss with the community.

Okay. Let's move to next agenda item. Stephen again, ECA. Anything from ECA?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No. We're in a rejection action with regards to the IANA budget. I don't see anything happening there. We had yet another change of actors [inaudible] but other than that, all is quiet at the moment, and I expect all to be quiet. I do not anticipate anything coming out of the board in the foreseeable future that would require an approval action, so things are very quiet, continue to be quiet, and I continue to hold the pen and keep an eye on what's going on. And if anything develops, well, let everybody know. And I think that's it. Thank you, Katrina.

EN

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah. Thank you, Stephen. Any questions? Yeah, an exchange with the other [AC] members, we agreed to have some onboarding materials. [inaudible] actually started already working on [inaudible] slides, used our slides which we used for our community in the past. Just need to add something specifically related to ECA.

Okay, thank you about that. CSC. Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Katrina. At the last meeting of the CSC, we noted that the report from IANA was 100% clean following a 98.4% report form the month before, so they continue to track it at a very high level. So that's their basic job, so from that perspective, they are doing well.

In terms of some of the other issues at play, going forward, as some of you may remember, originally there was no travel funding available to CSC members because the idea was that the members would be coming from the Registry Stakeholder Group of the GNSO or from ourselves, from the ccNSO, and that the general idea is that the members would already be at ICANN meetings because of their respective day jobs.

However, as time has gone on, what we have found is that is not necessarily the case. However, the respective bodies continue to support their representatives on the CSC like we did with Jay Daley when he left dot-NZ but we continued to support his membership on the CSC. But he didn't have a way to get to ICANN meetings during that period, and the GNSO has experienced the same thing. So we as the CSC

are making a budget request of ICANN that they support travel funding as required for members of the CSC who require it. That's something a little bit new.

A couple of the main pieces of work that the CSC has been engaged on over the last 18 months or so are really coming to a close. That includes the service level agreement change mechanism, which is really in the final strokes and now essentially has to get board approval. We hope that that will be happening in Kobe, but that is unclear on timing. But that is the goal, although that timing is now out of our hands.

The remedial action procedures are essentially at the very final stages, approved by CSC and PTI, so we're in good shape there. [And for the effectiveness surveys has been, I guess, completed,] although that's not directly, of course, in our remit. And the results of the annual PTI and IANA survey have just been completed, and overall, the survey results continue to be very favorable for IANA, although as in the past, participation is extremely low, which it's difficult to get any statically significant results as a result of the low participation rates. The only thing they can glean from that is that silence gives consent.

The results they do have are positive, and the fact that nobody is complaining is probably an indication that the services are being delivered at a level that the community finds acceptable, although silence isn't a great result and I would continue to encourage our community to fill in the survey when it comes around next time. There will be a face-to-face meeting in Kobe on Monday, March 11th in the morning, and the goal is that we will also have a meeting, the CSC will have a meeting with the PTI board. And I think that that's still a work in

progress in terms of scheduling. That's all I had to report, unless there's any questions.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Byron. I see Stephen has a question. Stephen? Stephen, please unmute.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Byron, my question to you is – thank you for the report – is there anything council can do proactively to promote the funding that you described shortfalls for?

BYRON HOLLAND: I'm not sure. I suppose the only thing would be some sort of letter of support. It's certainly not that we have been denied or anything. This is a first time, and we have gone through the ICANN budget request submission process. So at this stage, things are proceeding as per plan. I don't know, your question is an interesting one, and maybe your question is more than just a question, but a good suggestion as well that if the ccNSO council wrote a letter of support for that request – it certainly couldn't harm and would probably be helpful in raising the profile of it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Thank you.

EN

BYRON HOLLAND: Maybe I will leave that question with Katrina to see if that's something that we could do just in terms of a letter of support from the ccNSO council recognizing that not every member always has funding available to them.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, in that case, technically, we can of course do that, and maybe we should support it, but then [inaudible] question [why should we use a ccNSO slot for that?]

BYRON HOLLAND: That's true, and I think the response to that is because sometimes the membership of the CSC is not comprised of a ccNSO-paid employee, or rather a ccNSO member paid employee, and thus while the ccNSO as a body has put that person on the CSC, there may not be the funding that was initially anticipated when all of these bodies were created back in the mists of time of the IANA transition.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Alright. And I feel we need to fund them to be there, certainly to be at the face-to-face meeting, so that's why I asked that question. Thank you, Byron.

EN

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you. [inaudible] comment period for budget [inaudible] we cannot [inaudible] to the comment at the moment, so let's [inaudible] and if there are any issues, we'll see how to proceed. We'll see if your request is accepted, and if not, then we clearly need to do something and look for a possible way forward. Thank you very much. Thanks for the [inaudible]. Thanks for the update.

If there are no more question, let's move to the next agenda item, RZERC. No report from RZERC. Most of the time, it's a very dormant group. That was the idea of the RZERC.

So speaking about Kobe, you see the list of all the ccNSO council meetings. First, we have a workshop, then we have a prep meeting [during the month,] we have a meeting with ALAC in the evening, [inaudible] meeting with the GNSO during Monday lunch and our council meeting on Wednesday. We need to do our annual [inaudible] roles and responsibilities, including chair and the two vice chairs – well, traditionally go with two. It's not a requirement, but traditionally, we had two vice chairs [inaudible] all those roles and responsibilities.

I've already mentioned last time [inaudible] council workshop, Bart and I are working with David [inaudible] our facilitator, and I think we have a very interesting agenda for our face-to-face meeting. We will inform you closer to the meeting, you'll get some prep materials to make sure that the workshop is [inaudible] and brings us value.

Then, yeah, Alejandra, our ccNSO [inaudible] the floor is yours.

EN

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Katrina. So, you can see in front of you our ccNSO block schedule, the things that are highlighted are the changes from the last update. You can see on Thursday that the public forum part two has been split into two sessions [inaudible] related. One is ICANN board session on governance, and then the public forum [inaudible] a little bit. Also, there is a little arrow on the joint meeting with ALAC [inaudible] the last document the timing was not correct, but now it states clearly that it's only for 45 minutes, so for you to consider that.

Can we move to the agenda, please? Thank you very much. So this is the current draft of the agenda of the sessions that have a green tick on them, are the ones that are completely confirmed with all the participants of the session. We're still in the process of confirming some presenters, but that should be done quickly, so no need to worry.

Can we move a little bit forward in the document? There, thank you. So, where you see an arrow or [inaudible] the sessions that changed from the last time. We moved the [inaudible] study group sessions to Tuesday due to scheduling things. And now we have a legal session. These [inaudible] to the call for presenters that [inaudible] launch for the ccTLD [news] session. Some of them were more on the legal side, and then these sessions evolved into becoming one. So now we have a very interesting legal session on Wednesday, and the next thing you need to know, this is the final session, needs to be rescheduled for some conflicting agendas, and we are planning on maybe switching it with the emoji study group, but we still need confirmation that the times that we are proposing are the ones that actually fit the presenters' agenda.

Moving a little forward, the last arrow you can see is the session with the ccNSO-appointed ICANN board members. That needed to be moved from where it's originally planned, and that is that. If you have any questions, comments, please let me know, and I will be sending these two documents to you soon.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Alejandra. Any questions? Okay, no questions. This is the time when we can talk about our meetings with – and the board. First, about the GAC. Thanks a lot, Peter, for your efforts [inaudible] agenda. Now, currently, we have the following topics. One is status report on our [ccPDP requirements.] Clearly, GAC would like to hear that even though I think they still haven't appointed any representative to the working group. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, they have not. And do I need to go and appeal once again asking for one? Question to you, Katrina, as chair.

KATRINA SATAKI: This is a good question. I don't know how many times we can ask or [inaudible] if there's no interest. Yeah, maybe you could point out that there's still no one from the GAC, but [inaudible] there's nothing we can do about it. They get [inaudible]

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, there's not, but I think it's very [key to make sure we document we] asked and asked, and when they possibly express displeasure with the result, we can say we asked. [inaudible] and you didn't respond.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, it's a good point, but I can tell you that [inaudible] have some objections to the final [inaudible]. Peter, you have a suggestion.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm happy to make the appeal yet again in our face-to-face with them, but only if you think it's worthwhile.

KATRINA SATAKI: Do it for the record. Peter, [inaudible] suggestions from you?

PETER VERGOTE: Yes. Hi, Katrina. Hi all.

KATRINA SATAKI: Please go on.

PETER VERGOTE: Yes. Hi, Katrina. Hi all.

KATRINA SATAKI: We can't hear you.

PETER VERGOTE: To respond to –

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, Peter, we cannot hear you. Cannot hear you. peter, can you hear us? Okay. And there is a background noise from someone. Yeah, okay. Peter, sorry, we cannot hear you. Please use chat window.

PETER VERGOTE: Can you hear me now?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, now we can hear you.

PETER VERGOTE: Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes.

PETER VERGOTE: Can you hear me now?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, we can hear you now. But not anymore. For the third time, yes, we can hear, but that's all we can hear –

EN

PETER VERGOTE: You can hear me now?

KATRINA SATAKI: We hear only, "You can hear me now?"

PETER VERGOTE: Come on.

KATRINA SATAKI: [inaudible]. Okay, maybe let's move forward. Peter, sorry. Something is not working. We hear a couple of words and then you disappear.

PETER VERGOTE: I just wanted to say that I would not object –

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, other thing that we got a proposal for our meeting with GAC, the proposal was from CENTR, they asked regional organizations if their members would like to discuss anything with GAC, and there were suggestions that talk about DNS over HTTPS and to give the GAC information about what it is, what does it mean to have this [inaudible] widely implemented. And [inaudible] Peter [inaudible] have a presentation on that, and I hope that it's going to generate some interest from the GAC.

I suspect that those are old hands from Stephen and Peter, so please lower them. Another item for our discussion is the discussion about moving the slots for GAC [inaudible] session to Sunday before ICANN opening. That's not for Kobe meeting but for other meetings after Kobe.

Why? Because apparently GAC meets with other SO/ACs on Sunday. We believe that this might not be a good thing for ccTLDs, as if we meet during our face-to-face meetings with GAC, so our ccTLDs have opportunity to communicate with their GAC representatives, those who have them.

That's one of the arguments against moving, and this is something that we would like to bring up with the GAC. We probably need more arguments one way or the other and see what GAC thinks about [inaudible] whether they really want to have meeting on Sunday, which would mean that many ccTLDs might not be there, or they prefer [inaudible] Tuesday or Wednesday.

So what we think, and I think that's closer to the meeting, we should send an e-mail to the community and ask for their inputs, whether they're happy with meeting on Sundays or they still think that ccTLDs [would prefer to] leave it as it is, meaning that we meet during [inaudible] meeting.

So, [inaudible] anything you'd like to add to the plans, meaning the community provide their input? There are some other possible items for discussion. Peter has finalized them [inaudible] partner and GAC are setting agenda together. So, [we're going to] talk about EPDP in GNSO, not that we have much to say, but something that's related to –

EN

something that might interest GAC [inaudible] on CC perspective on this.

Do we want to know what are their priorities for ICANN strategic plan? Maybe some other things. And there's something more about regulation that different governments are trying to pose on ccTLD. So these are some of the ideas for our bilateral meeting, but personally, I'm a little afraid to put so many items on the plate, because usually, discussions [with the] GAC, they are lengthy on each subject.

So if we're fine with that, we can stick to three things: a report on ccPDP, DNS over HTTPS, and discussion about our future [follow-up] meeting. Okay, I see Giovanni [inaudible] suggests, supports two, three topics. Yeah, so I think let's dive into these topics and to have enough time for discussion.

Okay, and next, meeting with the board. By Monday, we need to submit our questions to the board. We have some ideas, we have discussed some ideas, different people, different suggestions. [Perhaps one of the] suggestions is that we could ask the board about criteria – as you know, board also looks at [inaudible] strategic plan and they have discussion and brainstorming [inaudible] plan, how to move forward, what should be important, what [might] not be important.

So one of the ideas for questions on the board is, what criteria do they use to evaluate whether an activity is in line with ICANN's mission? So, what are the criteria? Not just that they look at the thing and think, "Oh, no, that's really not..." or, "Yes, this is definitely for ICANN to deal with." So, what are the criteria? Not on some intuitive level, but some real

criteria, how they do that. And related to that, [inaudible] it looks like [inaudible] this meeting,

ICANN proposed to have a Q&A session with [exec] team. [I don't know if] it's still the idea. I hope they haven't dropped the idea. So they wanted at least to have a session where community would be able to ask questions to the [exec] team.

And slightly related to the question about the criteria, [I think SOPC has already noted that] and discussed it with Giovanni. It looks like SOPC is a [– the comment they] highlighted, it looks that each department within ICANN acts on their own understanding of what is the mission and strategy of ICANN. So the strategic plan does not provide, give you a feeling of strategy of the organization. Looks more like strategy for different departments. Giovanni, please correct me if I'm not summarizing it the right way.

So the idea would be to ask [the exec] team why is there a perception that they do not have a common view, why [don't they– they] view risks and challenges in a different way? It doesn't look like a document, unfortunately. It looks like a document of different departments. Giovanni, please give us more detail.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. Thank you, Katrina. If I like to compliment what you just explained, indeed when you read the operating plan and budget or you read the strategic plan, the impression you have is that – well, it's not really an impression, it's what you read, is that many areas that are described in those plans, they're coming from different departments, and it's clear that whoever edited the document, they just did a cut and

EN

paste of what they received from one department. And some of the strategic objectives and the respective goals for instance, they could be better spread across different departments, but this is something that doesn't come out from the document. On the contrary, it is like there is one goal, that goal is just for one department, and there is another goal and that goal is for another department even though the two goals look very similar. And also, the two goals probably would be better achieved if there is a coordination between the departments.

So I think that if you read the last strategic plan, the one that is the five-year strategic plan – it is open for public comment until the 20th of February – this is quite evident. So that's why I thought would be a nice idea to reiterate the message to the executive team and ask them what mechanisms they have in place to improve coordination between departments and ensure more consistency when it comes to achieving goals and subsequently objectives. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you very much, Giovanni. Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Katrina, and thank you, Giovanni, for the explanation. Just to clarify, so when we meet with the board, we are going to ask them either to clarify what is going on, or are we going to advise that they develop a strategy, an organizational strategy instead of what appears to be a departmental strategy.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah. Thank you very much, Pablo, for this question. Those are two different things we're talking about. First is we're talking about our meeting with the board, and another one is a session which is on Thursday from 2:45 to 3:45. It's a Q&A session with ICANN Organization executive team. So board perhaps does not know, and they shouldn't do micromanagement of the ICANN Org. It's not their t ask to organize those different departments within ICANN –at least that's my impression of what the board is supposed to do – while executive team really should be doing that.

So what we're talking about here, one is the questions that we might ask to the board, and on a related note, questions that we might ask the exec team. But for those – they might be the same questions. But I think we should really use the time more wisely and ask the board board-related things and ask exec team organizational-related things.

So, going back to that, I just gave you – [Giovanni gave me two questions.] One question to the board, it's about criteria, what criteria do you use when you discuss strategic objectives of ICANN to ensure that they are within the scope and mission of ICANN. So that's one thing, one question to the board. And then another question to the exec team, so what are – we haven't formulated the question yet, but it's along the lines of how they ensure interdepartmental collaboration and a common understanding of strategy [inaudible] challenges [inaudible]. We need to formulate the question.

So, are there any other suggestions for the questions for the board? This is the most urgent one as we need to submit it by Monday, [inaudible] by Monday. So, are you fine with the question about criteria that they

EN

use? That's one thing. And the second thing, do you have any other questions you would like to ask? Questions to the board? [inaudible].

We can of course ask about the bylaw changes, but [inaudible] we need to submit – yeah, Debbie, good, you have questions for the board.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Well, depending on if we get formal notification of anybody objecting to our [inaudible] people, I would be interested to ask them about we feel we should have three representatives. But it's difficult because until we formally know whether there's a formal objection, do we raise or don't we raise it? But do we keep it in our back sleeve in case we need to?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Yeah, if one appointing group objects, it really looks like one subgroup or SO can basically veto the entire process going forward. Well, a strange concept to me, especially because that particular subgroup apparently is not a direct customer of IANA, but okay, that's [on a different level.]

I don't know how we can formulate the question if we need to submit the question by Monday and we still don't get an official response from ICANN Org. It's going to be interesting how we can do that. [We need to think.] Debbie, you still have your hand up. Anything else you'd like to add? Oh, no. Unfortunately not. So, any other questions?

Okay, we'll try to formulate the question and send it to the council so that you can all see and suggest either new questions or [inaudible] proposed questions, because yeah, again, we need to submit them on

Monday. We need to do it quickly. So, thanks. Next agenda item is tech day. That's another thing I wanted to talk about as part of AOB, but maybe let's stop here. Could you [inaudible] summary?

So it looks like [generally,] we have tech day on Monday, but it looks like there are three other tech-related sessions on Monday that are – they look to – targeting the same audience as tech day. So I reached out to tech day and some of the members of the tech working groups. They agree that, yeah, this might not be a good thing. So the question is, do you agree that [inaudible] try to reach out to the people who apparently scheduled the sessions? So make sure that [– or at least] try to convince them to reschedule [inaudible] speak on behalf of the council or [inaudible].

So, how do you feel about it? So yeah, tech working groups supported the idea that we should try to push back. I don't know the process for pushing back. We have to discuss it. But [if I have you on] Monday to do it, we'll try to do it.

Well, as Jay Daley explained, the problem might be that these three sessions are marked as security-related not tech–related, because the tech-related, there probably wasn't an agreement that tech-related questions are not scheduled in parallel but as [inaudible] marked as security sessions. So they [are probably] always trying to have them in parallel.

So, anything? No? Okay, so are you okay? Anyone object that we go and start trying to – no one objects. Thank you. So, we will [inaudible] ccNSO council would like them to reconsider.

Okay, thank you. Can we go back to the agenda? Not much left. CSC meeting is Monday morning. On Saturday and Sunday, there are working group meetings, and the ccNSO cocktail on Tuesday, and once more, thank you very much, Hiro and JPRS for taking care of this [inaudible].

So, next, yeah, the chair update. I think we had a call with the CEO and we discussed different issues. They want to start discussing with the community how this strategic planning and having all different – yeah, that's just to get things rolling and then really moving forward [inaudible] initiative.

We also raised a couple of issues facing our important things [that you're seeing the summary of the call.] I think I more or less already covered all the things that we've done between the last council call and this one.

Any other updates from [inaudible] councilors, [inaudible]? Okay, I see none. Thank you. Pablo, please.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ.   Thank you, Katrina. A couple of things. First, I'd like to again thank you for the continuous support to promote the open leadership positions and in sharing that with the entire community. I want to invite all councilors to please help on the outreach effort to identify interested and highly motivated candidates that can apply for these ten open leadership positions in ICANN.

In addition to that, I'd also like to bring to your attention that as part of the regional organization LACTLD, I am working on a workshop in Puerto Rico in August where we will be celebrating our 30th anniversary to invite ccTLD operators from the Caribbean who currently are not members of the ccNSO or LACTLD to invite them to learn more about what is the ccNSO, what it does, what is LACTLD, what it does, and how can they benefit from it. And we're in the midst of doing that. And in the future meetings, I will provide further information. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you very much, Pablo. Any other updates? No. Pablo, please lower your hand. Thank you. Working group updates. GRC. Yeah, so [inaudible] bylaw change repository. We have also started working on Work Stream 2 recommendations. I have three Google docs and three teams working on these Google docs. We hope to present some of the initial findings, our initial analysis to the community in Kobe.

CCWG Auction Proceeds. I see Peter posted a brief update ion the chat window. SOPC, anything you'd like to highlight, Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. Thank you, Katrina. It was quite a busy time for the SOPC. We had produced three consolidated comments. The first one is the ICANN proposal to switch to two-year basis planning, and we have put forward some comments. Also, we have responded to some of the questions that are included in the document, and there are a couple of questions that are quite interesting.

The first one is, is it [smart] to move to a two-year planning process? And what we responded is we may prefer to have a high-level document instead of a preliminary draft document as ICANN is proposing in terms of strategic planning operating plan.

And the second one is even more interesting question, it's about what kind of barriers are at present that they are preventing a faster community engagement ion those processes. And we have responded that in terms of ccTLDs, we are speaking about quite an operational community, a community that is most of the time [time starving.]

And also, we have pointed out to ICANN that they should work more on the quality of the document and also on the accessibility of the document. That would benefit at the end the engagement from the community. In terms of our comment to the fiscal year 20 operating plan and budget, we have highlighted that there is a continuous progress and improvements in terms of providing more KPIs and metrics for the different goals and the various actions.

We have highlighted and complimented ICANN for the prudent approach when it comes to replenish the reserve fund and [whether] we have also underlined some, lets say, [consistencies] in terms of, again, the plan structure, but also when it comes to describing possible future actions in areas like addressing the GDPR concerns.

And the last document that we have provided comment is the five-year strategic plan. We have a knowledge that there is quite a good level of clarity when it comes to explaining the relevance of the five strategic objectives. However, it is not so clear how the five strategic objectives

and their respective goals have been selected and approved within ICANN, so the main comment from all the working group members is that there should be an effort by ICANN to explain better how those goals and the objectives were approved and what are the criteria to prioritize the different, let's say, objectives that they have in front of them. And I will provide more details during the presentation I'm expected to give during the ccNSO session in Kobe. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you very much, Giovanni. In addition to that, as you saw, we have a meeting with ALAC on Sunday, 5:00 local time, and we discussed with ALAC our questions or agenda for the meeting, and the thing is that apparently, when we submit our comments [on] ICANN's operating plan and budget or strategic plan, we look at the budget from different perspectives.

So they agreed that our SOPC – basically, let's be honest, it's Giovanni. Giovanni will give a brief overview of SOPC and how SOPC operates, how it's evolved, how [inaudible] development of these documents changed and so on. Giovanni Seppia 2, did you want to say something?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah, it's my alter ego. No, I just wanted to say thanks again to all the very proactive working group members –committee members who have participated in the process of submitting comments to these three draft documents. It was done in a very short time frame, and also, over the Christmas holidays and immediately after the Christmas [holiday,] so thanks a lot to all the committee.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, so thank you very much. Let's move forward. One minute left. We had an update written for next meeting. We have a list of next meetings. Our next meeting is March in Kobe, face-to-face, we'll see each other.

And Any Other Business. I managed to cover all my Any Other Business items during the other discussions. Any Other Business from any other of you? Anyone wants to raise anything?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Katrina, this is [Kim.] Can I say something really quick?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Sure.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: I just wanted to announce the council, when we resume our calls in April, we will be using Zoom. For anybody who's doing any current working groups or committees, you see that we are slowly moving over to zoom, and hopefully, you find this as good a news as we the secretariat do. It is technically still a pilot program, but we will be slowly moving all our calls over to zoom. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Oh, thank you very much. I hope that it's a good thing. So, closer to the meeting [inaudible] we need help [inaudible] newcomers to Zoom,

[inaudible] earlier to make sure that people manage to [join] without any issues.

Okay, so thanks, that's all from us. Apparently no other comments. So, thank you very much for being on the call. Thanks for your active participation, your ideas. [inaudible] questions and yeah, so let's make our meeting with other SO/ACs and with the board and executive team interesting and [inaudible].

Okay, so thanks a lot. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]