

---

MONTREAL – ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 1 (5 of 5)

Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:00 EDT

ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

The sooner we start, the sooner we finish. We're incentivized to get through this quickly. Okay, so the purpose of this Session is to go through two things, really. Firstly, to talk you through the Recommendations and next steps for the ccNSO Organizational Review, and secondly to give you some information about the ccNSO Council Workshop. And we worked very hard Sunday morning and Katrina is going to take you through some of the thoughts that the Council Members had in their workshop about what we are doing, how well we're doing it, and how best we can serve you, our Community Members. So, these are very important topics. I know it's been a long day, and there's cocktails between me speaking and me finishing speaking, so we'll go through this. We're looking for a lot of engagement but not too much.

So, I thought I'd start by just talking people through the ccNSO Organizational Review. And looking at three questions, why are we doing all of these reviews and why is there a ccNSO Organizational Review anyway, at what point are we now at with that review, and thirdly, what are the next steps? There's a scary lag between pressing and it happening.

So, first question, why are we doing this? And I must admit when I started looking at all of these sort of emails about reviews and it was

---

***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.***

---

always Bylaws mandated, well, what does that mean? And so, I forced myself to read the Bylaws. And it kind of explains, really, why we have to do it because legally, and I'd like things to be legal as a corporate lawyer, the ICANN Organization has to have the Board here, and I'll read it for you. This is exact wording from the Bylaws, "The Board shall cause a periodic review of the performance and operation of each SO by an entity or entities independent." Okay?

So, we are required by our statutes to have an independent review of every supporting organization, not just us. The goal of the review is to determine whether the Organization Council or Committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and if so, whether any change or structural operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness, and also whether the Organization Council or Committee is accountable to its constituencies, Stakeholder Groups, organizations, and other stakeholders. So, this is actually about trying to make us more effective and trying to improve things, and if you like things to be continuous improvement, if you like a learning organization and culture, than these are all actually quite laudable objectives.

So, in the next bit it says, "The reviews shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years." So, that's why we're doing it and that's why we delayed it for as long as we could, but then the five years kicks in and you have to do it. The results of the reviews are posted on the website for comment. And this is why, sort of the backstop, the consideration by the Board includes the ability to revise the structure

---

or operation of the parts of ICANN being reviewed by two-thirds votes of all Directors.

So, basically if we go through this review process and we don't seem to act on the outcomes of the review, the ICANN Board can enforce certain things on us. So, basically the smart thing to do is to diligently complete the review, listen to it, and explain what it is we're doing and why, I would say. The other point I want to make out is that review itself is not defined. Like, it could just be an external desktop exercise, or it could be a very complicated multiyear process. And what ICANN Board has chosen is a complicated multiyear process.

So, where are we at? So, everybody who is a part of the Community, hopefully would've been invited to contribute to this Meridien Institute Independent Review. There was a survey of all Stakeholders, that's within the ccNSO and in other parts of ICANN, the wider Community, everybody far and wide was, I was going to say asked politely but basically persistently sent reminders to complete this survey, between November and January 2018, 2019.

Within the Council, we have a Review Working Party, which I'm a member of, and the Independent Review had presented their Draft Report and gave us some comments, and we gave some feedback on those comments. All of this, by the way, is totally transparent on the ccNSO website. There's a section of this where you can see all the drafts, all of the comments, the initial Draft Report, the feedback from the Review Working Party, and now there's a Final Report.

---

As you can see, it was published on the 29<sup>th</sup> of August. And the Final Report is now 80 pages long, has 15 Recommendations, and 34 suggestions, which are helpful comments but not of the status of a Recommendation. And at the first opportunity for the ccNSO Council to have a proper face-to-face to discuss these, we did have a thorough discussion about all of these Recommendations and what to do next at our meeting on Sunday morning. So, that was a happy Sunday morning spent looking at all of these things.

In terms of what's happening next, us as a Community, as members of the Review Group and the Council, we need to consider our response to these Recommendations. And this is made certainly more complicated because in parallel with the reviews, there are other processes within ICANN. In particular, there's some Work Stream 2 Recommendations coming out of the Accountability Work. And to some extent, the Recommendations from that overlap with the Recommendations from our own Independent Review. So, the Council, on your behalf, has decided that in terms of handling these things efficiently and expeditiously and with the least amount of pain, that we look at it holistically and we look at all of these Recommendations as one set of Recommendations.

So, just to be clear also, these are recommendations. These are not orders or instructions. These are recommendations and we don't actually have to accept them, but if we are not going to accept a recommendation, then I think it's polite to explain why we don't accept them and to share some sort of thought behind that. We do need to formally respond. We have a template. The Review has that template as

---

a common template which is used across all of the SOs in ICANN and that is what the lucky team are going to be completing on your behalf.

Okay, and a reminder, don't forget if we appear to willfully ignore some of the Recommendations, the ICANN Board can do it for us. They can change our structure and operation, they have the power under the Bylaw if they want to. So, the way that the Council, I think, has decided to handle this in a sort of a fairly efficient way, is by a Prioritization Mechanism. So, of these Recommendations, what are relevant, what is high priority, what is easy to do, what's difficult to do.

And the Council, as you may or may not know, operates a Triage Committee, and myself and Jordan from .nzhed, and Laura, one of our NomCom Councilors, we are the Triage Committee. So, every piece of work which comes into the ccNSO funnel goes through a Triage Committee. So, we already assess things on the basis of relevance to the ccNSO, importance, and what we do next. So, we are going to use that exact same process when we look at these Recommendations and the Work Stream 2 Recommendations. And I've spoken with my fellow Committee Members on this, and I think we're going to try and do this fairly quickly. So, look out for some stuff.

So, that's about the process part, and I just want to talk you quickly through the Recommendations because I think part of our response to this is going to be listening to you to make sure that our view of the Recommendations is aligned with our Community. So, reassuringly given that we are a decisional participant within ICANN, we do have legal laws and levers for the whole structure, so pleasingly the

---

conclusion overall, and this is an exact quote from the report, which I have done all the work for you, you do not have to look at the report yourself.

But based on their findings, they have ruled determination is that the ccNSO does have a strong continuing purpose. Phew. There's no significant need to make structural or operational changes. I think we're all reassured by that. And they also found that, yes, the ccNSO is accountable to its constituencies, including its members. Now, we can go right? So, nine minutes. Unfortunately, the report is 80 pages long and this is just part of the Executive Summary.

So, if you look then at the 15 Recommendations in detail. So, some of these Recommendations I found a little curious, some of them I found effectively statements of the blinding obvious, and some of them I think require some careful thought because they might have some quite profound implications, and I'll try to highlight those as we go through them. So, the first Recommendation, which I think is a fairly straightforward statement of common sense, is that we should develop communication materials to articulate what we do to potential new and current members. And I think there's a lot of material already. I think those of you who are newcomers saw the brochure that we've done explaining what the ccNSO does. We've put a lot of effort into trying to explain our purpose and what we do and how we help our community. So, in the brief discussion that we had on Sunday, I think the Council feels that this is in train, and I think that's going to be our response to that Recommendation.

---

So, Recommendation 2A is about participation and diversity, and that we could and should do more around this area. So, this is an interesting Recommendation which is to have a quota system in terms of selection criteria for nominations that try to have people who have been involved in the ccNSO for less than three years, to enforce rotation and fresh blood into the Working Groups and Committees. I found this quite an interesting Recommendation. I think partly is how do you do this, and I was wondering.

So, I started coming to ICANN Meetings properly in Copenhagen two years ago, but I've actually been working for my Registry for 13 years, and I've been to some previous ICANN Meetings, kind of dipped in and dipped out. So, I'm trying to work out am I part of this one-third quota or not in this and how does it work in practice, and at what point do you start counting from the three years, is it from the Call for Nominations, or how do you measure all of these things. It's like, okay, does this just create a lot of confusion and difficulty for something which is already... Speaking as a current Council Member, we're not overwhelmed with volunteers for things already, so if we make it even harder than is that smart? So, that's going to need a little thought.

Recommendation 2B, again around participation, diversity, and leadership, that we should keep a running roster of individuals interesting in volunteering. So, this essentially is, I think, a statement of what I call Katrina's little black book of people to call on when we need a volunteer. So, okay, and I think this is something that informally we already have this, but maybe we should formalize it a bit more. And

---

certainly, any opportunities for enhancing participation, we should definitely seek and grab with both hands.

Recommendation 3 now, this is actually the fourth Recommendation because there were two Recommendation 2's so it's a bit confusing. So, this I found a little puzzling. It says there's a perceived lack of transparency in standardization around the selection processes for Working Group Members and Chairs, and that we should update Section 3.5 of this guideline to standardize that.

I suppose it's disappointing that there's a finding that there's a perception of lack of transparency because it doesn't say there is a lack of transparency, it's just that people perceive that there's a lack of transparency. And I think perhaps that's a wake-up call to the Council to do even more to try to explain what it is we're doing and to be transparent in our operations. And I think, again, we can do this and that's a very straightforward Recommendation to adopt.

In terms of Recommendation 4, those of you who've eagerly and closely been following the IANA Naming Function Review Team and the inability of the ccNSO to appoint a full complement of members because we didn't have anybody volunteering who was not already a member of the ccNSO, and therefore leading to a Bylaw amendment. We'll note that this is been in train now for many months. So, again, this is an interesting Recommendation, but it seems to have been superseded by actions which the Council has already taken in the interim. So, again, not very much more to do or say about that Recommendation.



---

So, the next Recommendation, number of diversity of people involved in the ccNSO Council could be improved. I mean, as a lawyer when I read that, it's like we can't increase the number of people because that's set in the Bylaws, there's a fixed number of people who have to be doing it. And again, in the Bylaws we have diversity as a mandated requirement in terms of three Councilors from each of the five ICANN geographic regions.

However, what the Recommendation goes into is talking about a term limit. So, this is interesting. It is common, I think, in a lot of organizations, some parts of ICANN have it and some parts don't have it, around a term limit about how to enforce, essentially, rotation of the people involved in the Council. And this is kind of like a hint that we should seriously consider this because there's a note here that a previous Recommendation to do this was not adopted. The previous Review back in 2010 had a similar sort of Recommendation which we didn't adopt due to lack of feasibility. So, this is a definitely sort of a, okay, this needs a bit of thought about how we're going to respond to this Recommendation.

Recommendation 6, important to engage diversity of voices. So, the ccNSO Meetings Programs Committee has a very dynamic leadership with Alejandra, really active participation, some new faces. I think that's a very fresh group of people and the Recommendation is that they should develop and adopt meeting formats to allow for a more varied interaction between participants at ICANN Meetings. And it talks about this is one of the suggestions. In addition to the 15 Recommendations there are 32 suggestions and one of the suggestions

---

includes ideas for implementing this Recommendation. And I think, again, we're very open to this sort of Recommendation and we've absolutely see what more we can do in terms of participation and diversity. So, again, it seems straightforward in how to respond to that Recommendation.

Recommendation 7. So, there's a group of Recommendations here which actually the Council found difficult, because these are not within our gift to implement. So, this one talks about, a lack of real time scribing on the ccNSO Members Day Meetings presents a barrier to participation for remote participants and non-native English speakers. And if you've been to the, say the GAC Sessions and some of the Plenary Sessions, you'll see that we have real time scribing, they've got simultaneous translation, these are obviously beneficial to have more participation in terms of non-native English speakers.

And I think the point is well made, that I, myself, am acutely aware that I'm in a minority in this ccNSO. There's not so many native English speakers. There's lots of fluent English speakers, there's not very many native English speakers. So, it's a great Recommendation, but the ccNSO is not empowered in terms of the way that the meetings are organized. We don't organize translation and scribing without the corporation of ICANN and the ICANN Organization and the ICANN Meetings. So, interesting, but it is implementable by us? Not clear.

Recommendation 8, we should do more to enhance the orientation of onboarding of new and newer members, as well as newly elected leaders. And again, I think, in terms of the written course into the other

---

ICANN languages, totally accept that that would be a beneficial thing to do. The resources and ability to do that though are with ICANN, not with the ccNSO Council but I think, again, this is a very positive and well-intentioned Recommendation.

Recommendation 9, so the finding was many respondents indicated that... Oh, okay. So, these are Recommendations all dealing with the same finding about orientation onboarding of new ccNSO Members. I think strictly speaking it doesn't mean members of the ccNSO, it means Staff working for members of the ccNSO. So, when a new Staff Member comes to ICANN, even if the ccNSO Member has been, you know... The Registry's been a member for 10 years, but they have a new start or change in personnel, then that's what this is speaking to, really strictly speaking.

So, we have Mentorship Programs to more efficiently connect new members of the Community with the longstanding members and to have a bit of a hand down and an arm around the shoulder when they come to meetings. And I think, again, anything that could be done to more efficiently and effectively get new Community Members up and running and comfortable and networked and happy and contributing, and able to volunteer, totally think that that is a very fordable Recommendation. And, here again the multilingual aspect of it comes through and the Recommendation is that the resources for newcomers should be assembled in one location prominently featured and accessible on the ccNSO website.

---

Now, again, great Recommendation but the ccNSO does not operate the ICANN website. We have ability to upload content onto the ccNSO section, but the overall portal is an ICANN Org thing. And I know the Leadership has been in conflation with ICANN about how to improve the ccNSO website and it's on their list of things to do when they've got the time and resources to do it, but I don't think it's a high priority, is that fair to say? Apparently not. But again, the Recommendation I think is well-intentioned.

Just the last couple of Recommendations here. Again, ccNSO website, it's very similar to the previous one. And here, the ccNSO... Okay, so this is an interesting one and they said that I think our excellent Secretariat, or usually excellent Secretariat could have a clearer file naming system for uploading documents and standardizing, so that's just sort of a helpful Recommendation around good administration and good housekeeping of our documents, as I read that. Again, seems pretty straightforward to accept that.

So, this was a slightly interesting Recommendation, the finding, the ccNSO Council does not always adhere to the ccNSO Council Practices Guideline with respect to publishing confirmed Council Agenda seven days in advance of a meeting. I think we try to do that, but perhaps we may not always hit the seven day deadline, according to our own guideline. So, the Recommendation is that we should actually try to do that a bit better going forwards, and if we're finding it too hard then we should update the guideline to not be in breach of our own guideline. Again, that seems like a fairly sensible good housekeeping, and also a very minor point to raise anyway.

---

So, then the final Recommendation, this is around future ccNSO Reviews, so the Independent Examiner, I think they struggled slightly with the various mailing lists that the ccNSO operate, there are different ones, and they would've found it more helpful it was archived in a more structured way so they recommend that for future ccNSO Reviews, the Independent Examiner should have access to the archived mailing lists for the period in the review and be able to join as an observer.

And I think, again, helpful and easily adoptable Recommendation. So, when the next review happens in a couple of years' time now, then we'll put that in place. So, that's basically a quick look through the reviews, and you'll see there's only really two or three which I think are going to require a little bit of unpacking and careful thought. So, now we'll take it on the next steps, and I'll hand it over to Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Nick, for this excellent overview. What are the next steps? Well, first of all, I'll tell you about all the parties that are involved in this. According to this internal process, ICANN Organization Reviews, it's recommended that the SO/AC that is being reviewed have a Review Working Party, that is basically the liaison between Independent Examiner and the Community. In our case, we also have this Review Working Party and it had been working closely with the Independent Reviewer. And most of the comments submitted, as Nick pointed out, they are all published on the website, most of the comments had been submitted by the Review Working Party Members.

---

So, another party that is inevitably involved, it's our Guidelines Review Committee because they are the ones who will be implementing those Recommendations in our internal document. Then, of course, ccNSO Council, that has to approve all of those documents, and as Nick already mentioned, the Triage Committee of the ccNSO Council. So, at the moment, probably we try to do too many things but one of the things that we determined to do is to consolidate all the efforts and make them as efficient as possible.

So, next steps, ccNSO is expected to conduct a feasibility assessment, including an initial Implementation Plan for those Recommendations that we are going to implement and that are in our scope and that we can implement. Because, for example, we can't set up a website, it's clearly out of our mandate. So, this first step will be done by the, well, probably Review Working Party, or maybe tomorrow, during discussion with the Council we will come up with a better idea. But I'll show you later the table that we need to fill in, I think Nick already mentioned.

Then the ccNSO Council has to approve the assessment and submit it to their Organization Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board, or OEC. Then the Chair presents the assessment to the OEC via phone conference. OEC deliberates and make their Recommendations to the Board on the next steps including implantation, and Board would likely to resolve to accept the Final Report and the assessment, and we'll ask the ccNSO to commence implementation. And Board normally expects this detailed Implementation Plan to be ready and submitted within six months.

---

These are really very general things that need to be done, those are basic steps. Of course, each step involves some other sub-steps, but in general those are the things that we need to do next. And this is the table that Review Working Party is expected to fill in. Well, don't try to read it, it's really not so important for the matter of our discussion. But, yeah, this table has to be filled and for each of the Recommendations that are on the list.

So, the ccNSO Council had a workshop a couple of days ago and we wanted to concentrate on a basic question, how can we become better? And that, of course, includes all those Recommendations that Nick mentioned and Recommendations from Work Stream 2 and from what, personally I think the most important part of the review were the feedback we received, or let's say our Independent Examiner Reviewer received from you during interviews. This was something that for me was really an eye-opening thing because one thing is that I know how things are, and as we could see in those findings, there is perceived understanding of the things that are not necessarily true.

For example, there was one comment that we don't do onboarding for ccNSO Councilors. That is not true, we do it. But apparently, if people think there is no onboarding, then probably we're do something wrong. We are not outspoken enough. And for that, one of the things that... Well, they say that there are three versions of each of us, when we talk about us as individuals. Ine is who we see ourselves to be, then who others see us as, and the third is the person we truly are. And the issue that these three people are completely three different people.

---

So, the question for us is if there are things that we do, we think we do them well, Community maybe does not agree with this assessment, so the question was how can we look at the things that we do and how can we improve everything? So, we started this workshop, and for the first time it was a closed one, so sorry to all of you who wanted to sit in and listen, but we decided that we need all our Councilors to open up and we thought that maybe in the closed environment it will be achievable, let's say.

And another new thing that we did, part of the discussions were held among Regional Councilors, so for the first time we had discussions with our regions. And that also proved to be a very good experience because apparently people opened up more when they spoke to their peers from their region, probably because they meet more often, maybe because they have common problems and anyhow, somehow it really worked.

But we started with something, or tried to, a warm up exercise we did during previous Council Workshop in Kobe. We thought about fears. There are many fears that our Councilors don't feel. I don't think that we are very fearful, but just really we tried to think of those things that might influence the ccNSO and the Council in the future. Here are only some of those fears. I tried to summarize them or at least to have the most important ones. Well, what I see as the most important ones.

As Nick already mentioned, it's not that we are blessed with constant flow of volunteers asking to do something, you know? We really have to reach out and beg you to participate. And this is one of the main fears



---

that we have, that we won't have enough participants, including for the ccNSO Council. Not only for the things to do, Working Groups, but also for the Council. We also think that maybe we won't get enough voice in the ICANN Community if we fail in what we're doing. People might get tired of ICANN because everything happens very slowly and very inefficiently. As we heard today during the discussion about the future of the internet, probably ccNSO future is also strongly related to the future of the internet. And one of the fears was that because of our inability to act, we might be opted out of ICANN Empowered Community.

Then we thought also about the future, so what do we want to achieve, how do we see ourselves in 10 years, let's say, what we want to be. So, we want more power, more power to influence everything that's going on, we want to ccNSO to be an environment for meaningful capacity development, place to share ideas, to share best practices, and actually this is what we see already happening. You just heard a report from the TLD Ops Workshop. Stronger constituency that is able to respond faster to Community needs. And one of the things that we wanted, that we might be the ones who drive the processes towards a lean, efficient, useful ICANN, that's just to overcome all the fears that we had.

But going back to what I said about those three people, or three different persons depending on the perception, as Alejandra already showed during her highlight session, so we thought of can we apply the same principle to the ccNSO Council? So, how do we see ourselves? Like a very hard working bunch of people. Community sees us... And actually, later during discussions, I take this picture that's really the first

---

one I could find, but I must say that later you will see that the Council really wants... The Community sees us like Men in Black protecting them from everything. But if you look at, for example, Facebook posts, I think at least my colleagues are firmly... No, no, no, not the Community. On the contrary, we're defending the Community.

Yeah, but so when we discussed how we want to be seen by the Community, actually I'd say we had this consensus among regions, and also Regional Organizations and NomCom Appointed Councilors, is that we want to be seen as trustworthy, reliable, open to input and suggestions, professional, competent, diligent, presenters and advocates for ccTLDs in the Community. And in this case, not only... Well first, two things I'd like to stress. First, for ccTLDs, not ccNSO Members, and second Community, not only ccTLD Community of course but for wider ICANN Community. So, we may be even behind the limits of our universe.

So, that was the first step into looking at those Recommendations and looking at Recommendations from Work Stream 2. All those Recommendations were grouped into 19 areas for improvement and here you can see, really, only top level ones go deep into all the structure. But there was an attempt to look at all those Recommendations grouped into those 19 different areas. And that was very helpful, and we could see where we can influence things and where we may be can't, where we should do something and where we maybe think that it's not as important to do it at the moment.

---

And at the end we came up with a list of do's, what we want to do. And actually, almost from all groups, all people on the Council, we heard that we need to communicate better, so we need to improve communication. Again, because we think we are trustworthy and great but if we don't say that to the Community, Community perhaps does not know that. Then we came up with a couple of don't's. Sorry, I was writing too quickly, and don't try to read. So, don't try to read what's on the picture. Main three things, do not fail, so we can't afford a failure in our attempt to become better, we should never give up, and KISS, meaning keep it simple, stupid. Everything in ICANN environment is so complex, if we can KISS, we'll succeed. I mean, keep it simple.

And with that, the last step was Action Plan. We're going to go into more details tomorrow during Council Meeting and actually beyond that. But some basic things that we understand we need to do is we have to go back to our Communication Strategy we had some time ago, just need to open it again and see what's working and what's not working. We should list all communication channels and all information that is being sent out.

Another thing, another thing to improve in our Action Plan is we need to work with ROs more actively, well, ROs are active in their own regions but ccNSO is a global platform and we have to work with ROs and see how this experience that ROs accumulate in their own regions, like how it can be transferred to other regions. Another great suggestion was to identify and promote the most successful projects that we have and promote them outside the ccNSO. I think one of the best candidates for

---

that is this Guide Book that TLD Ops has developed. We can help other communities to spread the word and be better prepared for disasters.

And, yes, the last thing, we will send out a survey because we need to know what you think and what you want, what you want us to do. We will have a very short questionnaire, not more than 250 questions. Some are sleeping, but no, really few, five, six basic questions that we need to be answered to understand the feeling in the Community. So, that is a very brief summary of what we did on the Council. Now, I'll give the floor back to Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Thank you very much. So, I think that's completed the part I would call like the show and tell part of what your Council has been doing on your behalf and what's coming down the track and specifically the Organizational Review actions, which we've got. So, the floor is yours to ask us any questions about how that has come over to you and whether you think we've covered things correctly, give us additional feedback, have we missed something out at this stage, are you shocked and horrified at the prospect of yet another survey, do you agree that the Recommendations, some of them have some merit, do you think the whole thing is another futile exercise in sadomasochism, you know, just tell us what you think. Pierre?

PIERRE BONIS:

So, for further ado, so Pierre Bonis, AFNIC. First of all, thank you very much for the presentation and for the work you did secretly, behind

---

closed doors, and thank you for being transparent, as transparent as showing us the result of your conspiracy.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Not a very good conspiracy, really, is it?

PIERRE BONIS: I'm not going to go in the details of what should be answered. I just want to point out the one or two or three Recommendations, I think they're 7 and 8, when you said this is not in the hands of the ccNSO because we are talking about the website, because we are talking about the transcripts. And if I read it well, the Independent Review says action, ask ICANN to do something. I think this is in our hands to ask ICANN to do something. And as you said, if we ask for improvement of the website, this is somewhere on the to do list.

But if we want to be good guys and implement the Recommendation, that's very easy for us. We write a letter to the ICANN Organization and say we want the transcript, because by the way, this is a very good idea, and we want the improvement of the website. And I think if we do not do that, the next time we will want as ccNSO to ask something to ICANN Organization when it comes to accessibility to information or linguistic diversity, they may come back to us and say, "You didn't even implemented the Recommendation of the Independent Examiner." So, I really urge us to take them by the word, write it down, and ask it.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you very much and you're absolutely right. What we meant when we said that this is not for us to do, it's nothing we as volunteers can do. Yes, in the Implementation Plan, clearly there will be some lines saying that this is for ICANN Org to do. And the Board, as I mentioned, the Board will have to... Well, they will look into those Recommendations and they will look into Implementation Plan and when they approve it, clearly it has to be implemented, yeah. Yeah, thank you. It's just nothing that the Council or Community can do. We need to ask ICANN Org to do that, yes.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think the point is...

PIERRE BONIS: Write a letter and ask formally.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think the point is very well made, Pierre, because I think we are certainly exasperated because we've asked ICANN to make improvements to the website. They agree that improvements need to be made, but it's just not a high enough priority and it's a good way to leverage the report findings to get what we want and need. So, I think that's fair. Danny?

---

DANNY AERTS:

Danny from .se. A small suggestion for the survey, everybody likes your visions, first of all. And if you would come with all the Recommendations and you would ask us to give it a rating, and you can choose 12 and 10 and 8 and then 7, and so, then you would end up somewhere with what the Community thinks are the most important ones to start with, and you have five years for the Recommendations.

So, maybe you can start with the top three, then, and take it easy on the other ones because I have the feeling that you get overambitious when you get 15 and you want to be best in class and you start with all of them. And it might be that the one that has the highest score is the webpage from ICANN, what you have to start with.

KATRINA SATAKI:

I highlight it every time, now for second meeting in a row, ever since the report and all the Recommendations have been published. Yeah, that's what I say during SOs/ACs Chairs Meeting to the CEO. "The review said that our website is the crappiest one among the websites of SOs/ACs. Please do something." And they say, "Yeah." They say, "Yes, now we're working on ICANN's website." ICANN's website, yeah.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

I think in terms of prioritization, that's a very good observation. I should say that the initial report had I think about 50 Recommendations and we went through a process with the Review Working Party with a number of Recommendations. And I think I remember personally urging the Independent Reviewer to be as prescriptive as they could in

---

terms of what their professional opinion was as to what are the priority areas, and really make us focus on the priority areas.

Because, you know, we're quite busy, we have the Work Stream 2 Recommendations, we've got a ton of other stuff to do. If you give us 50 Recommendations with no indications to which of the ones, in the professional judgement of the Independent Reviewer, are the ones that we should most usefully spend our scarce time on, then that's not a massively helpful outcome. And so, we have got down to 15 Recommendations, you can see some of those Recommendations there are fairly straightforward in the sense that we have either already done them or we agree totally with the sentiment or whatever minor modifications in what we already do.

So, I think we've worked very hard to get to that sort of prioritization. I think in terms of the survey, I will definitely discuss the suggestion to have a scoring ranking. I'm not saying that everybody in the world is a great fan of the Eurovision Song Contest methodology, and I know the United Kingdom frequently receives [inaudible] for its musical contribution, but yeah, I'm sure we could do something along those lines.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Maybe I can ask the audience, who would be willing to look at all those Recommendations and take those that you think are priorities? Oh, now it's not all of them. Okay, I see some... No, definitely. You review



---

all and you indicate which three are priorities, for example, just a suggestion.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So, we've got 10 minutes left and I'm interested if we want to use that time usefully, if anybody has any initial views as to which is the most important one of the Recommendations that we need to work on. Then we can shortcut the surveys and we can tell us now if you think it's already obvious. If you want more time to think about it then that's fine but now's your opportunity to... You know, the Review Working Party Members are all in this room. Tell us.

KATRINA SATAKI: Bart?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: You have to speak with a microphone and give your name clearly and who you work for, for the record.

BART BOSWINKEL: Sorry, I didn't understand the... What did you say?

KATRINA SATAKI: You have to state your name and affiliation.

---

BART BOSWINKEL:

Bart Boswinkel, ICANN Staff. Okay, and the rest. What I think makes it very hard is you have to see the total picture because there is so much overlap between the Work Stream 2 Recommendations and what is coming out of this Review, especially in the area of SOs/ACs accountability, or the accountability of the Council, vis-à-vis the Community. And that means, just looking at some of these Recommendations, for example the simple one is about the Agenda. You can resolve it fairly easy but the underlying issues, I think that's where the Community really should focus on in the Council. How can we avoid this type of Recommendations in future, at least make it worthwhile for everybody? The ccNSO Council is responsible and accountable for what it does, and the Community as well.

And there is another area which is very interesting, it's about onboarding participation, etcetera. And I think if you combine it there, you see there is a need for a lot of work which you could already see, which is some of these Recommendations as well, is how do you get new participation, how do you get new volunteers. And you heard it this afternoon with the SOPC, the report from Giovanni on the SOPC and how it's acting and what they need, one of the issues is finding new volunteers who want to do the heavy lifting. And that's a major issue, which some of these Recommendations talk to, but you need to understand the underlying issues, and this is covered in the combinations of Work Stream 2 and the suggestions of Recommendations from the Review. Thanks. Sorry.

---

DANNY AERTS: What I'm trying to say is we are a small team, not a lot of people, you get a whole bunch of Recommendations, try to get one or two major Recommendations and start with that and instead of you choosing, you could have some sort of bottom up type of what to start with, and my personal view is start with the Communication Strategy solely for one year and show some good results.

BART BOSWINKEL: Danny, I fully agree, but by saying Communication Strategy, I think you cover already a whole set of these Recommendations and suggestions, and this is where you put it. It's almost low hanging fruit, but that's where the Council and the Community needs to go through is what is the low hanging fruit, where should we put our, in which basket should we put our eggs before just shooting at it.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think we're in violent agreement on a lot of that. Let me make two observations. I mean, firstly I've never worked in an organization... However good they are at communication, whenever you've done this sort of feedback or review process, whether it's a 360 [inaudible], the result has always been you should do more communicate better. So, I think that's almost like, as a learning organization, for us as a Council or the Community in general, is that we should never stop trying harder to communicate better. I think that is one thing. But, the point that Bart also touched on is that some of the specific Recommendations which seem quite discreet and unconnected, actually those are symptoms of

---

different underlying inherent structural issues which we have and just ICANN itself is a bit slow and inefficient where it's part of the structure, as part of MultiStakeholder. Sorry, Margarita.

MARGARITA VALDES:

Hello, Margarita from .cl. Something that maybe helps to our colleagues who are not Councilors, is just in the workshop that we have done on Sunday, it's something that more we receive or show up some ideas that are in the same line of some of the Recommendations, especially in visibility which is something different in terms of dimension. And probably we could put some efforts in order to how to deal with this connecting things in terms of visibility and communications, perhaps some kind of marketing or something like that, that helps us to communicate better.

Not only in the ccNSO which is probably our main goal or first goal, but also with the other layer, up or down I don't know, it's ICANN Community itself. So, probably if we find the opportunity to work about that in convergence with the Recommendations that we received and also what the conclusions that we or the ideas that we got on Sunday in the workshop. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Thank you. And I think one of the things which I've been thinking about is how we measure how good we are at communication and how we look to improve our communication scores, and to be able to evidence like, "This is what we're doing, these are all the things we are, and this

---

is what you're telling us as to how well we're doing it." This is a useful part, and the surveys I think is one of those ideas. Sorry, I think we've got four minutes left, so perfect. Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

Just a really quick point, how many people here have read the Review Report? So, some. And how many people have read the Work Stream 2 Final Accountability Recommendations? Yeah. So, I don't want us to do a process that makes everyone do too much work in understanding what the proposals are, so maybe if we could blend this survey thing with some prework that maybe proposes a sequence and asks if people think they're good or not, that might bridge the gap between people who feel informed on this and people who don't want to say they don't but don't have time enough to read all those source documents.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Thank you, Jordan, and I think I'll take that point. I mean one of the reasons for me to put the Recommendations in black and white on the slides for you today, the slides will be made available afterwards, is to help people digest the sheer volume of these sorts of things. It can be, even for those of us who are elected and responsible for dealing with it, it can be overwhelming in terms of the volume and the point is well made that we should do more and try hard to make it digestible and guide people through all of it and the key parts.

KATRINA SATAKI:

KISS. No, this is the way forward to Cancun, the meeting in Cancun. Yeah, so we will summarize everything we heard today, everything we

---

discussed on Sunday, everything we hear from you during our conversations, and so yeah, we'll have a clearer path forward and in Cancun I think we will continue. We will report back on what has been done, where we are, and yeah, what we're doing, basically. If there are any suggestions... Yes, please, always. Yes, I know. We want to be seen as those who listen to the Community and always open to suggestions.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

That's brilliant, and that ties in very nicely with my very last point which is sort of huge thank you for everybody staying right to the end of the day. And as a reward, if anybody would like a drink, Nomina is buying drinks in the Intercontinental and you're very welcome to come along for a pre-Community Cocktail cocktail, if that's sensible. Yeah. Well, get a move on. That's everything. Thank you. We'll release until tomorrow morning.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**