MONTREAL – ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 2 (2 of 3)
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

PATRICIO POBLETE: Good afternoon and welcome back from lunch. Please, take your seats. We're beginning in about one minute. Okay. In this policy session we'll be changing a little the order of presentations. Annebeth needs to run to another meeting. We'll begin with Annebeth Lange with an update about the next steps by the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group on Work Track 5. That has to do with geographic names at the top level. Please, Annebeth.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you. Not many people here, but we'll just start. It is the important people who are here. Now, this is a milestone what we have done. This meeting is the last time I'm talking to you, here, about the Work Track 5. Not only because we delivered the final report, but also I will be leaving ccNSO. I've retired from Norid, and I will not be joining ccNSO meetings anymore. I will be in NomCom for 2020. You will see me around but not in center meetings. Not in ccNSO meetings.

Then we go on, here. Most of you know what Work Track 5 is. It's one of the groups in the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process. It's a working group that has been working only with Geographic Names at the Top Level. In the beginning, it was in the full group. It was so fragmented and difficult to sort out the problems

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.

for geo-names. It was decided to put it in a special work track. That has worked quite good.

The overall working group is tasked with trying to find the experiences from the 2012 program and see if any change is needed. That is not only for the geo-names level but for everything that was in the Applicant Guidebook in 2012. What we did in Work Track 5 was to review the existing policy and implementation. When I say "existing policy," that was the GNSO policy from 2007. Implementation is the Applicant Guidebook 2012.

At that time, the Applicant Guidebook was not considered policy by the GNSO. One of the things we should do is to see if we could make 2012 the implementation rules into policy, to get all the different stakeholders to accept that as a policy. Which, if we could find some better way to do it, some of the issues were discussed that we perhaps needed some refinement. If we could do that, that would have been great.

What we should look at was the two-character, as you know, country and territory names in all their forms. Capital cities, and a lot of other things as well. What I do today, since I only have 10 minutes, I will just say the result and what we have done about these things that were important for us as ccTLDs. That is country and territory names, mainly. The whole report also talks about a lot of other things. You can find it and read if you're more interested.

What is the current status? We drafted a final report, which we sent out to the full working group, including a set of recommendations for the working group to consider. Before we did that we had a consensus call within the Work Track 5 on this final report. It's quite interesting. It was 168 participants in that group. As in all working groups, it's only a handful or a few people that really, really participated. That's how it always is. When we sent it out for consensus, we had 34 answers. Three non-support and 31 support. That is, in the GNSO way of looking at consensus, what they call consensus. It's not full consensus. That would have needed 34 support. It was consensus. Every member was reminded many times that, "It's your opportunity to comment. You can go in and give your view," etc. That was what we had when we reached the later state.

This concludes the Work Track 5's work. The only thing is that if the full working group asked the Work Track 5 to look further into an issue that has not been considered, if they look at the mandate and what we should do, and we haven't, then they might send it back to us. It's not finally closed. We'll see how that works out in the coming months.

All recommendations coming out of Work Track 5 will be reviewed and discussed in the full group. In the full working group, that is more heavy on the GNSO. It's open and everyone can attend. If you're not a member and are still interested, and see that this will be followed up, please join.

After we have discussed it, and they have discussed it in the full group, it will be a part of the full report from the working group, and subject to a consensus call in the full working group. We still don't know what will

happen. What we try to do now is then to hope that they will recognize the work that has been done in the Work Track 5. We have had 52 meetings, including the teleconferences. I would say that since it is consensus, we really deserve that they listen to the stakeholder community. This is a broader participation from ALAC, from the GAC, from us, in addition to the GNSO. This will be interesting to see, how they consider it.

A few highlights. As you know, it was members from all the different stakeholder groups. Mainly the GAC, ALC, ccNSO, GAC, and the GNSO, with each of our co-leads. 168 members and 99 servers from all the different stakeholder groups. It began in 2017 in November, so two years, now. 52 meetings over the course of two years. That's quite a lot of teleconferences, I can say.

We provided updates to the interested groups in the community, during ICANN meetings, by reporting back to their respective groups. It's also newsletters. I think that everybody has been given ample opportunity to come with their comments, if they are interested. Additional community input has been gathered through the working sessions in ICANN, etc.

The context for recommendations. As we all know, there was quite a lot of difference between 2007 policy, which was not really good for protecting things that we thought were important, and the 2012 implementation addressing the Geographic Names at the Top Level, which seemed to be quite good for CCs.

The important call was to ensure that policy and implementation were aligned. Even if it was a key promise of Work Track 5's deliberations that if we couldn't find a better way we should go back to the 2012. In the discussions, it was still quite a lot of different views, there. Quite a lot of the participants wanted to then go back to the 2007 policy. That would have been very difficult and would have delayed the process quite a lot in my view.

After the extensive discussion, we did not manage to agree on recommendations that depart very much from the 2012 implementation. A few small details, but that's all. That is quite natural, in a way, because on the one hand, several groups wanted more restrictions, more protection. On the other hand, they wanted no protection at all. This is somewhere in the middle. The recommendation is to update the GNSO policy recommendation to be consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, with a few things.

Recommendation one. Consistent with the Applicant Guidebook, continue to reserve or to let two character-letter letter ASCII combinations at the top-level for existing and future country codes. This was the only recommendation consistent with the GNSO policy in 2007.

Recommendation two, to have maintained the provisions in the Applicant Guidebook, but with the following clarifications regarding section 2.2.1.4.1.6. "Permutations and transpositions of the following strings are reserved and unavailable for delegation: Long-form name, short-form name, short or long-form name, in association with a code

that has been designated as exceptional reserve, and separable component of a country name designated on the separable country names list."

The only change from 2012 was that strings resulting from permutations and transpositions of alpha-3 codes, when changing letters within the three letters listed in the ISO3116-1 standard, are available for delegation unless the strings resulting from this change, permutation, transposition, are themselves on that list. That's quite natural to see today. Normally, three-letters are gTLDs.

What happens now? As I said, all recommendations will be reviewed and discussed by the full working group. To the extent that they are included in the work track final report, then it will be a consensus call with the full working group. The final report of the full working group will be sent to GNSO Council for further discussion, consideration, adoption. When they are adopted by the council, the recommendation in the final report will be sent to the ICANN Board.

What we don't know the result of, of course. When I presented this for the GAC, together with Olga Cavalli from the GAC the other day, as expected there are countries, governments, that do not accept this. They want more protection. We cannot, perhaps, avoid a discussion among the governments. Later on, those who were in the last round took quite a lot of time even after the board thought that it was okay. Let's see how this works out if we can get it through without too much change for us. I don't think that it will be a problem for the ccTLDs, anyway. It will be others that have a problem with that discussion. The

board will vote in the end on the final report recommendations. The report will be out so you can read it extensively. Then, we will see what happens in the future. Any questions? No questions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Annebeth? Just to understand this. Something like dot-canada would not be allowed, right? What would be a permutation or a transposition that would not be allowed either?

ANNEBETH LANGE: It will be if you put Canada with a stroke within it, or an extra letter, or trying to rewrite it so it will be confusing in a way. That's what I mean with permutations and transpositions. It's a little complex thing, actually. That's, at least, what it is today. I think that will continue. It's in the rules. The only thing is the two-letter codes is their letters change place, there, it will not be confusing in a way.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Okay, thanks. I guess that part about permutations was not written by a mathematician. Maybe you could call it "similarities," like "Kanada" in German. Okay. Well, if there are no more questions, we have had Annebeth coming here to report on advances on this work for a long time. Now, it's finished. We have the final report. She will not be coming for this reason, at least, anymore. She will be representing the ccNSO in the NomCom. Let's give her a round of applause to thank her for her service.

Okay, now we have Stephen [Deerhake] to report on the CC PDP Retirement Working Group.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Hello, everybody. I'd like to encourage you to get your green, yellow, and red cards out because there are four items I want to get a quick sense of the room on.

PATRICIO POBLETE: There is no cards. There are none.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Alright, you'll use your arms instead then, on that score. I'm going to do this rather quickly given the time constraint. I'm going to give you a quick review of progress since ICANN63 in Barcelona. I'm going to get the temperature on four items, and then give you a quick run-through of the next steps for the working group, and give you a quick overview of the definition of stress-tests.

Now it does not work. Yes. Forward does not work. Now. Pausing for technical issues. Meanwhile, you guys can get your cards. This is good. Now it went dark. Now it seems to work. Thank you.

Alright, with regards to closed items. To recall, we had an issue with definition of membership. We wrote to the council on that. That's off our plate. We came to grips with the scope of applicability of the policy. We came to a definition of the trigger event, the end date, and

retirement process. We also came up with a rather comprehensive process for removal.

We also came to grips and agreed on the duration of the removal process. As you'll recall, on a prior presentation this was discussed with the group with a basic duration of five years. If the manager of the retiring CC came to an agreement with the IANA functions operator with respect to a retirement plan, that could be extended out to 10 years.

For today, I want to ask you for your temperature/opinion on four items. Our oversight mechanism, the review mechanism, what we're doing with respect to exceptional reserved two-letter strings in the ISO table, and what we're going to do with IDNs that correspond to CCs.

With regards to oversight the policy makes it clear that it's directed at ICANN and the IANA functions operator. It also makes it clear in the policy as written that it does not intend to in any way put constraints on how ICANN interacts with the IANA functions operator. Nor does it change the role of the ICANN Board with respect to the cases outlines below: individual cases of delegation, transfer, revocation, or removal of the ccTLD string from the root zone. My first question to the group, then. Does this look reasonable to you? I'll put it back up. If we can see a show of green cards, that would be great.

PATRICIO POBLETE: In the interest of time we could do it all at once. Green means agree, red means disagree, and yellow means not sure.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: There we go. Put them all up.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Raise the appropriate color all at once.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thank you for that. Same question with regards to the review mechanism. What we're going to do is we're actually splitting our work stream into two parts. We're going to be issuing a report on the first part when we get our stress-testing complete. Hopefully, that will come in early spring. As a result, the review mechanism, because we could really go starting round and round in circles if we did them both simultaneously

… What do we do about review into the second part of this working group, with the idea that we get into review … We know the policy is pretty mature. We know the policy has passed the stress-testing that we've applied to it. Now, we have a rather firm foundation on which to develop the review process and how that would work.

My question to the group is, does that seem like a reasonable approach? To push the development of the review mechanism, which is a very important part of this whole process, off until we really have a pretty solid foundation for the policy? If I could see a show of cards again? Red, yellow, etc. Thank you very much, I appreciate that. I see one yellow. It's good to have dissenting opinion. Third item.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Peter Van Roste from CENTR. Thank you, Stephen. Can you specify a bit what you mean by a second working group under this PDP?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It's the second part, basically. It's all one PDP. We probably will open it up to new members for the review portion. It all comes under the auspice of … I'll let the issues manager expert …

BART BOSWINKEL: It will be your second call for volunteers, etc. There will be a second working group constituted that will address this one. This one will remain dormant as soon as they publish their initial report for public comment. Then, there will be a call for volunteers for the second working group because it will not just develop a review mechanism for retirement, but also for the delegation transfer and revocation. It will be applicable.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But if I remember correctly, the timeline for this PDP was 2023?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is included.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	It's included? Okay, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	That's the reason why it is extended. There will be a final vote on both proposals.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	Okay. The third item of the four involves exceptionally reserved codes. There are four that possibly in play with regards to us. The other ones are never going to go anywhere. The policy as currently constituted does have as its trigger event the eventuality that the maintenance agency makes a change to a two-letter code. The policy does give the IANA functions' operator leeway to consider if the change that the maintenance agency has made requires a retirement. If it does, then the retirement process outlined in the policy applied to the exceptionally reserved.
	The upshot of all this is that the exceptionally reserved codes, of which it's AC, EU, UK, and SU, are the ones that are of possible significance here out of the actual total of 12, the policy does apply to the exceptionally reserved. We just rolled those into the regular stream. There are no separate provisions in the policy for exceptionally reserved. As always, whatever decisions are made will be subject to the review mechanism that will be developed by the next working group under this PDP. My question to the group is, can I see a show of cards, please? Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The group is not concerned with what constitutes a trigger event. It's only the policy that's in case the trigger event happens. Whether an exceptionally reserved needs to be retired or not is not part of the decision of the policy. "How" is a bit of an issue. That's why we want to be very clear. It's just "how" to return, and not "whether."

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, the last one regards IDNs. Trigger events will be defined for retirements of IDNs under the upcoming PDP4. If, in fact, there is a trigger event initiating the retirement of an IDN, based on what PDP4 comes up with, then the retirement process as defined by the policy developed by this PDP will apply. At the end of the day, the IDNs will come under this policy as well. Essentially the goal here is to have a single, comprehensive policy to handle the regular ones, the exceptionally reserved ones, and the IDN ones. Does that sound like a reasonable approach to this group? If I could see a show of cards? Alright. Thank you very much. I want to thank everyone for their continued support on this effort.

Our next steps leading up to Cancún. We've got the policy document with a couple of minor phrasing issues pretty well locked down, subject to stress testing. Of course, the purpose of the stress-testing is to see whether the policy falls on its knees and doesn't work or gives us weird outcomes. That, then, will require us to go back and tweak the policy a bit.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

We moved into the new phase, which is stress-testing, at our face-to-face meeting earlier this week. We applied several of the policies. So far, it's held up fairly well. I think we have a reasonably solid bit of tech so far. It's taken us a while to get there but I think we're in pretty good shape on that.

Last, I just want to run by you what we're doing with regards to stress-testing, i.e. what is a stress test? Basically, as you can see there, what we're trying to do, in supplying the process on corner cases, is we think of anything really weird that might happen. For example, in the middle of a retirement the manager of the ccTLD being retired might just simply go away and essentially go out of business. There's actually some concern that that could happen. Any weird things you can think of along those lines … If you think of things, by all means, drop me an e-mail. We can add them to our pile of things.

We're thinking of things, but if you guys can think of things we haven't thought of, that would be greatly appreciated, too. Again, as a result of a stress test, if we apply it to the policy … We come up with a situation, we apply it to the policy, and the policy dictates some really strange or unwanted outcome. Then, we will have to go back and tweak the policy a bit.

That's it for me on this. Do I have any questions? Going once, going twice. Okay, thank you so much. Thank you again for your support on the path that the working group is taking. It's greatly appreciated. We will be reporting back to you in Cancún in March. Thank you very much.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you. Now for the final part of the session. Bart and Katrina will present the IDN ccTLD policy update. To be finished by the proper time, it would be great if we could do this in 16 minutes?

KATRINA SATAKI: In that case, I will skip introduction and give the floor to Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, thank you. Current state of play. Just quickly, again. You've seen this before. There are 61 IDN ccTLDs out there from 42 countries that are still not eligible as members of the ccNSO. There's a whole list of open issues that have been identified ranging from new developments in the variant management to the evolution of the confusing similarity evaluation. Retirement of IDN ccTLDs, that's again an open issue that needs to be addressed at one point, and the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs.

In Kobe, we discussed the road map so far to get from the fast track and the overall IDN ccTLD policy proposals to amendment of Article 10, a policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings that would address all these open issues. Again, this is more the underlying philosophy around it to get from an exclusive ccNSO to an inclusive ccNSO, and from a list of open issues and diverging proposals to a stable, predictable, and simple policy.

The road map. Recently, the council, after the meeting in Marrakech, sent a letter to the ICANN Board to request closure of CC PDP2, and stop

the evolution of the fast track process. As you may recall, in June the preliminary review team completed its gap analysis, which is a very detailed listing of issues that need to be addressed at one point regarding the overall policy. They made two recommendations. Effectively, bylaws change soon, the CC PDP is closed, and starts with the launch of a Policy Development Process. Again, I will not go into detail.

What is more important for today: what are the next steps? I will go in a little bit more detail around the changes needed to Article 10 of the bylaws so you are aware of what is happening. I will ask you, again, some questions. It's a bit hard, that one.

The first step is the board has responded to the ccNSO letter. I think it was on the 31st. They agreed with closure of CC PDP2. It has taken back. If all goes well and there are no real security/stability issues, there will be no more additional steps with regards to the fast-track process. We'll not be playing catch-up with the fast-track process over the next couple of years. That was importantly stopping the evolution of the fast-track process.

The next steps will be on the council's agenda today, to start the launch, emphasis on "start" the launch, of the fourth CC PDP. What it requires is a request of an issue report, appointment of the issue manager, and a tentative timeline. If council agrees, this will be on the table for adoption, the request for an issue report, at the December meeting. We need time to prepare that properly. There is already a meeting for

interested people around IDN CC PDP, or the CC PDP, scheduled for Thursday. I think it starts at 10:30, so go through your schedule.

Now, the second area is where I want to spend a little bit more time. It's the inclusion of IDN CC TLDs in the ccNSO. Some of you were already participating in the ccNSO meetings, even participating in the PDP itself when the proposals were adopted by the ccNSO members. That was in 2013. The world has moved on. This is just a brief check with you whether the proposals from that time are still valid. There is one additional point I will raise in a few minutes. There are, effectively, if you look at the proposals for the change of Article 10, that's the article in the ICANN bylaws with respect to the ccNSO, there are two main areas. First of all, the adjustment of the membership definition. As Stephen already alluded to, the PDP Working Group on Retirement has identified an issue. Hopefully, it will be addressed through the proposal of the bylaw change, in this one. In that way, it dovetails very nicely.

The second issue is around representation. I'll have to go back to give you a bit of a sense of what I'm talking about with representation. As you can see, there are 61 IDN ccTLDs from 42 countries, territories, or areas of geopolitical interest. Effectively, what it means, and you can see it here, is that in some countries or territories, and for this purpose I'll talk about countries, there are more than two or three IDN ccTLDs. In addition, you will have, and you will find, the ASCII ccTLDs. You will have, potentially …

If I use India as the most extreme example, India has currently 11 IDN ccTLDs. They also have the ASCII ccTLD. If they would be managed by

different managers, in India that's not the case, you will see 12 ccTLD managers who could be eligible for membership in the ccNSO. Now, think of some of the rules we have, or the ccNSO have. 10, for example, could ask for a vote or ask for the launch of a PDP. It means that if the whole country, all ccTLD managers from one country, would be able to launch a PDP, or have a very strong vote in other areas.

There is room for capture. That's what I mean. That is addressed in the overall policy. That was very hard, and a very deep discussion at the time. I'll go in a little bit more detail, there, just to give you a visual of what it really means, the representation.

First, let me go to the membership definition, the original text in the ICANN bylaws, pre-2016. Read it at your leisure. I think it is because of the reference to "sponsoring organization," it became very … There was resistance to that definition. As part of the stewardship discussion, the transition, the article was changed. If you look at the text here, below, it's what is currently in the ICANN bylaws. I'll read it out for purposes of this, Article 10. "A ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing an ISO3166 country-code top-level domain, or any later variant."

It becomes a bit unclear where the "any later variant" refers to. Is it to the ISO3166 country-code? That means if there is a significant change of name, is that the later variant, or not? It's very strange if you compare it with the other one. That was the issue on why the working group deferred this decision of this definition to the council. Now, if you look at what is included bylaws in the CC PDP2, on the inclusion, I've

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

highlighted the relevant sections for your reference. "A ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible." This is similar to the other one. It's a reference to the delegation record in the root zone database and referred to in IANA under the current sponsoring organization. That was in 2013 because that was the heading in the root zone database.

My proposal, and I will check with you in a minute, based on the discussions of the working group, is to change it slightly. The late variant of sponsoring organization and the current heading is "ccTLD manager." The meaning and reference, etc., of this change is not amended. However, the term "sponsoring organization" is removed in the latter proposal.

To show to you what it means, I've included some references from the root zone database as examples. If you look at the ccTLD record in the root zone database … I've picked the one for .ca as we are in Canada anyway. It lists in the root zone the TLD record as country-code top-level domain. It's very clear in the root zone database what is and what is not a country-code, or a ccTLD. If you compare what is included in the root zone database with respect to the gTLD record, it is a Generic Top-Level Domain.

Also, the difference is, and that's the highlighted part, it is the ccTLD manager in the root zone database, as least. To the gTLD record it is a sponsoring organization. It's a clear distinction. There can't be any misunderstanding that we talk about ccTLDs, what are the ccTLDs, and we talk about ccTLD managers. This is how it applies to ASCII ccTLDs.

Now, I've also included one for IDNs. As you can see there are IDNs. There is, clearly, a ccTLD delegation record for … This is a meaningful representation for the name of Bangladesh. The ccTLD manager is listed, the delegation record as well, and country-code top-level domain. Again, if you would go for the gTLD record, you see a delegation record for whatever it is, and then it's a Generic Top-Level Domain, and a sponsoring organization.

Based on the latter one, and I'll go back to the definition, you'll see it captures what is included in the root zone database. It captures the difference between ccTLD and gTLD. It captures what is a ccTLD manager. It defines an entity which is the ccTLD manager.

Now, again, summarize. This is why I like to have a show of cards. Do you agree with the proposed change of the membership definition? Recall, this was already agreed in 2013. This is a further refinement following the issues identified by the retirement working group. This is one of the core elements. This is effectively the main barrier why IDN ccTLDs cannot join the ccNSO. Question: do you still agree?

KATRINA SATAKI: I'm sorry. Before we do that, this is not a formal vote. It's just really a show of cards to feel the temperature in the room. Do you think this is [bold]?

BART BOSWINKEL:	Do we really need to have further discussion around it? Or, can we proceed with asking the bylaw change? Yes, go ahead. Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	I'm sorry, I don't want to waste your time but I didn't understand the link between that new definition and the problem. You talked about the number of IDN ccTLD …

BART BOSWINKEL:	That's the second one. There's a separate issue. I'll address it. That's the second one we'll discuss. This is the first one. This is the main barrier for entrance of IDN ccTLDs. They didn't fit in the definition. The first question is, "If you agree, please, a show of cards." The green card, if you agree that we pursue this one. I don't see … Any abstentions? Anyone opposed? No? Thank you. This is clear indication for council on how to proceed.
	Now we go into the second, your, part. The formal representation in the ccNSO. In order to understand this properly, it's "where is formal representation needed?" What are we really talking about? This is about votes of members. This is where there is a clear distinction between whether an entity is a member of the ccNSO or is not a member of the ccNSO. That is with respect to the nominations of board members. Board seats 11 and 12, that's probably the most important one, I would say. Maybe not.

The second one is council elections. Again, that is limited to, first of all, nominations [and secondment] is limited to ccNSO members. Also, the voting in case of one member candidate. Council elections and voting, etc. Probably what people do not know, it is also relevant with respect to raising issues to be addressed through the CC PDP. This is part of Annex B of the ICANN bylaws. If 10 or more members raise an issue with council they need to decide whether to follow up through a PDP, yes or no. Members do have the opportunity. This is something that will also have an impact. That is mimicked in the internal rules of the ccNSO. It's also mimicked there in the request for a vote.

Finally, and as this is probably ultimately the most important one, the members vote on the results of … Not the policy department process, but the process development process. You heard Annebeth talk about what will happen in the GNSO. In the GNSO, the GNSO Council determines the outcome and has the final say on the results of a Policy Development Process. In the ccNSO, it is the members. Council will take a first look at it, but ultimately it's the vote of the members determining whether the policy will pass and will be passed on to the board for adoption. There is a heavy quorum rule, etc., but it doesn't matter. These are the areas where the representation is important.

A second thing, and this goes back to what I just explained around the representation and the numbers involved, it is a matter of … As soon as the ccNSO is open for an inclusion of IDN ccTLDs, the [balance almost] between countries and territories. It's a little bit UN-like, unfortunately, but it is building trust and it needs to happen. You don't want to end up in a situation where one entity like the ccTLD manager for India

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

becomes a member with 11 or 12 votes and out-votes somebody from another country. That's a numbers game. You can see it now. It's in these four areas. You can see the board nomination could be captured. The council elections could be captured. The vote on the PDP could be captured that way. Raising the issue, there is no threshold. Only India itself will pass that threshold.

KATRINA SATAKI: Please also note it's not about India. Right? We love India, it's just an example. Currently, they have the largest number of IDN ccTLDs. In no way we wanted to …

BART BOSWINKEL: As another example with three IDNs, here, now, yes? Etc. I have to say, this is something to keep in the back of your mind. It's a side remark, but it shows you the trust of the community. There are currently already some ccTLDs who run more than one ccTLD in the ASCII world. I think the best example is AFNIC. The other one is Norid. They only member for one. I never asked them, but this could be one of the reasons. If there would be members for all seven of them, they would have seven votes. There is one exception to that rule but we will not go there.

Balance of power in the ccNSO. Just to recap. Currently, one manager, one vote. That's obvious. However, IDN-eligible … This is just a recap of what I just said. Some territories are more ccTLD managers. That's two or more votes per country. Some territories, one entity manages two or more. That's a subset of this one. That single manager would have two

or more votes. Some countries with no IDNs, although large it is, just have one vote because they don't have IDNs. That's everybody in this room right now.

Now, we go into the nitty-gritty details of the proposal. Introduce the emissaries. Hopefully, nobody has to deal with it. This was the solution. The basic solution is effectively, "Maintain the balance between the countries and territories. One vote per country, one vote per territory." That is the background of the proposal that was included in the 2013 policy proposal. If you will agree with continuing that path, that will go forward. What it means is we needed to find a name at the time for the person who would represent two or three IDN ccTLD managers from a country. That became the emissary.

The reasoning. This is directly quoted from the policy proposal. "In the event of two or more ccTLD managers from one and the same territory are members of the ccNSO, these ccTLD managers are to appoint an emissary. I think Egypt is the best example. That's the one I know. You've got the .[inaudible], which is the IDN ccTLD for Egypt. And, you've got .eg. There are two different managers. If both of them would become a member, they need to appoint an emissary who would vote on behalf of Egypt. Only that person would vote in case of nominations in the elections. Only in case of raising an issue to the council. Only in case of the end vote on a PDP result. The emissary is a representative of the two ccTLD managers from Egypt. That is what it says. That was the proposal at the time that was agreed upon.

PATRICIO POBLETE: We need to wrap this up quickly.

BART BOSWINKEL: I will, I will.

PATRICIO POBLETE: At some point.

BART BOSWINKEL: … For purposes, and then it's a definition. This is very important because it will change the balance within the ccNSO. Specific points we're initially doing is that if there are more than two ccTLD managers from one country and they can't find an emissary, that's taking care of as well in the proposal. If there is a single ccTLD manager, like the .india case, the emissary will be the single person who represents that ccTLD manager. All to avoid that you have more than two, or that in such a case IDN and ASCII will have two or more votes.

In 2013, the ccTLDs voted in favor of this system. That's my question. Do you still support this solution? Forget the term, but at least the basic principle of one vote, one …

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: One territory, one vote.

ICANN ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

BART BOSWINKEL:	Yes, one territory, one vote. If you do, please show your green cards. Any abstentions? Yes, Patricia. Yes. Any objections? Okay, Pierre. Could you please explain? I think that is important.

PIERRE BONIS:	I think this gives less power to the ccTLD manager of a country where there is another ccTLD manager. Of course, it's a solution to avoid capture. You have other solutions. Changing the kind of vote, saying that there cannot be more than this amount of votes from the same country when it comes to the appointment of someone, or something like that.
	Doing that, you put the ccTLD manager of a country of a territory that lives with another ccTLD manager in the obligation of having a kind of consensus with him, and speaking about the country, and from the country, and not from the country code. Specifically, if I talk about my country, we run seven ccTLDs. There are six others. If the manager of Guadeloupe or Martinique comes here, it means I have to find common ground with him. I have to send an emissary that will vote for us. No?

BART BOSWINKEL:	That's why I started this whole discussion around the formal decisions. It's only in four cases where you do. Right now, say, in these meetings, we will have one or two …

PIERRE BONIS:	Just for the nomination of the council or other boards?

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes.

PIERRE BONIS: I have to find a common vote. This is the purpose of the proposal, no? No? I don't understand, what is it?

BART BOSWINKEL: It is only the IDNs involved. In your case, there are no IDNs.

PIERRE BONIS: This is not what I read.

KATRINA SATAKI: Wait, it's one country and territory. One country. Not that you have seven countries, or seven territories. One country. Within that one country you have several ccTLDs.

PIERRE BONIS: We have more than 11 ccTLDs in France. One country, 11 ccTLDs.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, those ccTLDs are for other countries and territories. You are one manager, yes.

PIERRE BONIS:	There may be other territories, but this is the same country. This is France.

KATRINA SATAKI:	No, no, you're …

PIERRE DANDJINOU:	Excuse me, yes!

BART BOSWINKEL:	This is the exact proposal, okay? You talk about IDN ccTLDs and ccTLDs within the same territory. The same territory is defined, like Guadeloupe, within Guadeloupe, and not within France.

PIERRE BONIS:	Okay, so it's not the same country.

BART BOSWINKEL:	It is, but for ease of speech, it's one country, one vote. It's effectively one territory. If you want to be precise, in a country, a dependency, or other area. It's per ISO3166 listed entity.

PIERRE BONIS:	Okay, thank you for the clarification. I go green.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, thank you. That's important. There is no objection. That concludes, effectively, the presentation. I think based on this one the council is fairly safe to request a bylaw change. Thank you. That was the end. Quick question, please?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: This is Young-eum from dot-care. Actually, what Pierre just mentioned was the potential issue of capture of the European Union by Afnic. I mean, the current rules.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe the UN, but not the European Union.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Right, not the EU, but the European … For example, council vote, France would have that many votes.

BART BOSWINKEL: [ITU], but this only works on a global scale.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you very much.

BIYI OLADIPO: Okay. Alright. The next session is the session to hear from the candidates for the council election coming up in Cancún. We have six

candidates. From the African region, we have Souleymane Oumtanaga. From the Asia Pacific we have Atsushi Endo and Ai-Chin Lu. From Europe, we have Giovanni Seppia. Latin America, we have Alejandra Reynoso. From North America, Stephen Deerhake.

Alright. This is an interesting time because this time last year I was sitting there. Giovanni was the one that took this session. Now it's your turn. I'm taking this session and you are sitting down there. Alright. What we're going to do … We're just going to run through this. I think the other session has run into this. We'll try to make it as fast as possible. What we're going to do is, in two minutes we'll get to hear from the candidates. The candidates' statement is already online. I'm sure a lot of us have looked at that.

We will hear from you, two minutes. Tell us about yourself and about your aspiration into the council. Then, we'll take questions and answers. The interesting thing about this is they're going to tell us their issue but it's not about them, really. It's about t things that we want to know about them. We're going to have people … The microphones are there. You can just come line up on the microphones as soon as the discussion starts, so we can make it as interactive as possible.

Something that I like about this is the questions that are asked actually get to make the candidates think about their aspirations quite a bit more. I still remember two questions that were asked to me, one by [Eberhardt Liese] and the other by Byron, made me realize how engaging I need to be to ensure that whatever aspirations I have would be made through my contribution to the ccNSO. Alright? We're going to

start. I think we'll start from you, Giovanni. We'll come this way. Two minutes.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you so much. Thank you, [Bije]. I work as an external relations manager at EURid, the registry operator appointed by the European Commission for the .eu in Latin, in Cyrillic, and, as you know, in also Greek, as of a few months. I've been serving the ccNSO Council for a bit less than one term. I must say that what I've experienced so far is that it's quite a work to follow, get prepared, and attend everything that has to be looked after. I think in the ccNSO Council we have a good chemistry. Different people. I enjoy the [custom].

What I would like is to continue to serve for another term, and to serve the community. To continue to listen to the community. I think that's the most important part. Also, learn from what is said during the ccNSO Council meetings. That's another important component. My statement is online. I'm not going to tell you again all my CV, and this kind of stuff. I must say that I've very honored to be part of this community.

Again, to help as much as I can in the areas where I'm more competent, like the strategic and operating plan and the internationalized domain names, and whenever there is any issue at a diplomatic level, as .eu is a very special registry. We are dealing with European institutions on a daily basis. I'm happy to serve and put my experience of relations with the European institutions for the ccNSO community and the ccNSO council. Thanks a lot.

BIYI OLADIPO: Alright, thank you, Giovanni. Alexandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, [Bije]. Hello, everyone. To me, I have been in the council one term and a year, because I came also in the middle of a term. So far, it has been an incredible experience. I think I've learned a lot while being in the council. I got involved, myself, in many other areas than I expected to. My goal this time is to seek in the LAC community, Latin American and Caribbean community, to have them to participate a little bit more in the activities of the ccNSO, and to also ensure that there is a continuity in the work that we're doing right now. I've been in close relationship with several managers, and also with LAC TLD, which is the one that also hugs us very close. We've been developing some strategies to try to keep this communication more fluid with ccTLD managers and the ccNSO. That's that. Thank you very much.

BIYI OLADIPO: Thank you. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. I've been on council for one full term, and a partial term. I took over from Dotty Sparks de Blanc of .vi for that partial term. I've been involved in the ICANN ecosystem for probably a much longer period of time than is really healthy. I've been involved for 18-plus years. I will tell you that ICANN, then, was such a completely different

creature than it is now. The spirit of cooperation that we have today would simply be unimaginable back in the early days.

What I do bring to this community, and to council, is considerable institutional knowledge, given that I'm a dinosaur. I've been here forever. My interests are, as you probably have ascertained, the rights and responsibilities, and the exercise thereof, of the Empowered Community. To that end, I'm honored to serve as the ccNSO's representative to the Empowered Community administration. I am the only charter member. I think that speaks well for the ccNSO, in that we have had minimal turnover, whereas, the other SOs/ACs who remember, the ECA churn their leadership. Consequently, they churn the members that they send to the Empowered Community administration.

As a result, I've been holding the pen from the beginning. I'm the one that the other SO and ACs turn to when they have a question about what their rights and powers are as decisional participants. It's kind of an odd place to be in. To that effect, I'm frantically working on an ECA guidebook, for lack of a better term, to capture and document the institution's knowledge, at least with respect to the ECA.

I feel it's a very important thing for the Empowered Community to be cognizant and willing to exercise their rights, and not be led around by forces that have other interests at heart. Besides the ECA, I have a serious interest in the ICANN budget. As you know, I've been on the warpath about the auction proceeds and what to do about that in conjunction with the deficit in the inadequate funding in the ICANN

reserve fund, for example. I'm also following on my term as part of the Framework of Interpretation Working Group.

I'm honored to be able to be the chair of the PDP Retirement Working Group. As you saw in the previous presentation, we are actually making progress even though we appear to be the butt of some internal board jokes about how long things are taking.

The other main interest I have, which dovetails with the ECA stuff, is cross-silo dialog in education. Last meeting I presented to ALAC, or maybe it was the meeting before, art their invitation. I'm happy to do that going forward, to do whatever I can to foster inter-SO/AC communication. I feel it's extremely important that we do so, particularly now that we're decisional participants under the post-NTIA bylaws, which I refer to as "ICANN bylaws version three." Thank you.

BIYI OLADIPO: Thank you. Ai-Chin?

AI-CHIN LU: Okay, thank you. Hi, good afternoon everyone. I'm from .tw registry. I have been in the ccTLD business for 20 years, although the ccNSO for more than a decade. I think I believe I have gained enough experience and expertise to stand for the seat at the ccNSO Council. I have been the AP TLD Chair for two years. I presided over major changes, and the [growth], and the transformation to the biggest regional organizations whose members are engaging a constant and productive dialog.

Our mailing policy and the [inaudible] issues in the most friendly environment. I have learned the value of dialog, which should help me to communicate and [inaudible] the ccNSO members interesting in the process of interaction with ICANN Org. I think AP TLD Chair and the ccNSO Council role, these two positions mutually benefit each other. I think I can do the conduit between AP TLD and the ccNSO.

If elected, I think there are several important things I have to do. The first one, to straighten the collaboration among all ccTLD members. The second one, to harness the ccNSO [inaudible] to bring the best win-win strategy and practice, I think, to benefit ccNSO community. The last but not least one. I think we need to communicate it to the other supporting organization, and the advisory committee, and ICANN, and bring the best interesting to our members. Thank you.

BIYI OLADIPO: Thank you. Atsushi?

ATSUSHI ENDO: Thank you. Good afternoon, all. I'm with Japan Registry Services, JPRS. A .jp ccTLD manager for 18 years. I'm currently a manager of corporate planning and strategic planning department of JPRS. I am a candidate for the councilor from the Asia Pacific region. Firstly, I'd like to thank gratefully to the nominator Hiro Hotta, my colleague of .jp, and second [inaudible] of .kr, for their firm trust for me. I believe you have read the candidate statement, so I'm not going to touch on details now.

For preparation for this Q&A session I found interesting things I'd like to share here. One Q&A session on ICANN57, Hyderabad, India, it was over three years ago, there is a question. "What are the things you would hope to achieve in your next term?" Hiro responded to that question that if elected again he will serve more than 15 years in a row as a councilor. He stated at the moment that he'll find at least two candidates to the council in the coming term. That's three years ago, that Q&A session.

This time, we have two candidates from the AP region. It seems to me that Hiro accomplished his mission. We have a contested election. I think this is a very healthy situation for the ccNSO, especially for the APAC region. In this session, I'd like to express my willingness for contributing to the ccTLD community, and the whole ICANN community. Thank you.

BIYI OLADIPO: Alright, thank you. We'll have Souleymane, and then you guys can ask your questions. Souleymane.

SOULEYMANE OUMTANAGA: Yes, hello. My name is Souleymane Oumtanaga from Ivory Coast. I am seeking reelection to this ccNSO Council for the African region. I would like to continue serving [inaudible] ccTLD community as a member of the ccNSO Council. I am a teacher and researcher, working in research and teaching for more than 25 years [inaudible]. I contribute to the development of infrastructure and Internet in my country, design,

implementation, and operate the .ci registry. I built exchange point CXP from every coast.

I also set up two copies of [L] servers in my country. In AFRINIC sector I initiate and create networks. I work in telecommunication for teaching and research, named [Rita]. I have two laboratories and currently host certain doctors and students. In return of international cooperation, as president of College International of AFRINIC, I have actively contributed to the development of African domain names of territories, and I have a TLD workshop.

I contributed to development of software, named [inaudible], with AFRINIC. As a member of the ccNSO Council, I participate in different working groups like NPC, [EGLC], Travel Committee, and play an important role in the re-delegation of African ccTLDs, like .ml, .bf. Now, I advise African countries to join the ccNSO. I began with Togo, Mali, [inaudible], and so on. I am grateful to the ccTLD that proposed [inaudible] me as candidate, and [inaudible] encourage me to seek another term. Thank you very much. I'm waiting for my interview.

BIYI OLADIPO: Okay, thank you very much. Now, we have the candidate questions. I have my own questions, but I will allow you guys to go first.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you for that. First of all, before the short question, I realize that time is short. I'd like to hear from all candidates for this. I'd like to

express my appreciation to all candidates. I've listened to how qualified and ready you are to serve. Having sat in that seat myself for a number of years, I really appreciate that. My question is about motivation. Because of the time, I just really want to hear either one word or maybe one short sentence, something like that, a phrase. Why? Why do you want to serve? If you're seeking reelection, why do you want to be reelected? If you're seeking election for the first time why would you like to come on the council? Thank you.

BIYI OLADIPO: Thank you, Nigel. You actually peeked into my notes. That was my first question. We'll have you guys answer. Why do you want to be reelected, and why do you want to be reelected? We'll start from Souleymane, and we'll go down.

SOULEYMANE OUMTANAGA: Why I want to be reelected. I begin our work to bring African ccTLD to ccNSO. I contact registry. I began by [inaudible], Togo, and I want to continue this work. I have a lot of projects to ccNSO, like an observatory for African region to help registries to increase the name of the domains, and also to make …

BIYI OLADIPO: I think Nigel will just want one word, or one quick statement.

SOULEYMANE OUMTANAGA: I'll continue.

BIYI OLADIPO: You've said one word, and that's it. We'll move on. Atsushi.

SOULEYMANE OUMTANAGA: I also want to help African top-level domain [who is capacity] building. I do it [with Dennis forum] also. The next [inaudible] forum will be [Ndaga]. I want to help Africa and ICANN Africa to manage this event. There are a lot of things I want to do for the African region. This is why I want to be in the ccNSO, to relay information from Africa to ccNSO members. This is why I want to continue, and to be reelected. Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you.

ATSUSHI ENDO: Thank you for your question. In one word, I'd like to contribute the Internet to more better things. I'd like to contribute a community from my experience. I have heavily engaged in business development in JPRS, especially starting a gTLD registration business, or the new gTLD-like things. Basically, I have a ccTLD perspective, but also have knowledge and experience in gTLD areas. Currently, there is a situation growing, the importance of collaborative work of the whole ICANN

community. I believe I can contribute to collaborative efforts of whole inter-ICANN community. Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you.

AI-CHIN LU: Okay. Why I will run in this election. Yes, I think I have two reasons. Because they returned ICANN, I think it's very far to the Asia Pacific region. I think it's just a little bit Asia Pacific people to attend the ICANN meeting. I think that I want the country to be trained AP TLD and the ccNSO. I want to listen to every member's voice, and we can collect every member's opinion. That is the first reason. The second reason. I think that we need total resource-sharing because AP TLD started a series of capacity building. I think it was very good, but we need more resources, more expertise, more panels to cooperate with each other. That's why I want to run in this election. I think the resource-sharing is very important for the Asia Pacific. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Oversee to completion the policy development that has been going on for a very long time regarding RFC 1591, imparting my institutional knowledge to a younger generation, and documenting the responsibilities and the mechanics of the Empowered Community doing what it needs to do.

BIYI OLADIPO: Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. I believe in teamwork. I believe the ccNSO community is a really huge, big team, and they all work together for a main goal. Right now we have a very nice environment where we collaborate and share our experiences and best practices with everyone. We consider everyone equal. I would like to maintain that. That's my goal, here.

BIYI OLADIPO: Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: To answer the why: because I like it. I like to listen and learn. I like also to share my expertise in certain areas. Above all, because I would like to have some more time to work on the next generation of ccNSO membership. That's why.

BIYI OLADIPO: Thank you. Hiro?

HIRO HOTTA: Yes. As a successful outgoing councilor, I feel very encouraged when I see the two very quality candidates. This is a question. What do you think is the most important issue the ccNSO should tackle with now?

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

How can you add value in solving the issue as fresh councilors and still-fresh councilors?

BIYI OLADIPO: Okay, you want everybody to answer this? We'll start from Giovanni, and we'll come this way.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I think it's the most pressing challenge, which we partially discussed council workshop last Sunday, to work on consolidating the ccNSO in terms of membership, in terms of participation. Also, in terms of coping with the challenge of the fatigue of the volunteer model, and of the multi-stakeholder model which ICANN has just started to look into. I think that's quite an urgent matter we should work on. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Giovanni just stole my issue. Yes, we are very concerned in finding more volunteers for the work of the ccNSO. To complement what Giovanni said, I believe that we should find easier paths for new people to come into the activity of the ccNSO. Sometimes, it is a little bit hard to just jump in in current discussions. We are working on it in an onboarding program. Yes, that will be my issue.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Giovanni stole two of mine but not the last one. In trying to incorporate the recommendations of Work Stream 2 and the recommendations and

suggestions of the recently completed review by Meridian Institute, is one. Volunteer burnout, I think, is a critical issue. Not just for this particular So, but I think throughout the community. Last but not least, I think we as a community, as ccNSO supporting organization, need to start looking at perhaps doing some changes to, for example, the fundamental role of the ccNSO.

The way things were structured here some 17-plus years ago were great when it was small. When the ccNSO was 30, 40 members. Now, we've blown through 170. In some ways, we're a victim of our own success. I think we need to take a collective look at perhaps reorganizing some things a little bit differently. This really came to the forefront when trying to develop the rejection action guideline for the council based on having to adhere to what was written down a long time ago.

AI-CHIN LU: Yes, I think that currently the ccNSO are 170 members. I think the organization is quite big. How to integrate, and how to organize, is very important. Currently, sorry, it's a little bit of a loose organization. I think [inaudible] the button-up mechanism. How to listen to every member's opinions, and get consensus, is very important. The other way, I think how to protect the natural right is very important. The ccTLD is every country's territory. I think how to protect the natural right is a very important issue. Thank you.

ATSUSHI ENDO:	Thank you very much for your question. My observation for what is important that the ccNSO should tackle in the short term is completing the ongoing efforts that the amending ICANN bylaws allows IDN ccTLD to join the members of the ccNSO. I always say that basically it is important to assure the right to join the ICANN supporting organization for all ccTLD managers, including IDN ccTLDs. Middle and long-term, I mean, that's more comprehensive. Seeking to have the ccNSO as the supporting organization of ICANN able to support the whole ICANN community. For example, issues like so-called DNS abuse will affect not only the gTLD registries/registrars, but also the ccTLD operators.
	Moreover, it affects the registrants. This means that the whole ICANN community needs to be engaged into solving those kinds of issues. Given the situation that the growing importance of cooperation of the whole ICANN community, I believe I have the right experience to coordinate cooperation from a ccTLD perspective, especially between the ccTLD community and the gTLD community. As a fresh councilor, I'm sure that I can bring additional values to the ccNSO Council and ccNSO from my knowledge and experience in ccTLD community as well as gTLD community. Also, activities in AP regions, and understanding of the ICANN ecosystem. Thank you.
SOULEYMANE OUMTANAGA:	I think the important thing for us is to bring maximum countries, ccTLDs, to join the ccNSO. This is very important for us. And, to inform the registry what is done in the ccNSO. For example, if there is something new in ICANN we have to inform all of your community what

is done, exactly. We have also to give them tools to manage their registry. This is important. Politics to manage registry. How to increase the domain names in Africa. This is very important for us, also. This is what I want to add. Thank you very much.

BIYI OLADIPO: Alright. Thank you. Do we have any other questions? I have one. This is to everybody. First, I would like to hear from the guys who are coming to council, and then the same question will go for the people who are already councilors but are seeking to re-elect. The question is this: what will you do differently as somebody who is coming to the ccNSO Council? This goes to the fresh candidates. What are those things that you'll do differently to complement what has already been done on the council, and also for the work of the ccNSO?

For the people who are already on the council, what would you do differently that you haven't done before? What will you do differently to further the cause of the ccNSO, and also advance the work of the council? You choose who goes first.

ATSUSHI ENDO: I think that the difference, or the new values that the … I have compared to the … I believe that current councilors … I have directly involved in a new gTLD process. Having a lot of experience, knowledge, regarding those areas. I think that I can do collaborative efforts between the other supporting organizations and the SO/ACs more. Thank you.

BIYI OLADIPO: Thank you. Ai-chin?

AI-CHIN LU: Yes. I think the best difference will … I want to share information. That
                             is very important. For the Asia Pacific, like the AP TLD, I think the
                             information is not good enough. I think the front of ccNSO, maybe we
                             can do a lot of sharing to the Asia Pacific region. The other things, I think
                             the front agenda part. Yes, I think the AP TLD will do some interactive
                             … The section, I think, is better. Every time, the conference, just
                             somebody speak and someone just listen. They need to be more
                             interactive with the audience. I think maybe we can get some
                             brainstorming, and we can get new ideas. Maybe some creativity,
                             innovation. That is better, yes. Thank you.

BIYI OLADIPO: Thank you. So, for the existing councilors? Who takes the first shot?
                             Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll take the first shot. Exhibit more patience early on in the launch of
                             ICANN 3.0. Relationship with the staff responsible for the Empowered
                             Community administration was, shall I say, somewhat rocky. We have
                             come to an understanding. Things are going much better, let's put it
                             that way. It was a new process. There is push back-and-forth for control
                             of the narrative. That's my goal.

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hi. What I would do differently would be to communicate more proactively with the Latin American/Caribbean region. I've been always available for questions and participation, and do summaries on what the ccNSO is doing. That's on-call basis, when they ask me to do it. Maybe what I would do differently this time is to be more proactive and start sharing it from my side first, instead of waiting for the call.

BIYI OLADIPO: Thank you. Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPIA: I would make the ccNSO even more accessible and valuable to its membership.

BIYI OLADIPO: Souleymane?

SOULEYMANE OUMTANAGA: As a councilor our role is to serve your community. What I want to do is to continue serving the community. To bring information from the ccNSO to other communities is very important. I also want to be more active in the working group, and to make that African registry join ccNSO. This is a big job. It is not easy. I want to do it. Thank you.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

BIYI OLADIPO: Thank you. Do we have any more questions, or we just close it here? Thank you very much, everyone. Thank you for listening. All the best to the candidates. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

I C A N N
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019