
KATRINA SATAKI: Hello everyone. This is the Council Meeting, 19th September 2019. So, thank you very much for joining. We're still not quorate. We're waiting for someone from the AP Region to join. Hopefully they will. But let's start. We have several...

BART BOSWINKEL: Katrina, this is Bart. Jordan just joined so you are quorate.

KATRINA SATAKI: Excellent.

KIM CARLSON: And Hiro has joined as well.

KATRINA SATAKI: Excellent. Thank you very much. That's great.

JORDAN CARTER: Good morning.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, it's evening for some, but for those who this is morning, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. So, we have received several apologies. Kim, could you please note them?

KIM CARLSON: Sorry about that. So, we have apologies from Margarita, Leonid, Miguel, Giovanni, and Philippe, and Nick Wenban-Smith, as well. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Others hopefully will be here, or maybe already are here. Minutes from our meeting on 22nd of August have been circulated, and apparently they're considered approved. Some things from the previous meeting, some Action Items. As you can see, we still have some ongoing. Several are completed and hopefully you checked them before the meeting. Kim, could you scroll please?

Let's move forward. Also, some other things. Sorry, that's too much. A little bit back. So, we had several intermeeting decisions. First, we submitted several statements. Next page, please. Also, there's a proposal to appoint Frederico Neves as our Co-Chair of the IANA Function Review Team. We haven't received any objections, so this is decided.

We have approved several membership applications. Here we also should add one more, the one that today I sent in an email, earlier today I sent an email to the list, so we also have .eu, [inaudible] so welcome to all our new members. That's excellent. We are almost back to our number before we started checking, so now we have 170 members. I think that's great success for the ccNSO. I hope that the new members also will enjoy it.

Sorry, if you're not talking please mute because it's too noisy.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: My apologies.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, please mute. Thank you. Yeah, we also submitted the letter to the ICANN Board about IDN ccTLD Policy. A little bit more on that later. And, also submitted our, maybe I shouldn't use the word our here, because I selected some of the responses and added some comments. I'm afraid that I was the only one, but nobody objected so this ours. I hope that you at least had a look and agreed to my responses to the survey. Again, a little bit more about ATRT3 later today.

Okay, so we have some update about the ccNSO membership. I already mentioned now we're back to, almost back to, our numbers that we had before we started checking. So, you saw the background paper. Joke, would you like to comment on that?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hi Katrina. Happy to do so. The report was shared with you last Friday, it was shared on the mailing list, and since then some addition ccTLDs provided input. So, in total 49 ccTLDs requested changes. For the details on the per region basis are included in the annex of the report as which was shared last week.

So, as you already mentioned, the total number of ccNSO members as of yesterday is, again, 170; .vu is the youngest member. And as you know, seven ccTLDs were terminated following those verifications that we did, and three of them reapplied and become a member, or the current ccTLD Manager became a member in the meanwhile. If there are any questions, I'm happy to answer them. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Joke. So, are there any questions? Stephen, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. Joke, thank you so much for your work on this. It's important. You did a comprehensive job. This is more to Katrina and Council than to you. I'm just wondering with respect to those ccTLDs, ccNSO members, where there's still an open question about getting their ccNSO details in sync with the IANA details, will those ccNSO members, and I think there's six or seven, will they be permitted to vote in the upcoming Board Election, or is their membership in such a conditional state that they will not be allowed to participate? I'm just curious. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you. Joke, I see your hand is up.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Yes, Katrina. Happy to answer that one. Stephen mentioned that there are six ccTLDs which are still pending and awaiting further action. This number in the meanwhile has been reduced to three ccTLDs. We hope to resolve everything by the time the elections start. In any case, the Board Elections will only start in January so there is efficient time for that one.

The Regional Elections, if any, will start already in November so even there we still have some time to discuss the matters with those three ccTLDs. For two of them, they are considering some IANA Database changes. So, that takes some time and we'll see where this leads to. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you. I think that we can look into the issue when there's more clarity around that and when time is closer to the deadline. Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Katrina. Are those the six ccTLDs that are still pending and awaiting for further action, I understand that there's only three of them left, were any of those related to the seven ccTLDs that appear to be no longer members?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hello, Pablo. This is Joke. Those three ccTLDs are still a member of the ccNSO at the moment. So, the conversation with them is still ongoing and we'll see how to resolve the matter. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Joke. So, if there are no more questions or comments, please don't forget to lower your hands. So, if members are still members, they are eligible to vote. If they are no longer members, they are not eligible to vote. So, if there are no further questions, let's move to the next Agenda Item. That's Item number 5.

So, as you know, well I don't know if you know, some time ago, we presented already a Bylaw Change Repository, or tried to keep track on those things that we noted that need our attention, that need changes in the Bylaws. If we talk about the current status of our request to change Fundamental Bylaws with respect to the composition of IANA Function Review Team, then ICANN Board of Directors have approved the change. But as you saw email from Stephen, that triggers approval action, a process which means that at least two or more, so obviously we will support the change that we proposed.

So, we will support the change and we need two more decisional participants to support the change. And of course, no one should, or not more than two I think should, or not more than one, should object. I reached out to the Chairs, as we know from the report of our Liaison to the ALAC, ALAC supports the change, which is good, and so we have ALAC already supporting, so thank you very much to them for this.

It really matters a lot. So, hopefully at least one more decisional participant will support the change. But, I think if we, currently we have this Community Forum scheduled, tentatively scheduled, for Sunday morning. I think that if we receive enough support probably there won't be any formal need for this Community Forum.

BYRON HOLLAND: Did we lose Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Have you lost me?

JOKE BRAEKEN: No, I can hear you well.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, that's good.

BART BOSWINKEL: No, I can hear you too.

BYRON HOLLAND: Hello?

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, we've lost Byron. Okay, I'll write to him.

BART BOSWINKEL: Byron, we can hear you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. That's good. I mean, that's bad that Byron cannot hear us. But, I see Stephen has his hand up. Please, go on. Stephen, we can't hear you. Please unmute.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That would be helpful. Katrina, continue on but when you're finished I do want to discuss some logistics of this forum, etcetera, etcetera, with my ECA hat on. So, carry on and then I'll get back.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. No, actually, basically I have finished that. I just wanted to ask you what's the general feeling on the Empowered Community Administration, so what's the general opinion there?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, from an ECA standpoint, with my ECA hat on now, we would like to see formal notice from ALAC, which has informally said yes, we agree, and hopefully from two other SOs/ACs formally acknowledging agreement with this Bylaw change. If that is the case, if we could get that before Montreal, then what the ECA would like to do, in the interest of cost savings for ICANN, is schedule a web-based Approval Action Community Forum, which we are entitled to do, and wrap this up before Montreal so we do not have to incur the expense of actually having a formal conference room, early morning, Sunday morning meeting.

But, in order to that, because what we have to do, the way the Annex D Section 1 is written, is we have to have some sort of "Community Forum" and then go into this Approval Action, what do they call it, Approval Action Community Forum period. So, my ideal situation would be if the ccNSO Leadership can wrap up, get formalized approval of yes, we agree, we agree, we agree, then we can do a proforma web-based Community Forum, launch into the Community period knowing it's going to all be approved at the end of the day, and spare ICANN the expense of having to run a formal in person Approval Action Forum at Montreal. So, that's where I'm trying to go with that, but I leave it up to Council Leadership to secure the required formal approvals that are transmitted to the ECA from the other SOs/ACs. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you very much, Stephen. According to the Bylaws, this Community Forum is not an obligation, let's say, it's not mandatory. Regardless of that, if I understand you correctly, the ECA believes that even if we get support from a sufficient number of decisional participants, we still should have a Community Forum. Maybe it's not for the ECA to decide, of course, but what would be the formal process then. Stephen, are you there?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I am. You have properly corrected me on that. It does appear that 1.32, if, yes. So, actually it appears you're correct that the forum is optional. What we do need, then is, if we do not formally request one, what we do need is during the, we have a 21 day Approval Action Decision period which is supposed to begin at the conclusion of the Approval Action Community Forum period. So, we could conceivably open and close the Community Action Forum period in 24 hours, but I would think we would only do so knowing full well that the ccNSO has received formal support from other SOs/ACs to the Empowered Community Administration signifying their support for this.

At which point, the 21 day Approval Action Decision period can be collapsed down to simply the ECA, having received the requisite number of approvals and noting the lack of the requisite numbers of disapprovals to derail the action, we can then turn around and do an ECA Approval Notice to the Board and get this done. And conceivably this could all be done before Montreal. It's a matter for the ccNSO Leadership to solicit endorsement of this –

KATRINA SATAKI: That's clear. Yes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: – Bylaw change and then get them, whatever their procedures are, and this is an unknown to me, to get them within their procedures to formally say to the ECA, "Yes, we approve of this." If they can do that, this can all happen before Montreal, conceivably, and I would be happy with that outcome. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, that's clear. Yes, we need support. Yes, one of the Action Items that we should add to the list of the Action Items, is that we have to prepare a formal notification from the ccNSO, approved by the ccNSO Council, that we support this Bylaw change. Of course, we are also one of the DPs and definitely we need to express our official support. But that's actually not what I asked.

I asked whether there is any formal procedure. So, it's not the ECA that asks for this Community Forum to happen. It should be the Community At-Large. So, is there a process for that? So, somehow all SOs/ACs, all decisional participants, sorry, while their representatives on the ECA Forum somehow... Well, I'm just asking about the formal process. But let's not waste time on that. Let's take it offline. There's another question, comment, from Jordan. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Katrina. Can you put me again to the reference in the Bylaws that says the forum is optional?

KATRINA SATAKI: I do not have Bylaws in front of me, but definitely we can send you the... It's Annex D. Definitely in the Annex D with everything that's related to approval of any of those actions [inaudible] rejection actions.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay, thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Stephen, I see your...

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm waving my hand.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, I see you're waving it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: To answer, first of all, your previous comment, it's up the ECA to request the forum. And to answer Jordan's question, Annex D 1.3 Section 2, it says if the EC Administration requests a publicly available, blah, blah, blah, ICANN shall, and 1.3.1 at the direction of the ECA Administration can be in a forum. So, I believe what this is saying is that it's optional, Jordan. I didn't think it was until I started looking at this just now, but I think it's now optional. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: If I remember correctly, it is optional. Okay, anyhow, let's take it offline and I hope this Action Item is noted.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Agreed.

KATRINA SATAKI: We [inaudible] our own support for this. Okay, next one. Update on CSC Membership. As you remember, we had to find a new member to the CSC. We have selected Alejandra. Congratulations and thank you very much for stepping forward. Meanwhile, one of the members from the Registry Stakeholder Group

stepped down so they had to seek a new candidate. I hope though that by the end of this month. Well, formally, according to the process, we have to approve, both Councils, have to approve new state of the CSC, that's members and Liaisons.

Currently, we are waiting for the second members from the Registry Stakeholder Group being appointed. As far as I understand, they have a very good candidate so hopefully this won't be an issue and won't take long. What is important here, please do not forget, that we have the Selection Committee, we have one representative from each region who are authorized by the Council to approve the full slate of the membership. Those people have already been informed and hopefully they will act quickly. We really need to act quickly at this time. Okay, so any questions about that? No. Let's move forward.

Update on the ccNSO Selection of Board Seat 11 and Council Election. Members may ask our Nominations Manager and Election Manager, Joke, to give us an update. Joke?

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Happy to do so, Katrina. So, the call for nominations launched on the 11th of September and still runs until the 2nd of October. In the meanwhile, two candidates have been nominated and seconded, one from the Latin-American Caribbean Region, Patricio Poblete, and one from the African Region, Calvin Browne. The Archive of the Nominations and Secondments is public.

And according to the timeline approved by the Council, the candidate statements will be provided during the ICANN66 Meeting on Day 1 of the Members Meeting, in the afternoon that is. And elections will be held in January after the Due Diligence Verifications. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any questions, comments? If not, let's move forward. This is something that I already mentioned, but here we have a formal decision. Yes, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm just happy to say that we've got two really well qualified candidates in the contest. I couldn't be more pleased. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. We're already on Agenda Item number 8. Formal decision to appoint Frederico as a Co-Chair. Kim, could you scroll? Anyone would like to move? Alejandra. Pablo seconded. Thank you. Any further comments? Didn't receive on the mailing list so I hope, apart from thanking for the record, for agreeing. I hope that there are no other comments. Thank you very much, Frederico, for agreeing to be our Co-Chair. Let's go to voting this draft resolution. So, anyone object? Anyone abstains? Do not see any which means that the resolution has passed. Thank you. Emoji Study Group Final Report. Bart, may I give you the floor to give us an update?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, so Alejandra has been on as the Emoji to Council Liaison. Alejandra, if you want to take the lead this one? Otherwise I'll do it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I don't mind you taking the lead on this. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. Okay. So, the draft report was already circulated before the last meeting, but it is quite extensive. As you will see, it includes observations and some recommendations. It's not shocking. It is using the format of the [inaudible] Study Group. You had the chance and the time to read it. It's now time for the Working Group to end this work and therefore the final report is submitted to the ccNSO Council for adoption and support of the recommendations and then we take it from there. So, I don't know if there are now substantive questions with respect to the report, even after the last time?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Bart. Any questions? I think the recommendations are pretty clear. See several Action Items coming out from these recommendations. If there are no further questions on this, may I ask for anyone to move? Alejandra. And Pablo seconded. Thank you.

Well, with that you see the draft resolution in front of you. So, the proposal is that we adopt the final report then we inform the ICANN Board of Directors accordingly, so we respond to their resolution from 2017. And Hiro would like to thank the members of Emoji Study Group for their work. I hope that they enjoyed it and at least those reports that they gave to the Community were really interesting and full of emoji, let's say. Let's move to voting then. Anyone object? Anyone abstains? No, which means that the report has been approved. Thank you very much, and thanks to the group.

Next one is IDN ccTLD Policy Development and related efforts. Hopefully that the Board will respond favorably to our proposal from our letter that we sent to them. So, I'd like to give the floor to Bart who would present further steps and

what we need to think about related to the IDN ccTLD, how we can move forward. Bart, the floor is yours.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. Scroll down. It's just a short recap for your... Scroll down please, Kim. So, you understand a little bit of the background and the need for further action. So, currently there are 61 IDN ccTLDs and they are considered ccTLDs from 42 countries, and as you can see they are not currently eligible to become members of the ccNSO, which is what it is. Next slide please.

In March 2019, there were some known open issues with respect to the Selection Procedure and other things, as you can see, inclusion of IDNs ccTLDs in the ccNSO is one, also the retirement of IDN ccTLD became very obvious. It was very obvious for the Retirement Working Group, that this is a hard nut to crack for them if you're not very versed in IDN ccTLDs.

As you may know, with the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel and the discussions with SSAC, the confusing similarity evaluation needs to be revisited and reworked because it became too detailed and under the Fast Track, and it deviates from the overall policy. And finally, the Board has requested the ccNSO and GNSO to work together on variant management and there is a placeholder in the proposed policy. Next slide please. Road map, I will not. Next slide. Road map itself. You've seen this before, next slide please. Next slide.

So, the road map itself, what it entailed, it stopped the evolution of Fast Track Process and PDP, too, so that it will be computed. There was a request that was sent out in August 2019 to the Board, so that's pending and now the Board needs to respond at one point whether they agree with the approach. In the meantime, the ccNSO has conducted a gap analysis of the overall policy that

was completed in June 2019, where say, the report which you adopted from the Preliminary Review Team.

And then the next step would be to replace the ccPDP 2, so that's the one on IDN overall policy with two actions. One is the Bylaw change and the other one is ccPDP 4 Policy to select IDN ccTLD strings. So that is the high-level story and the road map moving forward. Next slide please. So, you've seen this, you can read it at your leisure. It's just, again, to emphasis the need. Next slide please.

So, what is the ccNSO Council expected to do, and that was the requests for us to look into. So, first immediate step is not with the ccNSO Council, but it's with the Board, and that's the response on the letter. Depending on the response, ccPDP will be closed. And as a result, the Council and the Community, the ccTLD Community, can start the discussion on the inclusion of the IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO and start the process of updating the Selection Procedures.

The assumption moving forward is that by Montreal, the Council would have received a letter from the Board, and it might be useful to check with Board and ICANN Org whether that's feasible. Next slide please. So, assuming the Council receives a response, the Council action is, with respect to the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO, would be to separate the current proposals on the ccPDP out of the Board report and request the Board to implement them and change Article 10 accordingly.

Before doing this and in parallel, it would probably be wise to have a discussion and reconcur with the ccTLDs present the proposed changes to Article 10 because it will have some impact on countries or for ccTLDs where there is an IDN ccTLD and if they're not run by the same entity. And if the Community present agrees, a Council decision to request a Bylaw change to the Board.

Again, this is an action, if all goes well, to be taken by the Council at Montreal Meeting. Next slide please.

With respect to the update of the IDN ccTLDs string, selection proposed, again, this is the assumption that ccPDP 2 closes, but if that's the case, then launch PDP 4 at the Montreal Meeting. This requires a set of decisions from the Council. One is request the Issue Report, appoint the Issue Manager, and come up with a tentative timeline for the ccPDP 4, especially the main ones. The advice is to also include that the Issue Report should be limited to the issues identified in the Gap Analysis Report and that the Issue Report should propose how these issues should be addressed, and there are already some proposals in the Preliminary Review Report.

Also suggested is to mandate the Issue Manager to call for volunteers to assist in draft the Issue Report because the reason for doing this in principle, the Issue Manager is asked to draft the Issue Report, but in this case it would be good to already include people who have an interest and work with them in developing the Issue Report. That worked pretty well with the PDP 3.

And then finally, what has already been scheduled is there is a meeting for interested people in Montreal and that's scheduled for Thursday, 7 November. So, that's on the Thursday after the Council Meeting. So, these are the proposed steps and timing for further action with respect to the IDN PDP. I see Kim alert in the chat, it's Block 2 on Thursday. Thank you. Back to you, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you very much. I think everything is pretty clear and straightforward. Any questions? I see none. Okay, then thanks. Let's move forward with our Agenda. Okay, next one is ccNSO Organizational Review, next

steps. What we have here, as you know, Meridien Institute has submitted their final report.

And, actually yes, we received update and more information from MMSI Team. They have prepared some templates that we fill in, so we should look at the recommendations and then see whether we agree, whether they're feasible, and how we are going to implement them. Basically, work on the analysis and implementation plan of those recommendations that we're, first of all, that are in the scope of the ccNSO, and it's not like that website is not entirely in the scope of the ccNSO because we need support from ICANN to make sure that we can have this website.

But the suggestion is that we ask the Review Working Party, those people who already worked with Meridien Institute during the entire review process, we ask Review Team Working Party to look at the template or the recommendations and come up with this final assessment and implementation plan and then present it to the Council and then the Council would approve the plan. Does that sound feasible to you, at least to those of you who can hear me? Yes, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, Katrina, I note that this is an Agenda Item on the Council Workshop and I would be happy to take the lead on that particular portion of the Council Workshop. I got the thing printed off and I'm reading through it now. It's 80 pages, so it's rather dense.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, it is. It is dense and there are also many recommendations or suggestions. Let's say they are recommendations, not so many of them, and then there are suggestions that we could look into as part of the Council.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, and I'd be happy to take the lead on that in that particular part of our discussion in Montreal. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you. Well, just to make sure that we do not do things in parallel, because I don't think that the Working Party will finish their assessment by Montreal. So yeah, Stephen, you can probably look at those suggestions and see what Council could do and how that would help the Working Party to do their job. But, probably, look in the report and probably more concentrate on suggestions rather than recommendations.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, let's continue this discussion offline.

KATRINA SATAKI: Exactly, yeah. Okay. Thank you. Any other comments, questions? If no, let's move forward. Agenda Item number 12, PDP 3 Part 1 Retirement. Stephen, any updates from your side?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes. We continue to plot along. We got some draft policy, about 14 pages worth. We have got a little bump in the road in that the Maintenance Agency is

coming up with a revised version of ISO 3166, with some revised terminology and that has lead Bernard and I to go down the road of trying to nail down use of terminology. I'll be talking to him after we get off this call. We have our next meeting a week from today, actually. And we are noodling down on this whole issue of terminology to describe country codes, etcetera, etcetera.

The short and the long of it is we are making progress. We expect to have a really vigorous face-to-face meeting in Montreal, and I would say we're much closer to the end than we are to the beginning of this process, but I won't stay exactly when it might conclude. And that's my report, and if there are any questions, I'll be happy to entertain them.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Any questions? Okay, none. Yeah, okay, then let's move forward. And that's Council Workshop in Montreal. We already a little bit touched on this subject. ICANN, please open the Google docs. I hope you all had time to look at it. So, we have prepared Google docs and here, as you can see, we have already some topics. Please feel free to first volunteer to organize the session. It's not just... Currently, we have several leaders, for example, this Icebreaking Exercise, Jordan is the leader, but it doesn't mean that he should do everything alone so you can step forward and help to think about the session and help to organize it.

Yeah, and you can see also there are some other things that had already been proposed. Well, you see already some comments. Please, please, look at the topics. Do you agree with the topic? Maybe you could, if you have any ideas how to organize it, you can suggest. If you want to organize it or want to take the lead there, also please feel free to write your names or your suggestions, comments, add them to this Google doc. Any immediate, maybe you were too

shy to write, you want to mention something now? Oh, Jordan made a suggestion, but it had been deleted. No, have you made another one? I can see your suggestion here.

JORDAN CARTER: Sorry, Katrina. I was looking at the... I clicked on the link that just got posted and it didn't show up, but it is there. So, yes, it has not been deleted.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, we usually delete all your comments but this time this one is here. Okay, good. Thank you very much. Thanks a lot, to everyone who already commented and stepped forward as the leaders of sessions. So, please feel free to react to the topics we already have here and add some more if you have any ideas. Of course, I'm afraid that we won't be able to do all of the topics because we have reserved two blocks for the Workshop. It's a lot but it's not a week, right? So, we won't be able to, we might not be able to do everything.

But, yeah, and that's of course, it might mean that the more people support the topic, the more chances are that we are going to cover it. So, you could also note your support in the comments or maybe you could say, "Oh, no, this is not an interesting topic. Let's skip it." Please be more active because we want the Workshop to be valuable. Doodle Poll on the topics. Well, if we have too many of them, then yes, probably have to do some Doodle Poll but let's not make things too complicated.

But, for example, when Stephen stepped forward as a leader, he also asked how much time can we allocate to the session. I couldn't answer the question because it really depends on the number of topics that we have, the number of

topics that we select. Okay, thank you. If there are no other suggestions, let's move forward to the next Agenda Item. Let's go back to the Agenda, and I think that's the general schedule, yeah.

Regular Agenda in Montreal. We have Sunday Prep Meeting. After that, no. Workshop and then Prep Meeting. On Wednesday, we have, regular time, we have Council Meeting. A joint meeting with the GNSO Council. We have joint meeting. We had to move joint meeting with ALAC, unfortunately due to do some conflict there. Which means that currently our meeting with ALAC is in parallel with SOPC Meeting, which means that our Councilors on the SOPC, they won't be able to join but I think that's okay.

As you know, we did have a meeting in Marrakech, so we deferred it and one of the topic that we want to cover is that we give a presentation to ALAC, especially to those new ALAC to explain what our ccTLD is, what they're doing, what the ccNSO and what the ccNSO is doing. We did that several years ago but now there are many new people on ALAC, and they requested this, so we are trying to give more information about what we are and how we work.

I think that's bound to be critical for those Councilors and SOPC, so please do SOPC work and trust us that the rest of us that we will do our best to represent ccTLDs and ccNSO in our meeting with ALAC.

Tech Day Monday, Tech Working Group is working on the Agenda. Members Meeting also we have some information. Can I give now the floor to Alejandra to guide us through the current state of affairs? Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Katrina. Well, as you can see now on your screens, there's the current Block Schedule. All Plenary Sessions have been confirmed. In particular, the Plenary Session on DNS Abuse will have an introductory webinar that will be announced, so be aware of this in your emails and your inboxes. As has been said already on this call, the Community Forum has been moved from Monday to Sunday, it's still tentative.

And you can see now the time of the ccNSO and ALAC, it will be at 3:15 in the afternoon. Also, the Welcome Ceremony on Monday has been confirmed that it will be on morning. And because of this, the Prep Session with Session Chairs has been moved to Block 5 at the end of the day. Though, we still are pending to see whether Tech Day will go all over Block 5. If this is the case, then we will move that session to the beginning of the day, maybe 8:30.

Also, on Tuesday the GAC ccPDP Onboarding Session has been confirmed. As it was agreed, there will be no joint meeting between ccNSO and GAC, as in all ccNSO goes visits GAC room and have an exchange. Only there will be this GAC ccPDP Onboarding and we will continue with our scheduling parallel. And also, all Working Group Committees and related groups face-to-face meetings have been confirmed and this is the update for the general Block Schedule. If we can move to the Members Meeting now, please Kim? Thank you very much.

So, now from the last time that there was this draft, there has been a lot of changes. So, we will go through them. The beginning is the same. There will be Opening Welcome and a welcome from the local host and the highlights. But after that, there's this new session, the DNS and the Internet of Things, the idea is to start the discussion on this topic. And aiming, maybe, if this is a subject that is interesting for our Community, to foresee a Plenary Session in the next ICANN Meeting in Cancun. So, be aware of that.

After the Coffee Break, the Accountability and Transparency Review was moved. It was on Wednesday, now it's here. We will meet with the ICANN Board. And after lunch, as I told you, there's the GAC PDP Onboarding Session and in parallel we will have the Debriefing of the ccNSO Workshops that were moved from Block 2 to Block 3. After that session, we'll have the Q & A with the Candidates for the ICANN Board Seat 11. This was moved there to have it the same day as the ccNSO Networking Event, given this opportunity to maybe have some more informal conversations with the candidates after they have presented or being questioned on what they're seeking to do on the ICANN Board. So, this is the main idea on having this on Tuesday.

After the Coffee Break, we have the ccTLD News Session. The call for volunteers for the ccTLD News Session has been launched. It's open until September 25th so we still have some time so if you know anyone that could give us a very nice presentation, please tell them to apply and to write to us so we can consider them for this slot. And after the break, we have ccNSO Organizational Review. And this was merged with the review of the different discussions on the ccNSO Council Workshop. And then we end the day with our ccNSO Networking Event. Can we move forward please, Kim, thank you? Excellent.

So, on Wednesday, the IANA Naming Function Session was moved to Block 1. Then the Q & A with the ccNSO Appointed ICANN Board Members was moved to Block 2. And we will leave our room to go to the Plenary Session on DNS Abuse. And after lunch we come back to the Policy Session that was moved from Tuesday to Wednesday. And then we go to the Q & A with the Candidates on the ccNSO Council. That was moved from the beginning of the day to this time. And after the Coffee Break, our session of Internet Governance Discussion. And we end the day with the ccNSO Council Meeting. If you have any questions or comments, please let me know. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Alejandra. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina, and thank you, Alejandra for that. Since I can't scroll it, I may have missed it but is there a session for Board Candidates to present themselves to the Community and also for ccNSO Council Candidates to present themselves to the Community?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, Stephen. You can see them. Right now, they are being displayed. On Tuesday on Block 3, we have the ICANN Board Candidates Q & A.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Oh, yeah. See them.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And then at the end of what you see on your screen, on Wednesday on Block 3, too, you can see Q & A with the Candidates to the ccNSO Council.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Yeah, I broke my glasses today, so I'm really debilitated. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No problem. In any case, I just emailed every one of you these files so you can have them and maybe you can see them at your own pace.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Thanks a lot. I think the Agenda looks very good. If there are no further questions let's move forward. We have received a written update from Stephen about the ECA matters. CSC, any update from you, Byron? If you can hear me now.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, I can hear you now. Thank you. We had CSC Meeting yesterday. The PTI Report indicated that they had reached a 98, Bart correct me if I'm wrong, 98.6 percent attainment of their metrics. They had one minor one that I won't go into the details with that remains the CSC felt that there was no particular issue with regarding technical checks, but no issue.

One of the main things that we discussed was the transition from the current CSC composition to the next group of members and that two of the four members are leaving, myself included and Elaine Pruis are the two members whose term is ending as of this September 30th. Elaine was a bit unexpected, but she has just started a new job and that would prevent her from participating as she had expected to.

So, we are in a little bit of a predicament in that there will only be two members as of September 30th, unless the GNSO and the Registry Stakeholder Group get organized more quickly than they seem to be right now in appointing a new member. As I think all of us on this call know, we have appointed a new

member, but they have not, and the process demands that both members be appointed before both respective Councils approve the new members.

So, there were a couple of little hiccups with that in terms of how do you carry on business, how do we continue to carry on business over time in this predicament, depending on how long the Registry Stakeholder Group takes to get their new member appointed. So, we have undertaken to have a temporary solution whereby one of the Community Liaisons, Lars Liman, in fact is going to be a temporary or he's going to be an acting Chair upon my departure and will see the group through until such time as the new members are both appointed by their Communities and approved by both Councils.

So that took up a moderate amount of time as we had to come to a solution and come to conclusion on that. So, that's the main thing that I wanted to surface for this group because it is something of an anomaly, so we found our way through it and I think, also, I think I know all parties were satisfied with the conclusion. But I just wanted to make sure this group knows what's happening on that front over the next 30 or say days, I would expect. And that concludes my report. Any questions?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I see Stephen has a question. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. Byron, thank you for that. How does this intermediate solution comport with the Bylaws? Just out of curiosity. This is an area of the Bylaws I am not familiar with, so I refer to you on this. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, good question. And I don't believe... Well this is an internal procedures matter and the Bylaws, as far as we're aware, are silent on anything like this. And that's part of why we had to wrestle our way through it is that how the Chairs are selected, Chair by Chair, etcetera, is an internal procedure but also the issue of quorum was an internal procedure.

And originally, we'd had... So, way back in the midst of time coming out of the IANA Transition, because this was all uncharted ground, we set ourselves a very high bar on quorum, which was 100 percent, and not just 100 percent of those attending the meeting, but 100 percent of us, the four members. So, we could not take any decision that required a vote without all four of us actually being present.

And that was okay to start with and we all subscribed to that in the early days to make sure that nothing untoward happened and that we were all involved. As time has moved on and the Committee has matured, and our cadence has become a little more normalized, we believe that that bar was totally unrealistically high, especially given that over three years, some members have come and gone, changed jobs, moved on, etcetera, and the inevitable life that occurs where occasionally somebody can't make a meeting.

Although I do want to say the CSC Membership had extremely high attendance overall. But that said, because it's an internal procedure, and we had all four members on the call yesterday, we did adjust that internal procedure on two particular fronts. One is we said that we continued to require unanimity of all appointed members, previous iteration had all four members. We amended that internal procedure to say all appointed members. So, if the GNSO, for example, only has... Can I ask everybody who's not talking, i.e. all the rest of you, to be on mute please? Somebody's pretty loud. Thank you.

So, that allowed us to continue to carry on our business even if one of the Communities had not put forward a full slate, but we also put a limitation on it so it couldn't be gamed in that the only thing that we could carry on with was day-to-day run of the mill business, i.e. receiving, reviewing, and adopting the PTI Report. It would still require all four members to be both appointed and approved and presented to make any substantive changes to the business rules or conduct of the CSC itself.

So, we still continue to have, I would say, an exceptionally high bar to make any material changes to how the CSC conducts itself, but we did make that amendment to lower the bar a little bit to reflect day-to-day reality in the very straightforward business of receiving and approving the PTI Monthly Report. Hopefully, that gives you some relevant context, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Byron, and Byron, I personally want to thank you so much for your service as the head of the CSC for these past few years. You sent it on a well-directed course, shall I say, and I thank you for that. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much. Appreciate it. And we have a couple, as we know, Alejandra will be moving on the CSC and we have Brett Carr from nominate there right now, so we'll be in good hands going forward as well. But thank you for that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you. Let's move forward then. No news from RZERC. Then probably any updates from Councilors, Regional Organizations, Secretariat? Anyone would like to share anything? Okay. If, Pablo, please?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Katrina. I just want to recognize the fantastic work that was done by .gt in Guatemala. The Regional Organization for the Latin-America and Caribbean TLD celebrated a Workshop for both commercial and technical people and the host, .gt, was amazing and gave us an opportunity to exchange information from two groups that normally don't speak that much, which are the people who are involved in the marketing and the selling and the technicians, what's possible and what's not, right?

And so, this was a fantastic event because the atmosphere that was developed by .gt was specifically Alejandra, Luis Furlan and the rest of the team, Ivy and so on, was amazing. And I just want to publicly commend them for the fantastic work they did. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Thank you. That's great to hear that ccTLDs corporate regionally. That's I think always very much appreciated by ccTLDs and regionally you can do what we can't do globally. Okay, that's excellent. Thank you. Probably a very short update from me and Vice-Chair. So, we had a call with the CO of ICANN this Monday where we all exchanged information or we explained in more detail about IDN ccTLD, the PDP related to that. We also talked, explained a little about our election procedures, where we are and what we're doing.

And another thing that, well, Göran also mentioned some activities at ICANN level that's related. For example, Security and DAAR project, two ccTLDs currently joined the project, the DAAR project, DAAR. And also, there were some ideas, probably you remember I mentioned that, that ICANN wanted to allocate one million dollars to so-called Flexibility Fund that would allow SOs/ACs to fund projects that did not find their way into annual ICANN budget. Currently there is a new version of the idea and it'll be presented in more detail to SOs/ACs in Montreal. So, anything else? Byron or Alejandra, do you remember any other things that I haven't mentioned? Important things I forgot to mention, no?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, I think you covered it all.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, nothing from Byron. Okay. That's good. Then another thing, Demi, you are our only member on the ATRT3 Review. Anything you'd like to raise or share with the Council?

DEMI GETSCHKO: Hi Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: We can hear you. Please go on.

DEMI GETSCHKO: We have each week a meeting of the Committee to discuss the things. We did a lot of work examining the ATRT2 suggestion implementations. We have almost done this. We have great help from Bernie Turcotte. He did really an excellent job in that area.

We also received the response of the surveys. The first survey, I can say, that we have around 90 individual responses and more or less, all the responses from the structure organizations, the SOs/ACs. So, I think we will have a good collection of views on that. In the next meeting, next week, we have also the compilation of the answers to the second survey, then I think I will have more information to give you.

And there is a face-to-face meeting planning for Singapore, but I think I cannot attend that meeting as I have a very tough agenda in the next days but anyway, as I saw, we will have some slot in the meeting in Montreal where we can explain a little bit more the of the address. The ATRT3 has to be finished until March next year, that is quite short timeframe and we expect to have the draft reports for public comments probably around January. But, of course, this is yet to be decided in a more definite way. I think more or less it is this, thank you Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Demi. And again, thank you very much for stepping forward, otherwise we wouldn't have any representative from the ccNSO. That's really great and thanks a lot. Okay. Yeah, so, please all Councilors be at this session where we can listen more about developments of the ATRT. This is a very important review and we need to understand what's going on there. Okay, thanks.

Update from Working Groups. GRC, as I already mentioned during our previous call, we were working together with the GNSO Drafting Team on some common approach to special IANA Function Review. We will present it more to both Councils during our meeting in Montreal, at least that's the plan.

We also worked on this special IANA Function Review and then there was some break during summertime or summertime in Northern Hemisphere. And now we're again looking at the things that were probably put on the high shelf and now we put it back on the table and start working on things like Work Stream 2 Recommendations and others. That's about the, little bit about GRC. Next one, IANA Governance Liaison Committee, Joke, would you like to share something really quickly, what IGLC is up to?

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Happy to do so, Katrina. So, the IGLC has regular meetings leading up to Montreal and actually what we are focusing on now is preparing a session that will be held during the ccNSO Members Meeting in Montreal. It will be the last session of Day 2, which will be an interactive panel discussion which focuses on the importance of Internet Governance related matters to ccTLDs.

The IGLC also launched a survey. You will have seen that on the Council mailing list, and the group is really collecting input on which topics that are relevant to ccTLDs are being covered and which events or programs. So, we are currently invited to have a look at the survey and to please provide your input at your earliest convenience. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. SOPC, I believe there's nothing much happening there, at least that's my expectation but if I'm wrong please correct me and give an update. If no, we've already heard update from Meeting Program Committee, anything else you'd like to add Alejandra? Probably not. Auction Proceeds, Stephen, anything new there? Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It would so help if I would unmute. Yes, we had a meeting yesterday. Joke took great notes. The group is noodling towards a conclusion, is the best way I could describe it. They have an ambitious timeline to actually get something in the form of a final report up before the Community at Montreal. I'll send you a copy of the slide that I captured during the presentation. I don't think they're going to get there. There's still some issues that need to be resolved, but they're getting close. Let me put it that way. And I'll leave it at that. Thank you. Any questions I'll be happy to answer to the extent I can. Joke is probable a better source for that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, okay. Thank you. I see no hands up. Stephen, please lower yours. Then that means that we can move forward. We have not much left on our Agenda. We have update, we have Liaisons have written updates. Next meeting. So, we have it on October 17th. There are certain things that we agreed to discuss on the mailing list. Then, yeah, you can see we'll have face-to-face meetings in Montreal and then we'll have another one in December.

With that we swiftly move to any other business? Is there anything you'd like to raise with the Council? No, I don't see any hands which means that with that, our meeting today is closed. So, thank you very much for joining and see you on

the mailing list and definitely hope to see you in Montreal. So, thank you.
Thanks everyone. Bye.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]