

---

MARRAKECH – Joint Meeting: ccNSO & GNSO Councils  
Wednesday, June 26, 2019 – 18:30 to 19:30 WET  
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is Wednesday, June 26, at 18:30. This is the Joint Meeting, ccNSO and GNSO Councils in Tischka at ICANN65 in Marrakech.

KEITH DRAZEK: Hi, everybody. This is Keith. Just wanted to let everybody know we're getting ready to begin the joint ccNSO/GNSO Council meeting. We have some refreshments in the corner, up here to the left, for anybody that would like to come up and join. Council first. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Good evening, dear ladies and gentlemen, ccNSO and GNSO Councils, dear councilors. We're ready to start. Here you see agenda in front of you. This is something that we agreed to discuss but I'm sure that there are many other topics that are already on our list – Keith's list – and we are ready to address them one by one. Anyway, in the first agenda item that we have here is a progress made by the new gTLD Auctions Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group.

---

*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.*

---

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Katrina, and thanks to all the ccNSO colleagues. I think on this particular topic, as we know, the Cross-Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds has been working for some time now, and to my understanding there are approximately three sort of significant substantive questions that remain for the group and that it's obviously important for all of us as chartering organizations to this group to engage and to contribute to those discussions. But in our prep session, we discussed this with Erica and she agreed to maybe walk through some of those substantive questions and map out next steps, I think. But I think the takeaway for this will be this CCWG is making progress in approaching a sort of critical stage when it comes to this decision making and we just want to make sure that we've had the opportunity to compare notes with you and to ensure that we're all sort of aware of what's to come. So, Erika?

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you so much, Keith and Katrina. Yeah, I can keep it pretty short, I believe. As you say, we had a the critical phase, we had a good meeting actually this morning, three and a half hours, and we made immense progress. We have very few remaining items but with regard to these items, I believe we will need all the help we can get including from these two communities. So let me just briefly maybe explain where we are. And then I don't guide you

---

through the whole process again because I believe you have heard it so many times. It's not really needed again.

The big three issues which are remaining, the number one is about the structure of the future of the fund. We call this a mechanism, and if you remember we had four which we evaluated in-house, joint forces, and partnership with another entity then a new ICANN foundation, and the last one was to outsource the money completely to a separate entity. So, what we call mechanism indeed we neglected very early, already in the public comment period and the first public comment period in [inaudible]. We neglected this and there was a common understanding between everybody, "We don't want this."

So, we had three remaining. And then when we went to the public comment, we have favored two which was A and B, which was the in-house and was the joint forces in partnership with a different entity. Like it is in real life, during the public comment period, we received actually quite many comments which favored more the foundation and there was relatively little support for the idea to work in cooperation with a different entity.

So, we now had a discussion today and it looks like we've made progress on this item. We will turn our new recommendation around. It will be A and C, B disfavored, not totally. We can't

---

ignore it completely but totally put on the back burner. And here we have to take a decision now. It's an important decision and the main issue is about what we receive from comments and from constituency members saying we want to have as much as possible independence from the current ICANN organization, and that's why many of them are favoring a foundation.

Personally, I believe both options are viable and they're good, either in-house or you favor a new foundation. A new foundation is not a bad idea because you can project it much longer and since it's still connected to ICANN, it is practically an outside – it is somewhat still an ICANN structure. It's not something completely new.

Many of the oversight mechanism will not change. So even if it's inside of ICANN, it would be in-house, the evaluators and everything else would still be independent. So, many of the structures, what some community members are worried about, will there be sufficient independence? It depends how you build the structure. And if you ensure independence, it doesn't matter where it is actually housed. These are the main topics, one of them.

The second one we receive many comments in the public comment period is about community engagement and about oversight in the sense how will the projects are going to be

---

evaluated after a few years? And do we understand actually if the evaluators are on target? Are the goals met, or is there something substantially different than what was expected in the goal setting period? So, I think we have an understanding and we are fine, that we understood after a few years there will be a review and then the original goals will have to be evaluated and there needs to be a discussion with the evaluators as well to see if everything actually on target. Much more problematic is the idea to have a kind of advisory structure, kind of advisory panel from the community.

So, we received many comments. That's something we are still struggling with. Some of us believe we do need it as a kind of sounding board. Because imagine that's a new structure, so you have new evaluators. Let's assume they have to evaluate in clinical terms a technical project, they may not fully oversee and understand what this is about. So, isn't it then good to have a kind of sounding board, which of course they would have to sign up confidentiality agreements, etc., etc. but wouldn't this be good instead of pushing them the evaluators all these automatically then to pick up, to call or to talk to ICANN Org or to talk to the Board. That's maybe not really obviously needed. So, that's what we are struggling with. We have to find a model here.

---

Then the last one item is the question – so we are in the process now, we want to finalize everything in, I believe – I was looking for Marika, there she is – but I believe we want to have everything done the end of August, the last date. It's then actually do we need a new public comment period because we changed a few things compared to the first public comment period? Or can we not just instead hand this over to GNSO and the AC and the SO and say, "This is where we are, deal with it"? That's where we will need to particularly then as our sounding board to make a good decision. Maybe it's actually better just to go for public comment and nobody can come and claim afterwards and say, "You haven't fulfilled all your obligations." But we're still not sure if we would like to see this happening. If we would go for public comment period, we will only go with the new topics. We will not bring the old proposal because we don't want to invite super many new comments.

And there's one item which is critical too, I forgot to mention this. [Barry], we'll need your advice too. We will recommend a cut out of the current review mechanism. We don't like to see in the review mechanism established for projects but where they can get challenged to an RDP or whatever kind of existing structure. So, we would like to cut this out and want to say that's not possible, instead we discussed today an option which is typical in funds. Once you got – let's say you put project that's

---

neglected, you can go back to the same group of evaluators again. You can make the case, “You misunderstood what we did, please reevaluate but the same group. But not an evaluation open to the typical process which we have at ICANN.” That’s where we are.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Erika. First, thanks for all of your work on this and for everybody who has contributed to the CCWG [inaudible]. Clearly I’m glad to hear that the work that you’ve done this week, this morning, was so productive and it sounds as if you really noted that there are just a handful of issues or questions that remain, and I think that’s a really good sign from the GNSO perspective. If you compare that to some of our other PDPs, to have just three or four issues remaining I think is a really strong showing, so thank you.

Back to your point about sort of the right structure, whether it’s A or C. My understanding of the discussions of the group and the input from the Board is that, at the end of the day, whichever structure is selected, the Board has a fiduciary responsibility with regard to the funds. So, I think understanding that there’s an opportunity to consider both options but still recognized that the Board at the end of the day has a responsibility with regard to this account.

---

So, with that, Katrina, maybe I can just open it up for any questions if you have any thoughts at this point?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Well, I don't know if any of my colleagues have questions about that. Clearly we'd like to see the work of the Cross-Community Working Group completed and completed successfully, so whichever support you need from our side we're really willing to provide it because this needs to be done, and I'm glad to hear that you're very close to the end of the process. Any questions from anyone around the table? If not then let's move to the next agenda item. That's about the Customer Standing Committee. Let me just briefly summarize what we're talking about here.

Customer Standing Committee – by the way, we have four members on that committee and I think seven liaisons, if I'm not mistaken. Two members are appointed by RySG and two are appointed by the ccNSO. And from now on, we change two members every year, so one member is changed by RySG and one by the ccNSO. And then we also change half of liaisons every year.

There are two steps to the process. First, there are other members and then we coordinate members with the RySG to make sure that diversity and everything. The second step is that we need to take into account, like I said, both councils – ccNSO

---

and GNSO Council – need to appoint/approve the full slate. So, all the members – not just newly appointed members and liaisons but all the members and all the liaisons. So, that’s the process.

I would like to inform you that we came here from our council meeting, and during our council meeting we approved the timeline, how we’re going to appoint our members. We hope to liaise with RySG and GNSO Council. So, the general idea is to make sure that the full slate is approved by mid-September because the new members and liaisons, they have to start their terms on CSC on the first of October. Clearly, we hope we will have approval of this committee or subcommittee of the council and they will liaise with apparently your committee and we’ll do the approvals.

At least I hope that this process is now already running very smoothly. I do not foresee any bumps on our road, so I hope that everything is going to be very nice. Any questions? Any comments to that? No? Then let’s move to the next agenda item. It’s about procedures pertaining to the special IANA function review. Before we go to the special, special thing.

In the Bylaws we have two kinds of IANA function review. One is the regular one and the first one was supposed to start last year. Unfortunately, it did not because according to the Bylaws, ccTLD

---

communities represented by three ccTLD representatives and – two of them are ccNSO members and one non-member. Unfortunately, despite of all our efforts a year ago, two calls and numerous reminders, everything, everything, we were not able to find a non-ccNSO member. That’s why we appointed an interim member. Unfortunately, it looks like the process is still not moving forward, but meanwhile, especially during the past two or three months, we have received – well some of the non-members suddenly stepped forward and said, “If you have such big problems, maybe we can help you.”

Meanwhile again, we submitted a request to change the Bylaws to make sure that we can appoint the best people regardless of the membership, whether members or non-members. But again, just now during our council meeting, we discussed how to respond to this interest from a few non-members who might be interested to join the team, and we decided to launch or early next week we’re launching yet another call for volunteers. We will reach out to those who expressed their interest and that please now submit your CVs, your Statement of Interest, everything that we need to evaluate their experience and qualification.

Hopefully, this time we will manage to find a non-ccNSO member to our IANA Functions Review Team. If we still do not succeed, then we will have to wait until the Bylaws are officially

---

approved. But even if we do succeed, it took us one year. We really will ask you, the GNSO, as decisional participant to support the change in the Bylaws, to make sure that in case the Special IANA Function review or any regular IANA function review do not get stuck like we got stuck this time, just because the ccNSO is so successful that so many ccTLDs are joining the ccNSO.

That's about the IANA function review, that you know where we are and we really hope that we will be able to move forward finally. Because I really appreciate and I would like to thank those members appointed by the GNSO – all different stakeholder groups of the GNSO and other SO/ACs. We fully realize that they're waiting and they are there getting ready to start the review but are unable because of this, let's say, very unfortunate development that we found ourselves in.

Talking about Special IANA function review, this is a special kind of IFR and this is something that we – as GNSO Council and ccNSO Council – need to discuss in case of a really catastrophic failure of some kind. Something that we – here I mean “we as a community” and “we as CSC (Customer Standing Committee)” have failed to resolve despite all these remedial action procedures that CSC has developed.

---

There are three steps of escalation, and if all those three steps fail then we will need to decide. Consultation with other SO/ACs, we will need to decide whether we want to launch Special IANA function review. This is something that we will have to do in a highly unlikely event of this very bad development. If it comes to us discussing whether to launch Special IANA function review or not, we will need to coordinate and be really efficient to make sure that we can do that.

Here I'd like to thank really wholeheartedly the staff, both of ccNSO and GNSO, for their efforts and your GNSO Drafting Team that started working on a document and the procedure, how we're going to collaborate. I don't know if anyone – from your draft team or from the staff – would like to comment. Our Guidelines Review Committee that will work on our internal procedures have met and will meet with the draft team to discuss the procedure and to make sure that we are ready. If the lightning strikes, we are ready.

So, any comments? Yes, Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Katrina. It's great news to hear about the September timeframe for the approval of your slate of the CSC. I think on your point about the changes to the Bylaws and the process that you're going through to identify the ccTLD

---

appointments to the IANA functions review, I understand that, A, it's been a challenging process and with multiple iterations, and we understand I think the rationale behind the desire for a Bylaws change. We haven't as a council had a chance to discuss that in tremendous amount of detail but we've been tracking it of course. And I understand that the current Bylaw language is essentially imported or incorporated based on some legacy expectations from years past, where there was much larger pool of non-ccNSO members. But because to your point, as the ccNSO has become more successful with much more membership that perhaps it seems clear that having that old essentially requirement incorporated at this time is an obstacle or can be an obstacle or a challenge at a minimum.

So, I think we understand the dynamics. I think we understand the rationale for seeking that Bylaw change. I think – at least from my perspective and again not speaking for the whole council – it seems like a logical step forward. Obviously, we're all interested in moving forward on establishing the panel and the review and having that all move forward, so I hope that all goes well with your next and hopefully last call for volunteers. Thank you.

I saw Stephen put his hand up.

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Keith. With my ECA hat on, it's very likely the Board will approve this Bylaw change such that we can enter into an approval action decision period which will lead to in all likelihood an Approval Action Community Forum at the Montreal meeting.

Taking my ECA hat off and putting my ccNSO hat back on, if you could read tea leaves, do you foresee any oppositions/series opposition from the GNSO to approval of this Bylaw it's going to take an affirmative vote of at least three SO/ACs to push this over the finish line? And I was wondering if you could comment on that. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Stephen. You're trying to get me in trouble with my colleagues. Reading the tea leaves. This is just again my personal opinion. We have not had a chance to discuss this in terms of the next steps on process, but in my view this is sort of an internal ccTLD matter, for ccNSO and ccTLD managers and that at the end of the day, I think, as Katrina said, the key is to get the best people who are available and able to contribute and dedicate the time and commitment, and if one of those happens to be a non-ccNSO member, then great – or any number. My sense is this is really a matter for the ccTLD registries to address and I can't imagine why in my opinion at this time why the GNSO

---

or the GNSO Council would have any opposition. But we'll get back to you if that changes. I saw Michele.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That would be appreciated.

KEITH DRAZEK: Michele, Young-eum. Okay.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Keith. Yeah, as Keith said, this is more of a ccTLD/ccNSO issue, so unless you've managed to upset us all terribly in the interim and we feel like being playing nasty with you, I can't imagine a reality in which the Registrar Stakeholder Group councilors would be instructed to vote against it. I think we would just vote in favor of something that was put on the menu for a meeting. I can't see any reason why we'd object.

KATRINA SATAKI: What is very important here that this is a change in fundamental bylaw which calls for approval action and it means that we need active approval from at least two other DPs (decisional participants). Therefore, we will really need your support to that. Thank you.

---

MICHELE NEYLON: Sorry, Katrina. It's Michele and very briefly. That's fine. It's just that it's not something that I can see most GNSO getting upset about. So if you ask us to support that, I can't see why we wouldn't support it. That's what I was trying to say.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Thank you, Keith. This is Young-eum. I would just like to make note of the fact that within the ccNSO Council meeting today, there was a relatively heated debate regarding maintaining this demand for not following the non-ccNSO rule and maybe waiting until the Bylaw changes. But then there was this more general consensus within the council to not burden the other SOs and ACs with this matter because it was a specific ccNSO-related issue, and so I'm delighted to see all this amicability and agreeability with regard to this issue and we hope that not just the GNSO but the other SOs and ACs will follow suit. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Phillippe? Phillippe, stop joking with Michele.

---

PHILLIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Phillippe Fouquart here. I won't speak on behalf of ISPCP but just from a purely engineering standpoint, I would say that having such an important project relying on an external dependency makes the whole process too random, I would say, or too weak I think. Although that's certainly an internal ccNSO issue, it affects the whole community. And in that respect, I don't quite see why that couldn't be agreeable by our members. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. This time it's probably not so crucial but in case of Special IFR, it can be really very crucial and it can be very important to get the team together as quickly as possible and any bump like that can slow down the resolution of a very important issue. So thank you very much.

[BRENDA]: Thank you, Katrina. I was wondering whether it will be really helpful for those who have to make a decision on this as to what the rationale behind that requirement originally to have a non-cc member as part of the structure. I think that would help those who need to determine whether it's really a cc matter or whether it's really material. Because at the moment, I don't understand the rationale to have such requirement, but if we can explain that then it would help everybody. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you for the question. It's a very good question. I think during IANA stewardship transition process, when we had this at the team CCWG – I forgot to know those abbreviations and names – we had a very good representation on those teams and when we selected members, we were very careful to select not only ccNSO members but also very strong non-members. For example, I'm sure you know Lise Fuhr. At that time, .dk was not a member, yet she was very crucial to this overall success of the thing. So, we really did not care about membership at that time. We wanted to have the best people on board and that's what we got.

Then of course, one of the things that was worked into those proposals is that we still continue to try to get to those non-members involved as much as possible. At the time, I must admit that I was one of those who thought that this is not a good idea because more and more ccTLDs were joining the ccNSO. Actually, I think that many people saw this might be an issue but for the sake of the process, to make sure that we can move forward with IANA transition, we did not go into much discussion about that and thought, "Okay, hopefully we'll have good people still non-members."

---

A year ago it turned out that even if there is a significant number of non-members, usually they do not have enough capacity to participate and dedicate the people to this work. For example, small islands or countries that just emerged or whatnot, they really try to become active. Once they become active, they join ccNSO then we are where we are. Probably Stephen can add something.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

To follow on Katrina's comments, we are in some respect, a victim of our own success. With respect to the question of how this ended up in Bylaw 3.2 version, it's got to be in the archives of the transition CCWG somewhere, and I'm sure that would probably go from the floor almost to the ceiling. I don't think it's electronically searchable. I didn't know where it is at this point.

The answer to that specific question is how it ended up maybe lost in the sands of time. There are other areas within the Bylaws that are also problematic to other parts of the community, so we're not alone in this. But I don't have a precise answer as to why that was insisted, but it's a problem.

Putting my ECA hat on again, I would like to point out that if the prior scenario I described involving Approval Action Community Forum in Montreal occurs the earliest date upon which, assuming it gets the proper level of support, that the Bylaw

---

change can go into effect would be the 28<sup>th</sup> of November just for your planning purposes. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. I just want to do a time check here. We're at 13 minutes after the hour, so we have just a little bit of time left and a few other agenda items. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Byron Holland, .ca, Chair of the CSC, and was Chair of the ccNSO during IANA transition. Like many of us during that time, the discussion was certainly robust and compromises were made, and best efforts to find the best solution were made. I think that it's safe to say that back when we had 135 members – so think of 192 or 193 countries plus territories with 135 members, while some of us were concerned about this particular clause, there did still seem to be enough non-members that – two things. There would be lots to choose from and it seemed like a good idea even though there were concerns. And now that we're pushing 175 members, it's just non-member group is becoming ever smaller, and that is not a trend that any historical evidence would suggest is going to change. Even though we were all dreaming up what we thought was the best solution at the time, time has moved on, it's five years later, we have several years of experience now, and now we have to make some adjustments

---

and then to reflect the reality. If non-members want to participate, they will continue to be welcome, but we also just need high-quality folks to populate our part of the IFRT.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Byron. Just reflecting back on Phillippe’s comments is that with an ever decreasing pool of available non-ccNSO members, it creates a systemic risk and dependency of essentially what we’re seeing now not being able to form the team in a timely manner. So I think from a GNSO perspective, we’d like to make sure that the process is smooth and timely.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Thank you for your questions and thank you for your support.

Mutual concerns regarding the evolution of the multistakeholder model. Looking at the way we are discussing things, I think that multistakeholder model is in good hands. Nevertheless, there are some concerns and clearly it looks like all SO/ACs share similar concerns. During my years at ICANN, I’ve realized that the main idea here is to make sure that everyone is equally unhappy. I think this is the moment when probably we should try to make as happier than we are at the moment. It would be

---

very interesting to hear your views on the way it's moving and although the discussions are evolving. Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA:

I will try to be very brief. We had Brian Cote there and [you'd meet him] today. We tried to offer some positive solutions. I very much appreciate that they're trying to keep away from the results of the Work Stream 2 but with the outline in the issue document from the 12<sup>th</sup> of June is clearly kind of overlapping with the mandate of EPDP over the content of EPDP 3.0 and also sometimes with the Work Stream 2. So what we suggested is to convey a group maybe of people who were enrolled in the Work Stream 2 and PDP 3.0 – I know that it's a bit more work – and just identify the issues and just throw them out, and this will mitigate our concerns. I think this would be a very good exercise for us. I see the danger here, not when the Work Stream 2 or PDP 3.0 would be delayed, but people who are unhappy with the results will reopen the issues. We see it already happening with the comments to the small multistakeholder model exercise. So I hope that this will be taken further but I also believe that it will eliminate a lot of concerns, so we at least see the way forward.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Tatiana. Thank you, Katrina. I think on this one, the GNSO Council has been watching what is going on in the

---

discussions. I think there's a clear recognition that this process is meant to lead to a better understanding of and ability to prioritize the work of the community of ICANN Org, to understand the resource impact, and to identify things that need to be addressed and improved. So I think, to Tatiana's point, maybe there's an opportunity for some group collaboration between ccNSO and GNSO just to compare notes and to identify maybe some common areas. Maybe as an action item, that's something we can take away to consider.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. I think that's a good suggestion. Even though we haven't started any substantial discussions in the council or with our community, we do discuss many of the things like, for example, our Strategic and Operational Planning Committee constantly provides input budget to strategic and operational plans. This is one of the issues on your additional list.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you. Exactly. I'm not sure if there's another page of the agenda but we did again discuss the possibility of a coordinating group or subteam between ccNSO and GNSO Council on the question of the five-year strategic planning and the budgeting cycle. I know we have discussed this in the past, and even in

---

Kobe I think we had taken on some action item to review the respective comments to see if there was any commonality. I don't feel like we made full progress on that but I do think that perhaps this group of our budget committee and your budget committee coming together on the strategic planning and budgeting but also perhaps maybe that's at least the beginning group that could take a look at this multistakeholder model evolution discussion. Because that process that Brian Cote is running on behalf of the Board is supposed to inform the strategic planning and budgeting cycles. So I think they're very much interrelated.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Giovanni, who is the Chair of our SOPC, any comments, any suggestions how we could proceed to make sure that we coordinate better?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. Thank you, Katrina. Thank you, Keith. I'll be very happy to start a dialogue and coordination of those.

First, we have produced the very first draft of our comments to the Operation Plan and Financial Fiscal Year 2021-2025. ICANN has been not so transparent of that because it was just an answer on a blog post and it's not written almost anywhere. It's

---

public comment. The end of the public comment is the 5<sup>th</sup> of August. So we have produced the very first draft. We had very valuable discussion with the ICANN Finance Team two days ago and we'll continue to work on the draft and I'll be happy to share the draft with your contact point any time in the couple of next weeks when the draft is going to be consolidated.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. What can we do to learn the e-mail address of the contact point? Will you send us? Can I have it as an action item that we exchange e-mails? Thank you very much.

On a similar note, we have discussed many times – oh, not many times, maybe two or three times – discussed that there's a need to make sure that the requirements or the way confusing similarity for gTLDs and ccTLDs is evaluated in a predictable and similar weight to make sure that we have some clear rules how these confusing similarities are being evaluated. The Board also asked us to look into this variant management, and apparently you have already some preliminary results.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Katrina. I'm not sure if we have preliminary results. We've had preliminary discussion, for sure. I wish we had results. I think from a GNSO perspective – and we all know that the

---

ICANN Board in Kobe passed the resolution calling on a review of the policy implications around IDN variant TLDs, the top-level domains. And we all know that there is ongoing work in the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP about policies for future new gTLDs, but obviously we have existing TLDs and there's policy questions and implications around that but at IDN variant top-level. We're also looking at some of the IDN guidelines that are part of the registry contracts with ICANN in the gTLD space.

So, there's a number of different issues here and the GNSO Council has been discussing, looking at this IDN issue in a holistic manner. I recognize also that there is the string similarity question even in the ASCII strings but, generally speaking, string similarity. I think this is a topic that the council is aware of, has taken some recent steps to discuss to try to find a path forward, but there's a recognition that we really do need to engage together with the ccNSO to try to as the Board called for in its Kobe resolution whatever the output of the policy is to be consistent to the extent possible. So we recognize that and we take that on board as a serious task. We look forward to continuing to work with the ccNSO, and we probably at some point need to try to identify the right sort of structure to do that. I know that having conversations earlier today – I'm not sure if Edmon is here and Jennifer is here – there has been informal discussions and conversations going on, which I think is very

---

helpful but at some point I think together we need to figure out how to engage.

Obviously, as I said, there's an ongoing PDP in the G space. I know you have ongoing work that has been going on for quite some time and I think it's more advanced perhaps than where we are in the G space but I think we need to make sure that we're committed both to coming together and at least being aware of each other's work.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Keith. I think that is definitely the right way forward. We just need to identify the path. I think that's another action item that we can take from this meeting that we'll ask our staff to coordinate this discussion and maybe we should have a call to start at least discussing the way we're going to address that.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thank you, Keith. Marie from the BC. Thank you for raising this issue, not on the IDN part but on, as Keith said, the general string issues confusing similarity. After the last time we discussed this in Kobe, we went back to the BC and the BC are very happy to work with you on this. I remembered – we talked about this as well – even with Michele, the BC and the registrars, we both

---

agree that strings with S's at the end and these kind of things – sorry, I'm not sure where that's ... it's him. It's him.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We support [inaudible].

MARIE PATTULLO: It's just to let you know that the BC are very happy to it beyond that bit. It is to.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay, thank you, Marie. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Keith. Just on this particular point, I think a couple of things that we probably should clarify as well is that in terms of how we process through this, how we deal we those, at the moment it's being presented both in the GNSO and the ccNSO – at least on this slide anyway – as a single topic whereas, realistically, it's multiple topics. There are some aspects of it which are far more technical. There are some aspects of it which, as Marie was trying to say though she got lost in the feedback, would relate to security and stability. And there are other bits that are probably more kind of tied up in consistency of existing policies.

---

In the ccTLD space, you have several members that I know have a lot of experience in dealing with IDNs – I’m looking at my beloved friend, Giovanni, congratulations on your new IDN – whereas in the gTLD space, we play by totally different set of rules. It would probably be helpful, however, if we were to try and formalize some kind of way of continuing this conversation rather than ending up where we’re sitting across the table from each other again in Montreal and we have nothing to report even if that is just a simple mailing list with a few of us on it where we start throwing stuff backwards and forwards, anything like that. As Keith said, [he] knows I already put myself forward. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Introduce yourself.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you very much, Keith, for this, for Byron. Jennifer Chung, .Asia Registry Stakeholder Group. Thank you for this. Just very brief points on the last agenda item here. Basically, previously the ccNSO and the GNSO have worked together in the JIG Working Group as everybody does know. The suggestion is to have this in a formal coordination role so it gets tracked, that we get meetings, we get calls. Secondly, to have this early on because we can identify issues of commonalities and also issues

---

where you don't require harmonization. And to this point, then we can structure the work in the way that perhaps there could be separate charters for the ccNSO PDP and the GNSO PDP, but identify a structure where we can work on the areas of commonalities and also work separately on things that you don't require harmonization, so maybe like a joint pre-PDP group could be formed to have this. Thank you very much.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: I don't think we have agreed to having a PDP. I think we're meant to look at coordinating on this and liaising on this, but I don't know if we are actually looking at doing a PDP in the GNSO. Keith has –

KATRINA SATAKI: You do everything via PDP.

MICHELE NEYLON: Well, if we had a PDP to order coffee, I probably have died from lack of caffeine.

---

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Michele. I think we have not made a formal decision to initiate a PDP but I think that is one of the paths that we have to consider as it relates to the ICANN Board’s resolution from Kobe. Obviously, as you know, if there’s policy work to be done and it’s expected to be binding on gTLD registries contracted parties then the PDP is the mechanism to do that. Jennifer, thank you for the input and the very constructive and concrete possible next steps. Thank you very much.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. I think let’s start with another action item. So we have this mailing list. We subscribe those who are interested and then we see how we move forward unless there are other suggestions how we do that.

Okay, thank you. There is a suggestion I see from the staff. Yes, please, Bart. You can yell. Everybody will hear you.

BART BOSWINKEL: For those who are interested in this topic, there is currently – it’s called the IDN Preliminary Review Team of the ccNSO and they will meet tomorrow morning and they will have a discussion on the aspects of the ccNSO PDP #2 that need to be updated. This includes, among others, the variant management that there’s a placeholder and confusing similarity. So if you're interested, I

---

think it is from 9 to 10 tomorrow morning, but I'm not sure. Room is Opale, I believe. So if you're interested, you're more than welcome. You will step in work that's already done and I know some of my colleagues supporting the GNSO have been attending these calls so they can debrief you afterwards.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Yet I propose that we send an e-mail with details about this meeting. Please do not forget to do that. I reckon, if I understand correctly, there is a comment from a remote participant.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Katrina, this is Joke from staff. I just wanted to say that the meeting is tomorrow between 10:30 and 12 in Opale. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: So we won't send an e-mail. Please note in your diary. So, 10:30, Opale. Be there. We'll be very happy to see you. Thank you. Thank you very much for having us here. Thank you very much for this constructive discussion. See you in Montreal. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**