
HELSINKI – ccNSO Council Meeting
Thursday, June 30, 2016 – 10:45 to 12:00 EEST
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

KATRINA SATAKI: Good morning, so we have two more minutes, and then we start our council meeting. Hopefully, other councilors will join us shortly.

It's 10:45, so maybe we start, and then – okay, Bart will check once more outside, see if we can get more councilors here in front.

Okay, good morning everyone. We start our council meeting here in Helsinki, in a little bit unusual – not setup, but we're used to afternoon council meetings during ICANN meetings. This is, for a change, a morning meeting. So welcome everyone. Now, I would like to ask the Secretariat if we have any apologies noted.

Can you turn it off? Thank you, so we have received apologies from Abibu.

Agenda item number two, our minutes and actions from our 16th June meeting. Minutes were distributed, sorry, a little bit too late, but I hope you had a chance to look at them. Are there any comments, anything you'd like to point out regarding our

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.

minutes? If not, I propose that we adopt the minutes. Please, Secretariat, report regarding the actions.

BART BOSWINKEL: All actions are completed.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Agenda item number three, overview of interim meeting council decisions. This time we had none, so we can smoothly move to agenda item number four, and we're very efficient today. Approval of membership application .dk, Denmark. Very glad to see that we have yet another member, very active member. And as somebody pointed out this week, now we can refer to Lise as ex-non-member. But okay, Lise is unfortunately not with the ccTLD, but still very active, and we're really thankful for her contribution. So glad to see Denmark joining the members.

As far as I understand, there are no outstanding issues. We have received full approval from IANA. Therefore, I would like to propose a draft resolution: the ccNSO Council approves the application of the ccTLD manager of .dk and welcomes Dansk Internet Forum, DIFO, the ccTLD manager for .dk, Demark, as the 160th – yes, we have to correct this – member of the ccNSO. Can I ask for a motion? Okay, moved by Becky, seconded by Stephen.

Are there any – anyone would like to say something? Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE: I would just like to express my very huge appreciation of the fact that Denmark is finally joining. As a member of the EU, or one of the European countries or CCs that have contributed greatly to this community, it is very good that they are finally joining, and I welcome them wholeheartedly.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, I think I can – yes, please, Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Doesn't really apply to this resolution because you've already just done it, but with one exception right at the end just to save time, I suggest we waive the reading, because we've got them all in front of us, for the next resolution.

KATRINA SATAKI: Do we have somebody in the Adobe room joining remotely? No councilors. But anyway, they see the resolution in front of them in the Adobe room, correct? Okay, so thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: But I echo what Young Eum said about Denmark.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, absolutely. I think we have waited way too long for Denmark to join. Is there anyone against? Anyone abstaining? So who is in favor? Unanimously. Yes. Welcome, .dk.

With that, we move to agenda item number five, or maybe while we're waiting for – no, okay, we can move to agenda number five. 5.1, broaden the mandate of the ccNSO Guideline Review Committee. As you may remember at the Marrakesh meeting, the ccNSO Council requested that the Guidelines Review Committee develop our internal procedures relating to implementation of the CWG Stewardship proposal. But with the adoption of the new ICANN Bylaws, we will need to implement other processes and procedures that follow from the new Bylaws.

And since the Guidelines Review Committee has experience now dealing all the documents and all the processes, the proposal is that we ask the Guidelines Review Committee to work on these new internal procedures too. We have a draft resolution in front of us, so I will not read it. So may I ask for a motion? Moved by Stephen and seconded by Nigel.

Vika, please join us here in front. Yes, you can take your – maybe there. Yes, I hope that Byron will join us too.

Anyone would like to say something? If no, who is against that we ask the Guidelines Review Committee to work on these internal guidelines? Anyone abstaining? Who is in favor? Thank you.

Congratulations, Guidelines Review Committee, you have a lot of work in front of you ahead.

Agenda item 5.2, progress on the ccNSO guideline selection for ccNSO-appointed member, one member to RZERC. RZERC, that's Root Zone Evolution Review Committee. As you know, the ccNSO Council will have to appoint one member to this committee. The charter of RZERC is currently published for public comments. The public comments window closes, if I am correct, on 5th July. The Guidelines Review Committee has a draft for this guideline. Now we have discussion on the requirements for those who would like to apply to this committee.

Luckily, the timeframe here is not as tight as in the case of the Customer Standing Committee, so we have to appoint our member on RZERC by September 13. At this point, there's no

action required. I just wanted you to note that this is something that we will have to do, and the guideline is on its way.

Agenda item 5.3. As you probably noticed, we have received a request to review the draft proposal for additional budget for Work Stream 2 items. I forwarded the e-mail from our co-Chair to you. I also forwarded another document that was developed by the Finance Committee of the ICANN Board. They developed some principles to apply to budget to these accountability implementation tasks, and now we have to discuss how does it look to you, dear councilors.

Our Vice Chair, Byron, who according to our work plan is responsible for overseeing accountability tasks. Unfortunately, he's not here at the moment, but maybe – sorry? But, yes, here is our draft decision in front of you. Again, I'm not going to read it. So anyone would like to move? Yes, Becky. Young Eum seconded. Who would like to open up discussion on this issue? Becky, please.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks. I'm sure everybody here has seen the report on the budget impact of the CWG and the CCWG Work Stream 1. And I'm sure you've probably heard this week various members of the community expressing some alarm, and the Board is certainly

expressing some alarm about the pace of spending associated with this. I think if Mathieu was here – and on his behalf, I would say that I think we did a huge amount of very, very complex work in Work Stream 1, and a significant amount of legal work was required to do it. That said, it was a new process for the community, in terms of the amount of work and the kind of work that had budget implications. And at some level, we were doing this without kind of formal finance and budgeting controls.

This is an effort to create those budgeting controls, which I think makes total sense. It's responsible. It puts the authority with respect to budget at some level, and in the first instance it's back with the SOs and ACs that chartered the organization. I want to ensure, as it goes along, that we haven't created something that is so bureaucratic that it creates additional cost, but I think that's something we will have to watch very carefully. But I support this resolution, and I think it's a responsible thing to do for the community.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Becky. Any more comments? With that, who is in favor of this draft decision? Vika?

VIKA MPISANE:

Yes.

KATRINA SATAKI: Margarita, you're in favor, correct? Who is against? Abstained? No. Thank you. Oh, but apparently this is something that we – yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Next agenda item is 5.4, membership on the CCWG Accountability. As you know, we, as one of the chartering organizations, in accordance with the charter of the group, we have appointed five members on the CCW Accountability. And these members have been actively and very intensively involved in Work Stream 1, since the creation of the CCWG. That's starting from December 2014. We realize how much time, effort, energy they have contributed to this work. And, yes, we understand if

some people get really tired of reading countless e-mails and trying to cope with the pace.

I guess you probably saw the e-mail I forwarded to you yesterday. One of our members on this group, Eberhard, has expressed a wish to step down. He's ready and willing to continue if we cannot find a good replacement, but at least we have to try. And according to our discussions during previous council meetings, we acknowledge that our volunteers are getting really tired. And we also have discussed that we need to approach our volunteers and ask if they feel comfortable they still have energy and wish to continue. And as you could hear yesterday here, Mathieu agreed to continue his work as the co-Chair of the working group, so it's a relief. But still, we have a draft decision and the intention to launch a call for volunteers for membership on the CCWG.

There are many people from our community who participate in this working group as non-members, just as observers. They still contribute a lot and read all the e-mails and all the documents, but not formally members. The intention here is to try to find Byron.

[Emma,] please, join us here. Becky, I think you had his – yes, thank you, so that nobody forgets your name, we have [inaudible]

So anyone would like to move the draft decision? Debbie; Stephen seconded. Anyone would like to open discussion on this issue? Young Eum, please.

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Yes, I was wondering if we could just acknowledge again our members who have been involved in the work so far. We have done that before, but as we are kind of moving on and we're at a point where we're moving on to the second stage, that I would like to acknowledge the five members of the CC community that have participated so actively. And I would like to express my appreciation for the members who are Jordan Carter, Eberhard Lisse, Roelof Meijer, Giovanni Seppia, and Mathieu Weill.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, Young Eum, completely agree on that. It will be included in the minutes, and it's noted how much we appreciate their work and their commitment.

So any more comments, anyone would like to say anything? If no, may I ask for a vote on this decision? Who is in favor? Thank you. Anyone against? All in favor, thank you. So we will ask the Secretariat to launch the call for volunteers.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, of course, yes, following the same procedure we used not so long ago. Okay, thank you.

Agenda item number six, Customer Standing Committee membership selection. Agenda item 6.1, it's a call for expressions of interest. A couple of weeks ago on our call, we adopted the ccNSO guideline, ccNSO actions respecting the Customer Standing Committee. This guideline is publicly available on the ccNSO website. And according to the guideline, the ccNSO must instruct the Secretariat to send out a call for expression of interest for ccNSO-appointed members. In this case, when we say ccNSO-appointed members, it means that they are appointed by the ccNSO Council, but it does not mean that they need to be members of the ccNSO. Those are ccTLDs all around the world, regardless of their membership, so Denmark should not be worried. Oh, no, Denmark is now a member anyway, yes. So those who haven't joined yet should not be worried, but still welcome to join.

We have a draft decision in front of us. Again, I'm not going to read, so may I ask for a motion? Demi, and seconded by Ching. Anyone would like to say something? I'd like to point out that

here we have this e-mail address, ccnsocsceoi@icann.org. Probably a little bit too complicated, but I think if somebody who wants to apply on the Customer Standing Committee should be able to send expression of interest to this complicated e-mail address. It's kind of a test, perhaps. Yes, please.

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible] it works. No, it doesn't. Let me explain why. This is just to ensure that, say, if one of the councilors, or even one of the Vice Chairs, would apply for a position, he or she will not be involved in the [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, this is a separate e-mail address so that all the expressions of interest are treated confidentially and...

BART BOSWINKEL: It should work at some point.

KATRINA SATAKI: Any other point? Yeah, Becky?

BECKY BURR: I think it's just worth pausing to note that this is one of the first concrete steps towards implementing the transition, and we should all just pause to be glad we've gotten this far.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Becky.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I think Becky means breathe a sigh of relief.

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: May I ask for a vote? Who is in favor of this draft decision?

BART BOSWINKEL: All.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. We're moving to agenda item – yes, Peter? Peter has a...

PETER VERGOTE: Can I suggest that there's also a webpage created with the same information for easy reference? For instance, all sorts of reports about this meeting that go out. So it's not just those that are reading their e-mails or not reading their e-mails.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Secretariat, please create a separate page for more information on this.

Agenda item 6.2, selection committee for full council decision. This is something that we have discussed heavily during a couple of our calls and during our prep meeting on Monday. So as you know, that according to the new ICANN Bylaws and the charter of the Customer Standing Committee, the ccNSO Council needs to consult with the Registries Stakeholder Group before it appoints members to the CSC, and that must happen before 22nd July this year.

And together with the council, after 22nd July, we need to approve full slate of members and liaisons, so this constitutes the full slate of the CSC. And this appointment – well, approval – must take place before 12 August. So as we discussed, the deadlines are very tight, and to have it more efficient, we agreed to have a selection committee. Though it's called selection committee, the main task of this committee will be to consult

and liaise with the Registries Stakeholder Group and the GNSO Council. As you saw on the Doodle poll, we cannot ensure quorum on the calls, therefore I still propose that we authorize the selection committee to take final decisions on approving our members and approving a full slate.

Here we see draft resolution and – yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, for the record, Souleymane has put his name forward, so the selection committee is complete. So for reference, you should add the name of Souleymane – thank you, Souleymane – as [inaudible] of the AF member. So then you have a full –

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, so we have – we still have to and can discuss it, but you have a draft resolution in front of you. May I ask for a motion? Yes, Hiro, moved by Hiro, seconded by Becky, thank you. Any comments, anyone would like to say something? Young Eum. No, Ching.

YOUNG EUM LEE: As Becky noted, this is a very significant moment. And judging by the names that have been presented to us, I'm relatively confident that they will be able to select the member that will be

the most qualified for the job. And I think this is a very important first step that we present to the community, the whole ICANN community or the whole Internet governance community. And so I think this is an important first step that really needs to be done in a manner which everyone can agree on.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Young Eum. I just want to point out that we all – every council will have to select, so members will not be selected by this committee. Members will be selected by all the councilors, so please do not forget to send in your rankings when we ask for them. Ching and then Peter.

CHING CHIAO:

First of all, I'd just like to say glad to see actually – for Katrina, you're in this very important – you know, you actually have been working on this and liaising with other groups, so it's very good to see you here. But a minor procedural question is, for example, for us to vote for this, should maybe for the members listed on here as the selection committee is maybe better for us to abstain on this vote.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think you can abstain, but you vote for the principle, you vote for the selection committee. So I do not think – you're definitely not required to abstain. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe we can separate the two motions, or turn it into two motions, but I think nobody would see it as a conflict of interest based on the way it was done, and in consultation with all of the councilors.

CHING CHIAO: Sure.

BART BOSWINKEL: And it's more important, probably, that all councilors support this motion as it is.

CHING CHIAO: That's right.

BART BOSWINKEL: That the selection committee is [inaudible]

CHING CHIAO: So the point is she seemed to like brought this up, and then once we have clarification on this, I'm happy to –

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you for bringing this up, but again, this case, we vote for the principle that we all approve the principle. And it's good that we have them here and we wanted to have them here while we meet face to face, but – yes, Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: Thanks, Katrina, and good that earlier on that you stressed that it's actually not the selection committee that's making the call, but it's the ccNSO Council. And I want this to be very crystal clear for the members, that it's not a sub-delegation towards a selection committee. And just to avoid all that doubt, initially, we were thinking and exploring how can we do this as a ccNSO Council as a whole. But the Doodle poll really pointed out a massive risk that we would not be quorated during those very important phone calls. So we cannot simply take the risk that this ends in a failure, hence the logical decision to have a selection committee. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Peter. One more comment. According to the guideline, the council is not obliged to have the selection committee, so next time when we have more time, we can choose to do it differently. But taking into account this very tight deadline and our commitment to do our duty by a certain date, which is really very close, that was a decision to have the selection committee and authorize it to – yes. Please, Ching.

CHING CHIAO: Thank you, Katrina. I'd actually just like to follow in on actually echoing what Peter just mentioned. I brought this up also on the council mailing list, that, yes, the time is very tight, but it's the council who actually make the decisions. Also, we pointed out on the council list that it is not for the, quote/unquote, "selection committee" to go out, to search and to select. It is up to the members who actually do nominate. So with people here in the room, the members are here, really want to emphasize that – I mean, these things after the resolution is done, we really need to hear from the members. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Members and non-members, ccTLDs, thank you. Anyone else? No? Oh, Young Eum.

YOUNG EUM LEE: I would also like to just make one more clarification, which is that when the council is making their choice for the ranking of the members or non-members that have presented their name forward, if they are one of them, that council member of course will not be able to participate in the ranking.

KATRINA SATAKI: Absolutely, yes. Only those councilors who have not put their name forward will be eligible to vote, to rank these candidates. Seeing no more hands raised. Stephen, maybe you want to say something? No, Stephen doesn't want to say anything. So may I ask for a vote? Who is in favor of this draft resolution? All, thank you very much. After we close the call for expression of interest, we will send the names to those – when I say, “we,” I mean the Secretariat, people who will receive all those applications will send to non-conflicting councilors. And you will be asked to read all those expressions of interest, evaluate skill set, rank the candidates, and send them back to the e-mail address that will be indicated in the request to do the ranking. So more information will follow. Please do the ranking by the date indicated in the e-mail when you receive applications. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe just before – say, over the next week or two weeks before you receive all the forms, I will send out an e-mail to lay out the process. It's the same process we've used before, thanks to Nigel, just to acknowledge everything. So that's one internal procedure for the council, but I will send it out probably next week. End of next week, early. So before you receive all the names.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, and also I'd like to remind the CSC selection committee that you must be available for the work for consultation with the Registries Stakeholder Group and with the GNSO Council, so please do your duty. Thank you.

With that, we move to agenda item number seven. It's PDP on the review mechanism and retirement framework. As you know, in order to launch a PDP at our meeting in Hyderabad, we want to launch a PDP. But we have to do all the preparatory work for that. We need issue report. We need to appoint issue manager. Actually, we did that on our last call. Yes, we did. We did appoint you. You should read the minutes. I congratulated you. So we have issue manager, even though he pretends he's not the one. And then we need also to approve this tentative timeline to receive issue report, because as you know, we need an issue

report out for public comments before our face-to-face meeting in India.

Yes, sorry, I cannot pronounce the word. Yes. I can manage to say India.

We have a resolution that I'm not going into much detail. We have seen this and we discussed that many times before. So we have a draft resolution on everything that we need to do according to the ICANN Bylaws in our preparation for country code policy development process. May I ask for a motion? Becky, and seconded by Stephen. So, please, any comments? Anyone would like to start a discussion? Becky, please.

BECKY BURR:

We discussed this at the members meeting the other day, but obviously, this is the next phase in the serious work over a very long time that the ccNSO has done on issues related to delegation, revocation, transfer of ccTLDs. And we've made great progress in moving forward on the Framework of Interpretation, but it's time now to kick off the PDP. We were hoping to – and I think did – get as much out of the Framework of Interpretation and existing policy as could be gotten in order to make the PDP about as narrow as possible, and this is where we are.

We do think it's time for an issues report here, and we have – we're doing this in a second – solicited volunteers from across the ccNSO to participate in an oversight committee for issues drafting. This will come back to the council and to the community in Hyderabad for further discussion. But this, as I said, is the next step in work that has been very important and ongoing for the ccNSO.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Becky. Ching.

CHING CHIAO: Thank you, Katrina. And so actually looking at the overall ICANN processes – for the record, I'm all for this getting to this PDP or actually to start to review what needs to be done in the delegation or the redelegation of the ccTLD. I'd also like to take this opportunity maybe to point out whether this will impact the ongoing IDN ccTLD Fast Track. Would this be somehow to be incorporated in the future? Have we – or let me put it this way. Does this working group of – sorry, this PDP Review Team will need to consider that from, or do we sort of separate these two issues?

KATRINA SATAKI: Bart would like to answer.

BART BOSWINKEL: It's very simple. Effectively, whatever the outcome of this group also applies to IDN ccTLDs. The IDN PDP and the IDN Fast Track is only about the selection of the strings. The delegation, revocation, transfer rule apply to IDN ccTLDs, as well as ASCII ccTLDs. So the scope is broader than just the ASCII ccTLD. By definition, say – in both processes, so in the policy and in the fast track, it's very clearly stated that the rules around delegation, and in that case the redelegation, of ccTLDs apply to IDN ccTLDs.

KATRINA SATAKI: I also would like to note that Demi, the Vice Chair responsible for policy development process, will oversee this committee and the preparatory work and the work after, when we already start our policy development process. So any other comments? Yes, Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes, I'm not entirely sure what we're going to be deciding here today, but I'm looking at this list of one, two, and three in the papers. I certainly would have a preference for a single-process PDP, because the skillset is going to be – you need to marshal

the members, and the skillset of the members from the delegation/redelegation working group is almost exactly the same for both of these. It's kind of irrelevant whether you say that they're sequential or parallel, because clearly, there's one part of this which is almost an easy ride, so that'd be over fairly quickly. That's the retirement side. So the choice between two and three is not really that big, but the choice between one and the rest is quite clear, in my book.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Becky?

BECKY BURR: Thank you. And I think we heard that in Marrakesh, that there was some desire to do this as a single but in parallel. We're not deciding that today. We're deciding on an issue report, and it will be an issue report that covers both topics. And I think that the decision that we will have to make in Hyderabad, whether it's one or two, in part depends on sort of priority. The community expressed some desire to prioritize the dispute resolution review mechanism over retirement. And whether it's one or two will make some difference in when the council actually can come back and vote on and the community can adopt the outcome of the PDP.

That said, I totally agree that the skillset is quite close, and there's going to be an important decision about what the ability, sort of what the volunteer capacity and the expertise available is, but that is a decision we will make in Hyderabad.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Any more comments, questions? I forgot, did I ask for a motion on this? I did, okay, thank you. Yes, Becky and Stephen, so I think we've discussed this already. This is a very long resolution here. Any comments on the actual text? So the idea is that now we appoint issue manager, now it's written in the resolution, so he will never say that he wasn't appointed again. We have the ccNSO Council oversight committee that will oversee the process of this issue report, and we ask for an issue report. And we need it in good time before our meeting in India.

May I ask for a vote? Who is in favor of this resolution? All, thank you.

Agenda item number eight, outcome of this ccNSO Council survey. Again, let me remind you that when we started thinking about accountability of the ccNSO and accountability of the ccNSO Council, we decided that the easiest step, and probably the most correct first step, to make is to ask you, the community, what do you expect from us? What do you think of

the work that we're currently doing? And yesterday morning session, I presented a couple of slides from the survey.

I don't know if you had time to look into details, some of these slides and responses that we gathered from the community. But anyway, I'd like to ask the councilors if you have any immediate thoughts on the next steps that must be taken by the ccNSO Council in order to meet the community's expectations and deliver better service and share information better, and probably get better feedback and more feedback from our community. So any – Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Yes, thank you. I think it was pointed out during your session that there was no distinction between the responses of the councilors and responses of the members. And maybe that's something that, given that I think the 40-some responses, and given that I'm assuming that most of the 15 or 18 councilors did respond, which would make up a large portion of that, and so I was actually interested myself to see how the perceptions would be different. I'm wondering if we could kind of make a distinction between that. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. I think at this moment, we cannot do that with the current survey, but we definitely will take that into account in the upcoming surveys. At the same time, I agree when Hiro noted that when he answered, he did not give a perspective of his own, but the registry, so this also should be taken into account.

Personally, I'm more interested in those negative responses when the people say that probably sometimes we do not explain our decisions to the community. I'm sure that those were not councilors who responded. I'm sure that councilors improved the numbers. So I'm really more interested in those negative or close to negative responses, and probably we should look into those and try to dig deeper to the root of the problem and really think of some ways to improve the communication. Yes, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

May I suggest that we use the next council meeting to look more into the details and see if we can come up with a little bit more of analysis? Because, say, the survey closed on Friday. We shared it as quickly as possible to use the Helsinki meeting. And now it's time to start reviewing and analyzing what needs to – the outcome, and then come up with some suggestions.

KATRINA SATAKI: But I'd like to urge the councilors to think before this discussion takes place so that maybe we can already come up with some ideas. Yes, Becky.

BECKY BURR: I apologize if I missed this, but are we going to continue to try to get ccTLDs to respond to it and get some more answers?

KATRINA SATAKI: This was one of the discussions of our prep meeting, and Peter was the one who suggested that probably before we reopen the survey, we should think if we can get any more qualitative data out of reopening it. Maybe we should try some different approach, not try to understand – well, in this case, try to understand why people do not feel well informed about our activities and our decisions. So maybe at this point, we will not open it, but definitely should discuss our next steps. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Just to be clear, although you think it's a limited number, I think they were in the 40s who responded, including some councilors. If you compare it with previous surveys we had and the short time frame, it was a relative high number. So in that sense, whether it's representative, that's another question, but the

number of responses in themselves was pretty high compared to other surveys we've done.

KATRINA SATAKI: Not only we've done. Look at the GAC survey, they get less than 15%. Debbie?

DEBBIE MONAHAN: If I remember it correctly, it had an area where people could actually write some comments in. Were many comments received? And I think that's what you're talking about, Bart, is the only thing that's in the survey that we haven't seen that might help us with ideas.

BART BOSWINKEL: At least Katrina presented them already yesterday, and if you look at the results of the survey, you'll see it as well. It's the questions 12 and 13, I believe. There were six responses, so I didn't count –

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I didn't realize it had been summarized that much, meaning I didn't realize – I thought it'd been assumed that it'd been summarized, and there was more there.

KATRINA SATAKI: We don't make assumptions like that.

BART BOSWINKEL: What we left out was a comment of, "I have no comment."

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you, so this is food for thought, something that you can think about and we can discuss it at our next council meeting.

Agenda item number nine, it's a report from the working group on EPSRP.

BART BOSWINKEL: The Extended Process Similarity Review Panel.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's what I wanted to say. So as you know, we have this EPSRP Working Group, and it was tasked to provide further on how to deal with certain aspects of the extended process confusing similarity review. And the working group has worked hard, so they have delivered the draft report, and this report now needs to go through the public comment period. Okay, we don't have –

Giovanni is our Chair on this working group, but I'm sure that Bart is very well aware of everything that's going on there. Do we need – we definitely don't need any decision. Apparently we just need to inform the working group –

BART BOSWINKEL: And he's away, so effectively, [inaudible] it was more the unclarity on Giovanni's side on what were the next steps. The next step is go for public comment and then see what happens. The working group will need to update or not update its draft report, and then submit it to council.

KATRINA SATAKI: Officially, GAC and SSAC, they decided not to be officially on the group, but I hope that they will provide some report. Any indication that they're going to do that?

BART BOSWINKEL: I have no indication, but we will alert them that they were asked and refer to the board resolution.

KATRINA SATAKI: So I assume this is an action that we need to – no? No action point, okay. So please inform the group they need to start this public comments period.

Thank you. Agenda item number ten, it's a council update. First is Chair update, I have a feeling that I'm talking all the time, so probably I will skip this because most of my time was eaten by the Customer Standing Committee and the discussions with the GNSO and Registries Stakeholder Group, another acronym I'm not able to pronounce.

Vice Chairs, anything from you?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't have anything important to say. I was a little bit far from the activities of the last month, but I'm hoping to be involved more profoundly basically in this review committee. And so then I don't have any important thing to report.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: A little bit of a parallel activity to the ccNSO, but I was at the OECD Digital Economy Ministerial Meeting last week in Cancun.

And I raise it only because, of course, that was primarily policymakers there, so they do have an impact on us from time to time. I would like to report, there were many discussions there, but there certainly seemed to be reinforcement and strengthening of the notion of an open, borderless, permissionless Internet. So it's good to actually hear many policymakers say those words out loud. However, the strain of security and some of the ramifications of what security actually means on open, permissionless, and borderless was still fairly strong. And I would encourage all of our colleagues here in the ccNSO community to be involved with their local governments, their national governments, and continue to make our presence felt as independent experts in the space of what keeping an open, borderless, permissionless Internet actually means, because while we heard those words a lot and they were encouraging, the substring of security and the closing of the Internet was also present at the OECD Ministerial Meeting. So again, encourage all our colleagues here to get involved with your national governments and become a trusted advisor to them.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, Byron. I think that's very good advice to every ccTLD. Anything from the councilors? Becky?

BECKY BURR:

I know it's been reported in the council, but just for the minutes and the community, I wanted to note that I have been elected by the Contracted Party Stakeholder Group – that is the registries and registrars in the GNSO – to replace Bruce Tonkin when he retires from the board at the end of his three term-limited terms in November. I am greatly honored and I think I'll have trouble filling Bruce's shoes, but I wanted to make sure everyone is aware that I will be resigning from the ccNSO Council after our meeting in Hyderabad and consulting with the North American members of the ccNSO with respect to a replacement and then, at the end of the Hyderabad meeting, taking place on the ICANN board, where you all can count on the fact that my heart will still be with the CCs.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Becky, for this. And I know that according to the Bylaws, the ccNSO appoints only two board members, but it feels like now we have appointed three. So all the best in this new capacity, and I'm sure that you can fill in any shoes. So, Bart, you wanted to say something.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, on behalf of Abibu. He just sent an e-mail saying he participated in the AIS 2016 held in Gaborone, Botswana, as a panelist, and shared the ccNSO PDP process as part of sharing of ICANN PDP to the African community during that event.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. If there are not more updates, agenda item 10.4. Any regional organization would like to add something to what they already shared with us yesterday? No? No updates from regional organizations. Any updates from staff? Okay, Kim? No updates. Thank you.

Agenda item number 11, working groups provided their updates during our meeting days, and liaison updates, you will receive written updates shortly after the meeting. And now, about the next meetings. We propose to have two meetings currently. It's 1st September – yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: May I add, based that the direction of travel around the CSC selection process, up to yesterday evening, I still had the tentative 28th of July included. I deleted that one, and I didn't put in the third one. So it will come up in the official minutes for your own diaries.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you, and we keep alternating 11:00 UTC with 19:00 UTC, which of course is – 19:00 UTC I know is tough on some members, but 11:00 UTC is tough on some other members. So I understand those who are not able to join us in the middle of the night, but the proposal is still continue with these alternate times. Any councilor would like to say something about next meetings? Young Eum.

YOUNG EUM LEE: I agree with the concept of alternating, but I'm wondering if we can maybe move the time of the 19:00 UTC slightly either forward or backwards, because it's – for a lot of us, it's either 3:00 or 4:00 or 5:00 at night, which is much different from like 12:00 or even 6:00 in the morning is okay. But 3:00, 4:00, 5:00 is very difficult.

KATRINA SATAKI: I understand you, Young Eum, but we tried to compile this Excel sheet and see what's going on, and unfortunately that was – if you can come up with some other time, probably you should just go look at this Excel sheet. And if you can find any other number that would work for as many councilors as possible, I'm sure we can discuss it and see how it works. Thank you. Debbie.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I'd definitely benefit from this. I thought it was two meetings at 11:00 UTC and one at 19:00, so is it that the July one was 11:00 as well? I thought we were doing two up there and then one –

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, the idea was – yes, those critical meetings we put at 11, because then it's 7:00 UTC that is really hard for our colleagues in Asia. So anything you'd like to say about the upcoming meetings? They look fine at this moment.

Agenda item number 14, any other business. Anything anyone would like to say? Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Quick update on our ALAC liaison, Ron Sherwood. He's asked me to convey his greetings to the community. He expresses his regret for not being here. He is out of hospital but he faces a long recovery, and he wishes us a productive meeting.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, and we wish him speedy recovery. Some things I wanted to say about this new format, the first Meeting B that we tried. I've heard mixed feedback. Some people are happy. Some

people are not so happy. Some people think that something must be done differently. What is your opinion on this policy forum? What could we recommend to our Meeting Program Working Group? Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, first a negative point. In terms of time efficiency, I don't think there is any time efficiency, so I don't think that the short format of meetings will make sure that we spend less time during an ICANN week.

Positive feedback, I think that the people quite liked the cross-community sessions, at least I have been picking up some positive feedback on our geoname session of yesterday. So that might be something that we take with us. And even somebody suggested that we should not have a typical type B Meeting as a necessity for having cross-community sessions, and that was I think very relevant feedback. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any other feedback? Well, we did not know how this Meeting B format would work for our community. And I know that according to the strategy, they expect less people to come to a policy forum than to either A or C Meeting. So we did not want those ccNSO non-members to come to the meeting to feel

they're not welcome to our sessions. That's why we tried to still run a usual business and discuss as many issues as possible. But, yes, we can gather feedback from the community and we will ask them to fill in these evaluation forms. So when we gather more feedback, probably we can come up with different ideas and different ways to run the meetings. Ching.

CHING CHIAO:

I can only speak for myself. Obviously, a shorter meeting, I think this time works for me, and coming to Europe twice, in May and June for the GDD, travel-wise, I think shorter meetings like the GDD, which some of you were there, and for this one, I think in terms of the scheduling, in terms of the efficiency, it definitely worked for me. But I only can imagine that the length of the meeting to be doubled next time, and given my love to India, I don't mind staying even two, three weeks. My wife and myself, we stayed there very, very long time during the winter, during the summer. But let's think if an important decision would be made on day six or seven, what would be the outcome of that? So that could be something that we can think of, maybe in our next council call, in terms of this topic.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, Ching. Margarita.

MARGARITA VALDES: Yes. A good feedback from me, from my perspective, is that this meeting was less fancy but most focused. That's it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. And as Ching just pointed out, next is Meeting C. It's going to be very long, and I've received some feedback already – not feedback, but wishes from our community. It's not clear when we start and what's going on, on which day. The community wishes to have – at least some members of the community want to have our meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday, as we are used to that, which means, again, traditional ccNSO cocktail on Tuesday evening. So again, something that we are used to. I don't know if that's going to work, but, yes, this is something we need to find out, something that our Meeting Program Working Group start working on. Byron first, then Alejandra.

BYRON HOLLAND: I just wanted to echo Ching's comments in that a nine-day meeting, not everybody is going to be able to attend all nine days. So I would suggest that we try to do a similar kind of meeting that we're used to, in terms of our two dates back to back. Whether they're Tuesday/Wednesday or not, at least make sure that they're in a somewhat regular format and that they're

not spread out over time. I would just make that recommendation, because I'm sure there are many folks who will not be able to spend the entire time there.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, but the problem is that people already need to start booking tickets.

BYRON HOLLAND: Agreed, I'm just making the suggestion and recommendation, and the sooner we can understand that, the better, for exactly the reasons you've articulated.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, the sooner the better, I totally agree with that. Yes. So, any other business? Oh, sorry, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No problem. Just a little bit of an announcement. There will be the last cross-community session in Hall A will be regarding the Meeting B wrap-up, and planning ahead for the Meeting C. So if you would like to attend that, and maybe see what's going on.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Maybe we'll have more clarity after that. I wouldn't count on that, but... Any other business?

If no, then agenda item number 15, and this one, sorry, I'm going to read out. The ccNSO Council expresses a warm thanks to Juhani Juselius and his team at FICORA – this is a country-code top level domain, .fi – the local host for their hospitality and assistance during this wonderful event in Helsinki, and in particular for organizing as sole sponsor the very successful ccNSO cocktail. Unfortunately, I do not see anyone from .fi here, but we will deliver our thanks to them. And please, if you see any of them, hug them and thank them for their efforts.

The ccNSO Council wholeheartedly congratulates Keith Davidson that he received the ICANN Ethos Award. The ccNSO Council and ccTLD community was fortunate to benefit from Keith's leadership, wisdom, and humor in his role as ccNSO Council member, Vice Chair, Chair of the Delegation Redefinition Working Group, and Chair of the Framework of Interpretation Working Group. Keith, congratulations, and thank you very much. And I ask Debbie to hug Keith for all of us, because unfortunately he's not here at the moment, and we cannot do that ourselves.

With that, I would like to close our council meeting. Thank you all for participating, and looking forward to very intense work

during summer, when we need to appoint all the members. So thank you very much, and have a safe trip back home. Enjoy the last moments of the ICANN meeting, and have fun. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]