

---

KOBE – ccNSO: Council Workshop  
Sunday, March 10, 2019 – 09:00 to 12:00 JST  
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:           Made to survive for the first hour.

KATRINA SATAKI:           First hour. I'm slightly disappointed with the turnout.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:        Don't tell me. I woke up at 4:00 for today.

KATRINA SATAKI:           [Botox.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:        [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI:           Good morning, all. Please join us at the table. Okay, we're having a council workshop. We'll start, because it's already 9:01, and all the councilors were reminded to be on time. Maybe I didn't say it was 9:00 AM local time. Yeah, my bad. Look who's here. Slowly coming in.

---

**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.**

---

Okay. Maybe we can start with introductions, because otherwise, we're not going to make it. This is going to be a really very intense exercise. Yes, very intense. And no idea how it's going to work out. This is the first time we're going to do something like that.

Yeah, with that, let me introduce – oh, you all perhaps remember David Kolb, he's a professional facilitator who will help us to manage everything on time and come out of this exercise alive, probably, hopefully smarter, wiser and more experienced than we were before.

So, David, the floor is yours.

DAVID KOLB:

Thank you so much. What we're going to do this morning, I know that Katrina had sent an e-mail out with the agenda on it, but just to briefly go through the reason that we need to start on time so that we can finish on time, is we want to start out with some introductions, which with a smaller crowd will actually go a little bit shorter than we thought it would anyway.

Then we want to move into doing some work around triage, and then some work around rejection requests, and also talk about roles, responsibilities, expectations, and then at the end of this, we want to have people sign up for their roles and responsibilities in terms of what you want to do in your term as a councilor.

---

The reason we want to do the triage and the rejection work is so you can get a feel for what some of these roles do and what's expected from some of the roles you sign up for.

Our hope is that in doing that, you won't just go screaming into the night and run out the door, but you'll actually sign up for a role. At least that's the hope, but we'll see. We're actually going to lock the door so everybody signs up for a role before then can leave the room.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Both the doors.

DAVID KOLB: Exactly. Yeah, every single one. There's no question about it. So we thought by way of introduction – so how many are new councilors, new to here? One? Okay, so one new person. So since you know each other, except for – is it Jordan? Yeah, but he's not necessarily new to the ccNSO, but new to council. Thank you. There we go. And I think we've got three total that are new.

It'd be great for the new folks to hear from the veterans, if I can call you that, and also for you to hear from each other something around what we're calling hopes and fears. Hopes and fears is not this big piece of personal disclosure and things like that. It's more around, tell us who you are, and in your role at this point, where

---

ccNSO is in terms of issues before them and things like that, what are your hopes and fears? What do you hope for to see happen, and what are you anxious about, what are you nervous about, worried about, if you will, moving forward?

And I've asked Katrina to start us, because she's really wearing two hats as a ccNSO member and also as chair, so you'll kind of have two introductions. You can use the same name for both though, by the way. So if you'll stop the recording at this point, because again, we want people to share and not feel like you're going to be recorded on your hopes and fears, like, "You listened to that recording of the ccNSO council? They are really nervous about what they're doing." So we'll stop the recording and we'll start it back when we get into triage.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes. thank you very much, David. Good morning again everyone. We've got another new councilor.

Then we have also several committees like triage committee, and today, we're going to simulate the work of the triage committee, because triage committee acts as a filter of all the incoming requests, they try to look into those requests, and then come up with suggestions.

---

Travel funding committee, they are reviewing all the requests for travel support from our community. Then we have a person responsible for ccNSO membership application oversight. We have a member on the empowered community administration. Again, we have another guideline in which we explain the process and all the requirements for this person. Currently, that's Stephen, and as we learned today, Stephen is the core issue why people do not read Annex D, basically.

Okay. Then also have liaisons, they actively participate in information exchange with other communities. And here, we have – well, four very important roles for rejection action petition manager, and deputy rejection action petition manager, and then two other councilors who are part of the rejection action petition review committee.

We approved rejection action procedures guideline, I think the year before that. Yeah. And we already actually survived one year with these people being appointed without and rejection action petition. And today, again, we're going to simulate the process to help people by doing things to help understand everything better.

One new role, we haven't approved the guideline yet, but yesterday, the guidelines review committee finalized, agreed on the final wording of the relevant guideline, and it'll be sent tot the

---

council very soon. So we will need to appoint an approval action petition manager.

Then other roles that we have in that table, it's ALAC and ccNSO agenda setting committee, then we have ccNSO-GAC agenda committee, and here I'd like to thank Peter. Unfortunately, he's leaving the council, so please think if you are ready and willing to liaise with GAC. Currently, it's [inaudible] who is, I think, really helpful and tries to set up an agenda that would be interesting for both GAC and the ccNSO.

Then we will need to appoint a new person to the NomCom, but that's a general call for volunteers, and then also council liaisons to different working groups. We have also onboarding, mentor-mentee committee, another thing that needs to be done, ethos award committee. There are time limits, so thanks to those who stepped forward.

Council CSC selection committee, we appointed these people some time ago when we first selected our members to the CSC. They are the ones who we kind of authorized to approve the full slate so that the entire council doesn't have to come up and vote on the full slate.

Then we also have ICANN fellowship selection committee, and yeah, if you remember, Pablo stepped forward and he can share

---

also his experience with reviewing application that are being received by this committee.

So with that, I think that is it. Yes, so that's about the roles and responsibilities. Yes, please.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Yes. Thank you, Katrina. Just one question, because I think in the fears and hopes part, we heard quite a lot of interesting points. I would like to ask if there's going to be a moment now or in the future when the council is going to address those points, because I think they're quite important, and I think they're at the core of our future work. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah. Thank you very much. Yes, we will summarize them, we will listen to recordings. I took some notes here. We are not going to do that today, neither during the workshop nor during the council prep, but yes, this is something that we can definitely think about in the future.

Anything else about roles and responsibilities? It was really very quick intro because we still have a lot of things to do, and I would prefer that we move to some hands-on exercises and actually try to triage things.

DAVID KOLB:

Thank you so much. I'll bring your attention here to we have a chart of the roles and responsibilities listed out, and this is where we want you to sign up to before the end of the session or at the break if you've got a real preference and you're just dying to sign your name to something over here. You're welcome to do that when we take a break a little bit later on.

For now though, we want to do some work around triage, and I counted about 16 council members, so what I'd like to do is divide you into four groups, and then we'll work accordingly to those groups. Katrina, let me ask you this: do you want me to put the groups in the corners, or do you want to explain the exercise before they group up?

KATRINA SATAKI:

I think we explain the exercise and then we move to corners so that discussions of each group do not disturb discussions of other groups. And if one group starts fighting, others can leave the room.

DAVID KOLB:

Yeah. We'll try to keep it away from the dishes in the back.



---

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, that would be nice. And mirrors too. Thank you.

DAVID KOLB: So I'll get you counted off. The most challenging part of this is remembering your number and remembering where you're going to go. So let's start here with one.

KATRINA SATAKI: Two.

DAVID KOLB: Three.

KATRINA SATAKI: Three.

DAVID KOLB: Just go with four. We'll work with you. I told you this was the most challenging part. So I'm guessing one.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I was using zero base.

---

DAVID KOLB: One, two, three, four. Excellent. So many comments come to mind, but I'm not going to go there. Okay, so when we do divide up, the ones who'll be in this corner – and we'll pull a flipchart over there. Twos will be here, threes will be there, and fours will be up here. So, Katrina, back to you. Would you like a handheld to walk?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you very much. So you received those exercises in your mailboxes a week ago or so.

DAVID KOLB: And you memorized those too, right?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, absolutely. I hope they not only read them but also thought about them very carefully. So each group will get all three, but they may choose two.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: You take any two. And maybe one is even enough for one group, but the idea is that you answer those questions so that you think

---

about the question that we have. First, do you agree with the recommended actions? Maybe there are other actions that you would suggest. And second question, do you agree with the assessment of the impact on the ccNSO or ccTLDs? And what criteria did you use?

And after this exercise, after we had discussions, each group will present their criteria. And those criteria will be used by the triage committee in the future.

So, is the exercise clear? I suggest that each group takes either case one or case two, and the case three, but it's really up to you. You do not look very excited.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yes, we do that, my commander.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's good.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Okay, and how long do we have?

KATRINA SATAKI: How long do we have, David?

---

DAVID KOLB: It's negotiable.

KATRINA SATAKI: We did it really quickly, much faster than we expected to.

DAVID KOLB: We're doing well. So the entire exercise, probably about a half hour total, but that's also for presenting back your criteria too.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 35.

DAVID KOLB: So in your groups, let's check in at 20 minutes. Does that sound good?

KATRINA SATAKI: If we need more time –

DAVID KOLB: Checking in.

KATRINA SATAKI: In 20 minutes, we ask the groups if they are ready.

---

DAVID KOLB: Yes.

KATRINA SATAKI: But we still have time.

DAVID KOLB: Okay, so ones, if you'll just group up over here, twos here, threes back in this corner, and fours over here, and I'll bring a flipchart up for you to talk around.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, I'll give each of you a copy.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: We are four, because after three, there is four. Okay? After three, there is four. It's mathematics.

DAVID KOLB: Okay, find your group and get started. Fours are looking kind of lonely over there. Not for long.

Two-minute warning. Wrap up your case and the questions, and figure out who's going to present back with your criteria.

---

Okay, time is up, so figure out who your presenter is going to be, and come on back to the table. Getting finishing touches on the charts.

So what we want to know from each of the groups is answering these two questions. So, do you agree with the recommended actions? And then what other action would you suggest? And do you agree with the assessment of the impact? And then what criteria did you use? With the emphasis on that last one, what were your criteria for triage? Because we want to see what the differences and similarities were around the four groups.

So, that said, who would like to start? How about if we start in numerical order? I don't know, who's the presenter for group one? Looking around, no one's stepping up. Was there someone who was in group one? Because it's a very attractive chart, I've got to say. So, who's presenting this? Come on. Don't be shy. That's right get the new guy, right? Yeah.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. When you turn it on, it works. Right, so just do them both together quickly, Peter and I can do one each. So we run through both cases?

DAVID KOLB: Yes. Yeah, tell us which case it was, obviously.

JORDAN CARTER:

Well, the first case is a mystery case and you have to guess which one it was. No, case one, we did the IANA functions agreement, and the action there was just to send it to a single e-mail list, we thought. This was a public consultation on the IANA functions agreement. And we said we would also send it to ccNSO members and the council, and we would stick that on social media and now in the ccNSO newsletter. And we'd probably ask for an agenda item at the next ccNSO council meeting to see if a ccNSO submission was required.

And that additional action reacts to us thinking that the impact of this was actually high rather than medium. And the criteria we looked at mainly there was that there's a direct impact on how the IANA functions operate. The IANA functions [in turn] are absolutely integral to our work as ccTLD operators. So if the institutional structure and IANA goes wrong, we are all at significant risk. That's why we thought it was high.

We elaborated some other general criteria. High would be a direct impact on the IANA functions, or whether it could interfere with the technical or registry operations if something goes wrong, or potential financial impact on ccTLDs. So those were the kind of criteria we were looking at.

---

Yeah, so we thought the impact was high because it was potential risk on the IANA functions. That was case one.

PETER VERGOTE:

Thanks, Jordan. Case two was the number two case of the [triage] committee about the review schedule. If I remember correctly, the proposed actions were to send it to various mail lists, but also to contact the guideline reviews committee and to ask them to draft a council statement.

Now, we were a bit surprised about that, both in terms of why specifically the guideline reviews committee – is there not another committee that could assist in drafting a council statement? And we also wondered, do we really need a council statement about this?

The impact, if we reapply the kind of more generic indicators that we used for the previous case, you can immediately see that the outcome is this is not high. But then an interesting debate started, whether, is it middle or is it even not middle, is it more towards very low impact? Because it's essentially not about adding new stuff, it's about rescheduling of systematic and organizational reviews. So that's not something new, it's more of how are we going to rebalance it a bit to get a better workload.



---

So, we identified some new [indicator,] which is in assessing the impact. We maybe should make a distinction between impact on ccNSO as an organization and impact on the ccTLDs, because if you would have a mild impact on ccNSO but a very low impact on ccTLDs, the overall adjustment could be that the impact is still low and not middle.

And to close off this case, we also added one question that could be added while trying to assess the impact: what would the result be if we do nothing? And the answer to that could help you with assessing what's the specific impact of the issue or the topic. That's it for us. Thank you.

DAVID KOLB:

And group two, back here at this chart. Who's presenting this one? That's great, Ajay was pointing to other people and they all pointed back at him.

AJAY DATA:

The young lady told me that she's [inaudible] with me. Young girl, you can come, please. Okay. So this is case three about IDN variants, and what we thought is that partly, we agree, and there are [reasons] to agree partly with that. We have some recommendations, and more details and analysis should be done to get better communication from community, and we expect

better language, because we realized within our group that people who are not about these acronyms, what is IDN and what is variant, it is difficult to even communicate back the recommendation. So it is better to give some simpler language and examples how they're getting impacted.

One of our members, colleagues, said that zero to nine, which is not available in top-level domain, is also being discussed in subsequent procedure as top-level domain. So this also needs to be discussed if this is getting impacted and it'll impact somewhere or not.

And the recommendation which is given by triage committee, that send it to the council. I think we recommendation that it should go to the ccTLD [world] list, even those who are not members, because they might get also impacted.

And the second question also we agreed partly, and there's a large impact, so we are not agreeing with the low impact. It's a large impact, and here's the reason: because when the top-level domain LGRs are going to be decided, they're going to become a standard. Though LGRs are not applicable, [not] ccTLD IDNs, however, if the string gets invalidated because of that LGR, then browsers may adopt that standard and your string may not work. So we need to really be concerned with that. It may not be impacting directly, but it will impact indirectly. And the standards

---

are going to invalidate your top-level domain if you're [inaudible] IDN.

And I think the impact should be from low to high, low for ASCII strings and high for IDN strings. Is there anything else you want to add, Young?

YOUNG EUM LEE: No.

AJAY DATA: Thank you very much.

DAVID KOLB: Thank you. And are we ready for group three?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Okay, we have analyzed more or less the case two, and also a little bit of case three. Just [inaudible] the points, first of all, I think that the staff is doing a very good job in selecting things we have to do in each case of request if we do have to do anything. Maybe we have to do nothing. But we'll try to establish some criteria to help them to analyze if the impact is big or not in the CC community.

Of course, for example the review things, there are a lot of overlaps that are very bad for us. We don't have people to participate in all of them. But maybe some reviews are more important to us or they are not so important. Then it's different the impact this will have in our community.

Then we tried to establish some criteria that can be used to evaluate if the request has a low, medium or high impact in our community. For example, we think that the major criteria is, first of all, if the major impact, the stability and security of DNS, DNS is our major work. If impacts the credibility and legitimacy of ccNSO, ccTLDs and ICANN as a whole, then it's also very important, or if impacts the operational environment or viability for us or members, or even ICANN.

I suppose these three criteria, if each of them are really involved in the request, we have to have the request evaluated as a high impact on CC. And just to say, in the case of two, the second exercise, we agree the impact is [minimal] and we agree also with the recommended actions.

In the case three, there was some division here probably, maybe the impact is not so low. We're talking about IDNs, that is a lot of technical impacting some kind of implementation of IDNs. You have to follow strictly the procedures and the RFCs related to.

---

And maybe this impact could be raised from low to medium. But anyway, in basic lines, we are in agreement with the recommendations. Thank you.

DAVID KOLB: Thank you. Okay, last but certainly not least, group four.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: So, first of all, it was a great working group. Byron. Words fail. So, regarding IDNs, so we agree with the recommendation, to answer the questions, but we believe that there could have been something else, something extra, the extra mile that could have been done, more outreach and education, especially to IDN CCs.

And also, in terms of getting their feedback, how many of them have participated in the process, how many that have been proactive, how many that are aware of the impact that his policy is going to have on their daily operation.

So in terms of the impact on the CC community, we believe that it should be medium, and that's because it falls into policymaking. We always say that this community, the CC, are making their own policies. But sometimes, we fail to realize that when it comes to IDN CCs, ICANN is playing quite an important role.

---

And at some point before delegating an IDN CC at the top level, we're talking about top-level, ICANN is requesting the local operator to implement certain policies. And those policies are part of the variant management policies, but also policies to mitigate confusing similarity and much more. So this is really get into the local policy.

And that is why we believe that the level should be medium rather than low. And that's it, and I leave the floor to Byron for the second case we have examined. Thank you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND:

So the second case that we looked at was the one regarding IANA transition or the naming functions agreement, and the first question being, did we agree with the recommended actions? Followed by, what other actions would you suggest?

So our basic premise is, no, we didn't believe the specific recommendation here was appropriate in that it was not enough. And that led into our recommended other actions, which is, if you recall in the case study, the only action was to send information to a single list, the ccTLD World list.

So we recommended that it was sent to a much broader array of lists beyond just that, including the members list and a number of others, but also that we tap into all of our social channels and

---

have a broader outreach there as well as webinars and other forms of communication where we could try to ensure that we tapped the entire community as opposed to rely just on a single list, which was the recommendation here. So, much broader outreach.

For question number two, did we agree with the assessment of the impact, and what criteria did we use? No, we did not agree with the assessment of impact, which was middle, if you recall. And as we've heard in one of the previous presentations, we believe that due to sort of the existential nature of this issue, there are a few more important than this that it should be a high.

It's not just about the list, its about ensuring that all ccTLDs are aware of the importance and the issues behind the IANA functions contract. And the relevance of this function, to us, is critical. It strikes at the heart of what we do and who we are, and as a result, by which we determined it to be a high rather than a medium.

But it also did lead to questions of how do we actually define low, medium, high, and what are the criteria. This is a more visceral reaction as opposed to, "It fit within X to Y in a particularly well-defined criteria."

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

DAVID KOLB:

Thank you. Well done. We're moving right along. The other thing that we would add too when you think about the criteria is also what's the current workload, what else is being considered, what else is in the queue, if you will, and are there overlaps, and what are the gaps as you triage these scenarios? So would that have an impact on things? Yet another kind of a long view, short view, if you will.

It's time for a break, even though you've been up and about. What we'd like to do is give you about ten minutes, be back in at quarter until. We've got coffee, you know where the restrooms are, stretch your legs a bit, connect with the folks you want to connect with, and then we'll resume with some nice, healthy rejection.

I know it's Japan and I didn't do that right. Okay, have a seat. Let's get rejected. So I'll queue you up. So we're moving into a piece here. Let me click it to the next slide. And I just want you to know, this didn't come in your bags, we didn't have enough for everybody, but Bart's been so kind to fix a pocket guide to the rejection action process. so you can fit this in your pocket. I know it's upside-down. For those that are jetlagged, that might look right side up. But that way, it's just something you could – right, so Katrina made it, Bart had it printed out, but I call it the pocket guide because I think it just has that kind of portability to it.



---

So, Katrina, on that note, set us up.

KATRINA SATAKI: We have a [inaudible].

DAVID KOLB: [inaudible]. And we're going to have these around the table.

KATRINA SATAKI: It's a little bit too difficult to read from those seats over there, but Maria can see just fine, I'm sure. Okay, we're going to do this rejection action simulation. This time, I'm not going to participate myself as I thought it would be really unfair to ask poor David to read Annex D and our guideline to see what's in it.

So all the councilors, Pablo, would you please join us at the table? It's just temporary, because as soon as we have our roles distributed, we'll have to move and form different groups. Because the idea here is that the best way to learn something is to do, and do it proactively, which means that as soon as there's some action, we will literally do it.

For that, you see we have flipcharts there, we have placeholders for ccNSO website, everything that we need to publish. We have [a role account,] ccNSOpetitions.icann.org. This is the e-mail list that is supposed to be used if anyone from the community wants

---

to submit a petition. Then we have other DPs, ECA, decision of participants and empowered community administration, ICANN secretary, and then there are two mailing lists, ccTLD community mailing list and ccNSO council mailing list.

What we have here, we have these sticky things that can be used to stick messages to these flipcharts. Now, please all close your laptops. This is not going to be a laptop session. No need to have open laptops.

So, what we have, here is the picture I'm sure you've seen before many times. This is something that we showed to the community when we explained what it's all about. So here, the moment we receive notification from the board about something happening, it triggers the rejection action petition period. It's 21 days.

Then we have next period, during which we need – well, if we get a petition, if any decisional participant gets a petition, they have seven days to get support from other decisional participants. Then there's another period, a rejection action community forum period of 21 days, 21 days for rejection action decision period, and at the end, the empowered community has to inform the board, yes or no.

Those are seven core steps. The picture is called seven core steps, but as you can see, four major periods. And we're going to go through each of those periods and see what we do.

---

For that, we have ECA, I will play the role of the ECA. We have ccNSO secretariat, and yeah, I propose that ccNSO secretariat people play the role of the ccNSO secretariat. And then we have a rejection action petition manager, which is RAPM for short, deputy rejection action petition manager, and two rejection action petition committee members.

Together, all the four, they form this rejection action petition review committee. And I suggest that this review committee sitting here close to these two things and close to the very short intro to rejection actions.

Then we have the chair and the ccNSO council, they each play certain role, and then we'll have a community. We will draw some lots. I propose that those community members who sit on both sides, not at the table, they will be the community. But some councilors also will apparently be the community.

Then we have Barrack, who will be ALAC's liaison to the ccNSO, and he will act as a representative of ALAC who will be seeking our support for their petition, and we will apparently ask support from him too.

Yeah, I suggest that we distribute the roles. Dear secretariat, please move to that corner, as you will have to work hard too. Please move to that corner. Maria. Wait a minute. So how many are there? 17. Good.

---

Okay. So please don't get too much into details of a particular rejection action petition for example or don't view it too literally. We are here to test the process.

So, what is your role? Who are you?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Who is rejection action petition manager? Councilor. You? Okay. Lucky committee, they got you. [inaudible].

Okay, so all these people, rejection action petition review committee, which is rejection action petition manager, deputy rejection action petition manager, and two committee members, please move to this corner. Yeah, you don't have to sit at the table, you can just move the ... And I must tell you, you're really lucky guys. You got Annex D in your group.

Okay. Who is the chair of the ccNSO council? Good. You can stay there, but you'll have to move anyway. You'll have to get up and go – so if you mind coming closer to – sorry? I'm not the chair, no. I represent ECA and other decisional participants.

---

So, councilors, I suggest that you also come here together. Community members, please all move over to that part. Byron, who are you?

BYRON HOLLAND: Community.

KATRINA SATAKI: Community. Okay, you sit with the community then. Influence their decision.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How many councilors?

KATRINA SATAKI: It doesn't matter how many. Okay. Ready, steady – councilors here, community is there. Eating already, enjoying chocolate? Typical community. Absolutely. Liaison is ready. Okay. Are you ready? Good.

Let's move forward then. So one day, we receive a notice – community, behave.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's not what the community does.

KATRINA SATAKI:

That is true. But anyway, at least try. Okay, so we receive a petition. The contents of the petition is really irrelevant now, but – sorry, it’s not a petition, it’s a board notice in which they tell us that, okay, we have accepted something that according to the bylaws calls for rejection actions. So it comes to us, to all DPs. So all DPs receive this.

No, it’s not about the budget, it’s about definition of ccTLDs, okay? Don’t go into the details of this particular piece. The decision was that they want to change the standard bylaws definition of ccTLDs. Okay?

So, what happens next? It means that this triggers day one of the rejection action petition period, so rejection action petition period starts, and that is this period you see here.

During this period, as you can see here on the timeline – maybe not all can see – we have actually three very important periods here. Within the first ten days, ccTLD community can submit their petitions. They can provide feedback on the received petition by the 15th day, and then no later than on the 20th day, ccNSO council must take a decision whether to move forward with that petition or not.

---

What happens? We need to publish it on the ccNSO website, secretariat website. Please, do you mind to shut up? The chair, inform the ccTLD community. It's behind you. Mailing list. Stick it to the mailing list. Secretariat, you have to set time for the call. We have it here. So it's time for the call, and it can't be later than 20th day.

Don't read the exact notice, it really doesn't matter at the moment. So our community has time to think, look into it, and decide whether they want to submit a petition. Dear community.

And at some point, one of our community members, any community member, please submit a petition to the role account. Dear community, you have only ten days to do that, so please be really quick.

So they submit a petition. What happens? Rejection action petition manager. Good. Where are all the copies? Thank you very much. Okay, so dear rejection action petition manager, you have to inform the community, the chair and the council. So I'd suggest that – no, send it to mailing list so you're not going to call him anyway. I believe that the chair list council mailing list, so there's really no need for ...

Yeah, but chair reads council mailing list. I don't think we need to send it separate. It's fine, yes.

---

And now our dear rejection action petition review committee needs to evaluate the petition. How we do that? First, we have to see if the petitioner matches the criteria. It has to be either a ccTLD manager, must be an individual who directly related to a ccTLD manager. Must be a ccNSO working group or community mandated to submit such a petition, regional ccTLDs organizations or the ccNSO council.

So, please look at the petition and see if it matches the criteria. And you can use the – where’s the other? Please use the mic so that you look at the petition and ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We’re looking at the petition.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, well, I will post it back here. So the idea here is that the Petitioner is objecting to the proposed change, and the rationale is that the results of this part of the IDN ccTLD PDP should be updated to include a section on voting rights.

So again, the idea here is that sometimes if a ccTLD is run by the same entity, they get two votes, or three, or five votes if they run several ccTLDs. For IDN ccTLDs, we made it clear that if several IDN ccTLDs are run by the same entity, they get only one vote.



---

So here is clearly what the Petitioner's pointing to the fact that, probably not good to have this distinction between IDN ccTLDs and traditional ASCII ccTLDs. That is the essence.

Now, let's go back to the criteria. First, vetting. Does the petitioner match the criteria?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We don't know.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, because as you can see here, it's Burt Bacchanal, policy director. So we have no idea.

But it's the day seven into the rejection action petition period. According to our guideline, what we can do is to send it back to the Petitioner and ask to correct the petition and resubmit it but still within ten days. Okay?

So we ask the petitioner to resubmit it. Okay, I'll do it on behalf of the community. So here it is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, we have a new one.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: This is a corrected one. We have Burt, policy director, dot-EN ccTLD manager.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So this is the new Swaziland ccTLD, isn't it? EN, right?

KATRINA SATAKI: But that is irrelevant.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So that land now fits the criteria, okay?

KATRINA SATAKI: So it matches the criteria. Okay, good. Next one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Council won't be informed about –]

KATRINA SATAKI: Not yet. Wait. Next, they still review it, that's why we have this review committee. They first vet and review all the incoming petitions. It's like with triage committee, right? They first review.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Okay, so when it’s resubmitted, you do not have to redistribute – ]

KATRINA SATAKI: Wait a minute. We don’t have time for that. He submitted first time on the seventh day.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] as chair.

KATRINA SATAKI: That wasn’t funny. Okay, does the petition match the criteria? So name and affiliation of the Petitioner. That, we have. We need, if this is a ccNSO-mandated group, reference to its mandate. But this is clearly an individual, this is not a community-related group.

Rationale. There is some, and here is the part from the bylaws, and it’s also included in our guideline. So, what needs to be evaluated if we talk about the standard bylaws amendment? What needs to be in the petition? This is a specific thing that needs to be in the petition. I can suggest that it’s fine, so you can say that it’s fine.

JORDAN CARTER: It’s fine.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. So the petition matches the criteria.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [You're doing great.]

JORDAN CARTER: Did that look scripted?

KATRINA SATAKI: Now that the committee has evaluated the petition, next step, rejection action petition manager informs the council and the secretariat. Yes, exactly. Now the chair is very happy, I'm sure.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, yes.

JORDAN CARTER: Right, there we go.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

---

KATRINA SATAKI:

And to this secretariat. Yeah, good that he has long legs. And so, what does the secretariat – secretariat publishes the petition and certification, which was provided together with the petition. Okay, so far so good.

Another thing that secretariat needs to do is to send notice to the community, but you've used all the copies, right? Oh, there is one. No, community is there. Yes, community now is informed. And with that, well, we run out of the first ten days, so we cannot expect any other petition. Even if somebody submits, sorry, it's too late.

So, what we need to do after day ten? Secretariat needs to publish all the petitions that did not meet criteria. And here is one thing that probably not entirely clear about in our guideline, because this is not covered.

We have had petition, it did not meet the criteria at first, we asked the petitioner to correct and resubmit, but we kind of theoretically still have a petition that did not meet a criteria. But the right one is already published. Do we really need to publish something that had been resubmitted within the allocated time frame? So, what do you think? Is there a need to point out that Burt did not indicate his affiliation? Yes, I would agree with rejection action review committee member, annex D, that no, there's no need for that.

---

Now, the community may provide feedback. Any feedback from the community? They're sleeping, it's unbelievable. So, any feedback from the community?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I disagree.

KATRINA SATAKI: You disagree with the petition? Okay, one ccTLD disagrees with the petition. Dear rejection action petition manager, summarize all the comments and inform the council.

JORDAN CARTER: It's hit the session after lunch, we had no feedback apart from one person disagreeing. And so I've put it on the council list. Do I send that message to the council list or something?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, well, I don't have a specific message for that so it's fine. Okay. Good. Which means that no later than on the 20th day of the rejection action petition period, the ccNSO council needs to decide –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Finally.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Do you accept or reject the rejection action petition? Let me suggest, you have to accept it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Let me check [our number count] first. [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: You are supposed to act in the best interest of all ccTLDs, IDN ccTLDs or ASCII ccTLDs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: According to the script, we have to accept it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, you have to accept. Hooray. Great. With that, what you have to consider, by the way, you have to consider the feedback, views and input received, and that's only one unhappy, probably always unhappy member of the community.

---

The importance of the matter for the ccTLD community and other factors deemed relevant by the ccNSO council. So any factors you would like to drop in? No?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: As council?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, the council.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Absolutely, yes. Please, Peter.

PETER VERGOTE: I think as councilor, I would like to understand why [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, but you don't have much time for that. You can send a letter asking for that, but at this point, you have to take a decision. You can move forward with it, seeing no objection from others, but yes, on later stages, you still can get more feedback.



---

And you also have to decide whether to request ICANN to hold a public conference call prior to the rejection action community forum and whether to request a rejection action community forum.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We want that in Bali.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. In Bali. Fine. So we have accepted the petition. What we need to do is we need to inform ECA. Well, I am informed. Other DPs, and ICANN – Stephen, please put that away. And ICANN secretary. You can just do it. ICANN secretary, put it in the middle. We don't have so many correspondences.

JORDAN CARTER: [Not very digital, is it?]

KATRINA SATAKI: Another thing, secretariat needs to publish council decision, just stick something, take this one. Don't have enough papers of everything. So we publish council decision.

With that, we move into seven days of rejection action petition support period. We need support from at least one Barrack. No, wait a minute, not yet. We look at you, we talk to you. So, rejection

---

action petition manager, please reach out to other DPs, Barrack, and ask him to support.

JORDAN CARTER: Please support. Do you want to do it more theatrically? Please support.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Good. Secretariat, post all correspondence on the websites. And here, we learn that another DP, Barrack, has a petition.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] petition?

KATRINA SATAKI: No, it's another petition on the same standard bylaw change, and here, on behalf of ALAC, [inaudible] BG, submits – yeah, you should talk to the rejection action petition manager, actually. You submit all papers. Please submit all papers he will need, all of them.

Yeah, so they see that, again, they refer back to the PDP undertaken by the ccNSO, and note that since 2013, these proposed changes did not go through a proper public comment period anymore, and in addition, the outcome results, again, is an

---

unnecessary distinction between ASCII and IDN ccTLD, which may affect end users whose interests we represent. So ALAC also opposes the same definition.

So we learned that. Our rejection action petition manager needs to inform the council and the community about this new rejection action petition. And here, please note that we do not need to see if this petition from another decisional participant matches any criteria, because this is something that has to be done by the empowered community administration. So here, clearly, empowered community administration has already said that, yes, this petition matches all the criteria we have in the bylaws that Stephen is trying to read now.

The chair, wake up. You have to set a council meeting. And we have only seven days, so please tell the councilors you can use the pen and write, “We have to meet day six,” for example. Okay. And ccNSO secretariat needs to post the request to submit the petition of ALAC on the website.

Okay, but this was the first day of our second period. And from day one to day five, we can ask the community to provide feedback on the petition from another decisional participant. So, dear community, what do you think now about this new petition? Should we support it?

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Think about what happened to the [inaudible] said no. [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: You don't have to provide feedback, but if you have anything to – and meanwhile, on day five, we learn that ALAC supports our petition. Please inform our rejection action petition manager, we support your petition.

Thank you very much, ALAC. From this point forward, it's not called rejection action petition anymore, it's called rejection action supported petition. Yeah, there is a subtle difference. And it's not ccNSO or something's petition, it is already supported.

We have to inform the council and the community rejection action petition manager.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [The petition can be supported by any SO/AC?]

---

KATRINA SATAKI: No, decisional participant. So if you look at this piece of paper here, empowered community, we have three SOs and two ACs. Three SOs, ASO, ccNSO, GNSO, ALAC, GAC. So those are decisional participants. Any DP, yes. We need this one support to move forward to the next step.

And of course, formal rejection action petition manager needs to formally submit the rejection action supported petition to ECA, other DPs and ICANN secretary. It's fine, yeah.

And now, on day six, chair set the call for council. The ccNSO council must take a decision. Do we support the petition submitted by another decisional participant? Wait a minute, I have to check what I have here. Okay. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]?

KATRINA SATAKI: No, it's really your decision, because they were so nice they supported ours. Okay, we support. Good. With that, our rejection action petition manger informs the ECA, DPs and ICANN secretary that, yes, we support this petition from another decisional participant.

---

Secretariat will publish the decision to support rejection action petition. Just write something on the website. And with that, we move into the next phase, which is rejection action community forum period.

During that time, we have this community forum period in Bali, so we have fun, this community forum.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is that Bali?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, it is. So the chair needs to set a date for the decision, and it has to be no later than on 14th day, because this is the moment when – yeah, okay. You have to set the date for decision. According to our guideline, no later than on the 14th day, please inform the council. There is a call.

And he already deleted something from the mailbox, which is good, because it was a friendly reminder perhaps. Yeah.

And on this day during this call, the ccNSO council may elect or rescind support. So from all you heard during community forum on Bali, if you really attended the forum instead of enjoying yourselves on the beach.

---

So now is the time when you can decide that, okay, we do not want to proceed with our petition. You proceed.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We love to move forward.

KATRINA SATAKI: You love to move forward. Okay. I think in this case, if we decided we don't want to move forward, we would publish it on the ccNSO website. We decided to move forward. Again, we published it on the – probably, we should publish it either way. Why? Because now we have seven days during which the community may veto the decision. For example, council decides that they don't want to proceed with the petition, either of the petition positions, and the community could veto that. 10%, not 1%.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: No. Okay, we can decide that we do not support ALAC's petition, right?

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: No, not to move forward.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [But she says, no, that's a bad idea.]

KATRINA SATAKI: That's a bad idea.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Okay. [Very fine.] We're moving to the next step. So rejection action decision period. And here, during this period, we need to learn. This is what Peter was worried about. This is the time when we can really listen to everything, all the feedback we have from the community. So, dear community, anything you'd like to say?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [I'm confused.]



---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Community is confused.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Why? It's such a linear process.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: You did not veto the decision, that's why we're moving forward.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. So I can still [inaudible]?

KATRINA SATAKI: No. And this is the time when you can provide feedback, because council will need this feedback. They're going to discuss – no, it's not a valid feedback. Not an argument. Why?

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Why? Because it was a very bad decision in the first place. We should have listened to the IDNs more.

KATRINA SATAKI: Now, wait a minute. Did you read the petition?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, for them to have a vote. Not really, because you said that's not important.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's not what I said.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [I'm sorry, that's what I understood.]

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Yes, it's a really tough process, isn't it? The petition said the proposed change is bad because it means that IDN ccTLDs and ASCII ccTLDs do not have the same rights. And that is why the petitioner thought that we must have the same rights for IDN ccTLDs and ascii ccTLDs. That's why this change is bad, and that's why the ccNSO council decided to move forward.

---

And now we need your feedback. Do you agree that IDN ccTLDs and ASCII ccTLDs have the same approach? So, should we still reject the proposed change in the bylaws?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What?

KATRINA SATAKI: Oh, they are better informed. They have thought about it. But now I'm looking to the community, because council wanted to hear from the community. So, what do you think?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. They think that IDNs should have more rights.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: [We really appreciate to hear from you. That's it.]

---

KATRINA SATAKI: So now the ccNSO council needs to decide, do we support, object or abstain?

AJAY DATA: [inaudible] a question [inaudible] everyone may be on the same page. The petition is to [inaudible]?

KATRINA SATAKI: To have the same rights, yes. No, it says reject the definition because current definition does not give the same rights. Yes. At the end, it means that we are against the fact that IDN ccTLDs do not have the same rights.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: So, your decision.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Support.]

KATRINA SATAKI: The council supports, and it's during the first 14 days they have to support. And this decision needs to be published on the website

---

to inform the community. Please, secretariat, publish the decision.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, sure. Secretariat wants to ask a question.

BART BOSWINKEL: May I ask a question to the secretariat? Why do you take a substantial decision? Because this is about process. And if you would take a substantial decision on a rejection action at this stage of the process, your decision, given the time frames, members cannot get back to you on this particular decision. This is just a process step and you need to take a role. At the end of the game, you may take a very substantial decision which is subject to members' votes. That's the real issue in these time frames.

So my question is, why did you take a substantial argument? You just check what is going on, does it meet the criteria? So that's more due diligence checks, that's the way the guideline was designed at the time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

---

BART BOSWINKEL: I'm just asking. To the council, yeah. At this stage of the process, you just want to make sure that everything meets the criteria and you can go into the next phase.

KATRINA SATAKI: The last phase.

BART BOSWINKEL: No, the –

KATRINA SATAKI: We are in the last phase.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We are in the last phase?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, this is the last phase.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] and we heard the community.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Community forum?

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Rejection action decision period. We already had our decision.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, exactly. We're in the last phase [inaudible].

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, I missed our community forum.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, you were reading ICANN bylaws. That's a problem. Okay, so this is the final one. This is the final stage, final decision. This is the last one. It's not about saying, "Okay, we decided to step back and not proceed with a petition here." We take the final decision. Yes or no?

AJAY DATA: [inaudible].

---

KATRINA SATAKI: No, we can abstain, we can decide not to, but it is one of the options. That was the question. But the council decided to support.

AJAY DATA: That's fine. My understanding was [inaudible] abstain [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: We abstain, it means – well, for a rejection action to actually take effect, three decisional participants need to reject that particular piece. In this case, three need to reject the proposed change in the standard bylaws. If we abstain, it means that one of the decisional participants does not have a stance on this. That's all. But if three of the other four support –

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible] abstain allows that the – I think maybe you know, Jordan, it's three may support, that is the minimum, but if two object, then it still doesn't fly. If one abstains and one objects, then it can go through, because that's why abstention was included. So it's explicit to abstain, but it does have an impact. But it's not as big as if you object.



---

KATRINA SATAKI: It means that, okay, apparently it does not matter for – okay, it does, but we cannot take any decision because there's probably not enough support from the community. And now during the last, final seven days of the rejection action decision period, the community can veto the decision of the council to move forward to support the petition.

So, we have seven days. Community, close your laptops and tell us, what do you think? I see one very concerned community member wants to say something. Okay, no feedback. Seven days passed and 10% did not veto the decision.

Yeah, it means that our rejection action petition manager informs the ECA, DPs, ICANN secretary. Thank you very much. Rejection action petition manager, inform the ECA. I know it already. DPAs, ICANN secretary. Yes, everything goes, all this correspondence goes to ICANN secretary. And actually, all this needs to be also published on the website.

AJAY DATA: [inaudible]?

KATRINA SATAKI: No, when we talk about ccTLD community, we talk about all, because you don't have to be a member to – yeah, we listen to all

---

– ccTLD community, because IDNs currently are not allowed to be ccNSO members. doesn't mean that we're not listening to them.

With that, I'd say that we have successfully completed the process, so congratulations. Thank you very much to all involved. Apparently, Stephen wants to say something. Yes, please, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

I'm technically challenged. Katrina, you were spot on with this entire process. I have a couple comments, however. One is with the caveat with regards to being spot on is that overall, this process is weighted very heavily in favor of ICANN Org, ICANN board prevailing over the community in a rejection action process.

There is a further requirement which Katrina did not touch upon, which is that every piece of correspondence between decisional participants, and that is every e-mail, every cover letter expressing support, whatever, has to be sent both to the ECA and the corporate secretary, and if it comes to pass that one of these pieces of paper is missing, it disqualifies the process.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you very much. So, are there any other comments, questions? So, was it helpful to go through the process? Yes, please, community member.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We're in the comment and question period now?

KATRINA SATAKI: No, everything's done.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I actually have a few comments. I think it was definitely worthwhile doing this, because I think it really highlighted that those of us who are probably closest to this issue vis a vis the broad community – and I would say that to a great degree – well, I'll just comment from my own perspective that I was definitely not clear on all the steps and all the timing, and how they would work. And if that's true in this group, imagine what it's going to be like in the general membership, and I think that we need to take it upon ourselves to somehow better educate the broad community.

To that end, I think the one-pager that's up here that you refer to, I don't know if anybody opened it from their e-mails, but it is actually one page. It's like a bottomless scroll.

---

I think there's a couple things we should do to improve that. One is having the running timeline down the side to see, understand where you are, but probably more importantly, we need to develop a [per] chart that clearly identifies the timelines and the actors by role and by name in a given cycle, given council cycle that's published so everybody can see it very clearly. So a [per] chart, a process flow of all of these steps, which is to a great degree on this one pager, but like I said, identified by role, by name, and running timeline. Just one note, the first step, the rejection action notice is 21 days, but if you total up our days, it's 22 days, because it's ten, five and seven.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. This one is corrected one. Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

KATRINA SATAKI: As I started putting everything into slides, I realize that there was a mistake. We have a newer version, corrected one. Sorry for that. I was just adding things.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, that’s fine. If it’s corrected, great. It’s just something I noticed that the dates didn't line up.

The other thing that I think we need to consider – and this was a good example, this was almost framed in a negative. So even as a native English speaker, I had to read it several times to really understand what was being asked, and I think that came out in some of the questioning there. What are we actually asking?

And in part, it was because it was framed as a negative.

KATRINA SATAKI: Are you talking about the petition, or questions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, the petition, and I'm just saying for our own ease of use, we need to make the questions very clear.

KATRINA SATAKI: But the petition is whatever comes from the community, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Which maybe means we need almost a translation of it, because all I'm saying is as a native English speaker, I read it and I'm like, “What are you trying to get at here?” And we heard it come out on the other side, “What are we asking here?”

---

So I'm making comments, and hopefully constructive suggestions, how do we make it easier [first off?]

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, thank you. We actually wanted to make, at some point, the guidelines review committee, we wanted to create a template for a petition so that it would be really easy for community members who want to submit a petition to fill it in with all the necessary fields and everything. We're not there yet, this is something that we need to do. And yeah, thank you, the point taken there, we'll note it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I think this is a very helpful exercise, because I think it highlights how complicated it is. Who came up with this? But How complicated it is, and to Stephen's point, if you miss anything along the way, the whole thing can be invalidated. And that's why back to the [per] chart of the process flow, roles, dates, actions, that it's incredibly crisp and clear on what we need to deliver so we don't run afoul of strictly a procedural miss.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Alejandra?

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. So, [inaudible] this one really quickly, but I know there's not enough time also in the process, 21 days, it's not too much. I really liked the exercise. Now I need to go over it a couple more times just to be sure. And I agree with Byron regarding the language, because I misunderstood the petition because, do we approve to reject to not – to what? And that's something that –

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. But again, I asked you not to concentrate on the petition as such.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, I know, but since it's a rejection, that's the negative on itself.

KATRINA SATAKI: It is.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So this should be –

KATRINA SATAKI: So the idea is that, "I reject, and why I reject." So it is a rejection petition. And you cannot reject in a positive way.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So we are approving and making a rejection. It's confusing in the brain, but okay.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Margarita, and then Ajay and then Pablo.

MARGARITA VALDES: When I was listening about the process and the short-term and all the terms that are in-between, and if it's closed, it's like [inaudible] system. It's open and close and open and close.

One suggestion could be to have a kind of software that could follow this process, because in my system, in the case of [Chile,] we have a kind of system that tracks the terms and shows you alerts or something that is telling you, yeah, you have three days until the end of this term and we'll open the following –

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, I understand that. I'm trying to get a ticketing system from ICANN. And believe me, it's not an easy thing, unfortunately. I hope that one day, we'll get a ticketing system, but it takes –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].



---

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, it would be, absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [It definitely just is] hard to manage. [inaudible] plenty of these situations that maybe –

KATRINA SATAKI: Exactly, it's not that we're facing it every day. And that's actually also a problem. If we do it every day, we would get used to that. But if we do it every five years, it might just really – Ajay.

AJAY DATA: Thank you, Katrina. This was wonderful, actually. And I'm just taking her comment [further, this is what I wanted to speak,] I think we don't need to reinvent the wheel. There are many top-class, world-class project management platforms available online. We just need to [inaudible] they have the automatic alerts, automatic time management and automatic reminders to everybody, we just use them. And if somebody require [inaudible].

And one question: when we started in the beginning, you said that ten days is the petitioning time.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes.

---

AJAY DATA: And you also raised the point where somebody we did not agree with, and we asked for resubmission, and if the guy resubmits within ten days, then what right somebody has to not consider that petition?

KATRINA SATAKI: Sorry, I didn't get he question.

AJAY DATA: Because you said they resubmitted but you did not reconsider the petition to be published. This is what you said.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [The ten days were over.]

AJAY DATA: No, within ten days. [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: No, we got a petition, it was flawed, it was sent back, and it was resubmitted. According to our guideline, after the end of these first ten days, we have to publish all the petitions that did not meet criteria. So with that, they did not move forward.

---

What we discussed here, should we publish this petition? Because it was resubmitted and so we finally accepted it, but do we really have to publish the one which was just plain wrong and it was resubmitted? And the decision was, no, we don't need to publish it because it's moving forward.

AJAY DATA: So now it became clear. You published the correct one, you did not publish the wrong one.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. In this case, yes.

AJAY DATA: Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Well, I want to say Kudos to you and to the rest of the team. This is an excellent exercise, extremely helpful. I would like to do more of that. And how much more – I would like to know, the entire process takes, what, like 80-something days?

---

KATRINA SATAKI: The entire process is 70 days. Well, the full process.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Because I saw like three [inaudible] of 21 days, plus some seven days in-between.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Together, it makes 70 days. It could take longer with us if there's community forum during face-to-face meeting. Giovanni, and then [Nick.] Giovanni, and then Young Eum.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Katrina. I believe it was indeed an interesting exercise. I think we all agree on the complexity of the whole process. I don't know if intentionally or unintentionally it's so complicated. Byron highlighted that it's difficult even for somebody who owns the language to follow properly. I believe it should be our duty to try to make it more accessible, especially because there is a large part of the process that is in the hands of the community.

And it's something that we should try to do, like outreach or whatever to make these more digestible, because at present, it's really hard. And I wonder how many of us had this in mind before the exercise and how many of our community have this in mind.

And if we go in a ccNSO room in two days and we ask how many, excluding those with this script, and we get five, that to me would be a major success. I don't think we have five people in our ccNSO community, members or nonmembers, who are into that, at least not in that, but just the basics. But there should be an effort at our level, eventually even ICANN, to make this more accessible. Also from the language perspective, also from the process perspective.

And I believe it's foreseen that in some years, there is a review to see how to simplify the process. Sort of.

BART BOSWINKEL:

This is already a translation from – which is probably even worse, that is Annex D. If you look at Annex D – and I don't think that will be reviewed. And you touch upon a very interesting point, say, that the ccNSO community is not very aware of what's going on. It's even worse in other communities. And that's the really scary part of it. This goes back to one of – I don't know who said it this morning about the accountability and what's going on.

Say, this group, thanks to especially Stephan and Katrina, is very aware of what it's doing. Other parts of the ICANN community are not aware. They have no clue what will hit them if it really matters. And that's why I think Katrina said you wanted something out of the budget.

---

This is getting worse if you go into the budget issue. And that's where you really want to have this power, because then everything is, again, squeezed in a tighter time frame.

KATRINA SATAKI: And, well, going back to the outreach, we presented this, I don't know how many times, to the community. And community even – well, this is what we have here. It's the result of community, [inaudible] green, red and other –

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I'm not questioning how many times it was presented. I'm just suggesting that we should present it in a way that we should ask ourselves, what could we do differently to present it in another way, to make it closer to people? And eventually even skipping some steps because you got in details, but at least having as a target, let's say, "I would like the community to know the first five steps, what I believe are the first three key steps." And now that is already an advanced course, just like business level.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, this is the simplest you can get. Sorry to tell you that. If you see what we can make simpler from this, I'll be happy to implement it. I have to advertise, it's done by Infogram. It's [a

---

tool,] and if you want this tool, I know sales guy who can present this to you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

With all respect, and I think it's a great work, but if you go to a communication agency and ask them – you brief them and you tell them what are the three key points you want to pass on as a message, and then you have something like that which is [A4 page, not all the map,] and that, I think, should be our target for the future, to have at least our community aware of the three main points we want them to be aware. And then the rest, we'll leave it to lawyers, we'll leave it to secretariat and so on.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Well, I'm afraid that even basic understanding of what is the difference between rejection action and approval action, it's already a challenge. You go ask any community member, what is the difference, and I'm afraid most of them cannot tell that. Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Thank you. I echo all the points about this process. I've had a lot of experience of finance and pharmaceutical regulation and company takeovers and regulated stock exchanges, and this is a very extreme end of complexity. Really is. And I very much

---

sympathize with anybody who's not a 20-year qualified corporate lawyer trying to understand what the hell's going on.

And I think I understand it now, it was a really useful exercise. Don't ask me tomorrow if I'll still remember, if I understand it, because it doesn't lend itself, it's not an intuitive process, right? It's very complicated.

And I suppose the thing I really wanted to say is that, look, in reality, if we wanted to flex our muscles as an empowered community and to actually in anger reject an ICANN decision on a budget or some other question, I just wanted to get your perspectives on – because this roleplay, it was quite a sort of passive, “the council does this, the council waits for this.”

In reality, the council is part of the community. In reality, we would expect, I think, the council leadership to say, “Hey, guys, there's a real problem with this thing. We need to motivate, we need to coordinate with the other ACs, because obviously, on our own, we can do nothing. We're just one of the decisional participants.”

So I was trying to work out in practice if there was a serious issue with ICANN governance, because this is ultimately the fundamental governance backstop, how would you see that working? And that's, for me, a more interesting point, because



---

that would be, I think in reality, you would have to have a much better liaison with the GNSO and other people to get this –

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, of course, but we couldn't squeeze everything into – Young Eum.

YOUNG EUM LEE: Thank you. I basically agree with everything that Byron, Nick and Giovanni said. And actually, my comment follows what Nick has just said, because this exercise, although it was process-oriented, really highlighted the fact that a member can submit a petition to reject, and it really highlighted the role that Nick emphasized of the council to really understand what's going on, and in that short time, discuss and try to lead the community. So this time, it was just very passive, but passing it is not the ultimate motive. It's getting it right.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: And the reason that we built these processes was to provide a counterweight to the ICANN board and organization, to hold it to account. It's part of the accountability framework. And so it is the

---

job of the ccNSO and the other decisional participants to keep an eye on things and to lead these responses.

So I think one thing that would be super good idea, if it isn't already happening, would be for the five decisional participant chairs and the five representatives on the ECA would get together and run some kind of a scenario like this, because what it's actually going to need is people like you, Katrina, on the phone or on the Skype talking to the others. As soon as one of these comes out, that's the only reason we accepted these ridiculous time frames, because we knew that there would be the informal dialog going on alongside.

So I'm interested in the idea of whether you've thought about or whether you've already done a discussion that doesn't have ICANN staff in the room, doesn't have ICANN directors in the room, just the leaders of the five decisional participants and the people responsible for operating this, whether you guys have done some work together to sort of stress test and work out how you'd really do it.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah. Well, first, to your point, in the guideline, you can see that – it even says in the guideline that before actually the start of this rejection action process, we clearly will have indications from our

---

community that petition is coming. It's highly unlikely that any petition would come as a total surprise.

But for the sake of the exercise, we didn't do that. Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND:

My comments are just on process. I thought the exercise was really helpful to highlight a number of the challenges with process and logistics, and actually, my first point really I think is similar to Jordan's, is that you and the other chairs, the other decisional participants really need to think about the politics and process of how you work with the other DPs, and doing something like this with them would probably be very valuable, so you're not all starting from a dead stop, should something happen.

Even though I take your point that if there's an issue big enough to trigger this, chances are you have a feel for it already, nevertheless, going through the scenarios is a good idea.

The other thing is anytime you have one of these state changes – and there are many state changes in this 70-day process – that's a hurdle, that's a place where we can trip and fall on our face. So identifying clearly who's responsible and who's accountable for the process, start to finish, and when somebody signs up to be the manager here – I'm sorry, I forgot the acronym, but the decisional EC –

---

KATRINA SATAKI: [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, that person, when they sign up on that template in the back of the room to be that person, do they really understand what they're getting themselves into? And are they the ones being held to account? If our whole community is going through this to say no to ICANN and they miss a step and don't submit a notice to some party and the whole thing falls flat because that person missed a step by accident, do they really understand what they're signing up for? And are there the appropriate checks, balances, support to help that person get through the process?

So who's responsible start to finish? Who's accountable start to finish? And do we ensure that that person who signed up as a volunteer has a support to do what they need to do? Because there's a lot of places to trip and fall in this 70-day process, and many state changes.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. And let me assure you, we're working with other DPs, but it's very difficult. [Was it in] January that they sent an e-mail to other chairs, members on the ECA with some suggestions how we can improve the process, how we can – for example a simple

---

thing, notice that we receive from the ICANN secretary about this that triggers the entire process, we really believe – and I think that Stephen definitely agrees with me, I'd hope so – this notice should have all these dates spelled out for the community, not that each community has to calculate all those periods, 21 days, seven days, 21 days. It has to be in that thing, it has to be calculated. Then we have Stephen who will definitely, I'm sure, check if they do the correct thing. But yeah, simple things.

We also believe that – well, I believe, definitely – that these rejection actions, they have to be numbered. Now they come just ... and then sometimes, first time when I received these, first they're sent directly to me. I can miss something like this. And then the person who sent it, it didn't come from ICANN secretary, it came from first name last name, employee I never heard of. So there are things that can be improved, that have to be improved, and we're working with other members on the ECA. But so far, I know that ALAC wants Stephen to give a presentation and explain – but we haven't received feedback on the proposal that we sent. I don't know, what else can we do?

So, sorry, somebody else wanted to – yeah, Peter.

PETER VERGOTE:

Thanks, Katrina. I agree with what previous speakers said about the importance of this exercise and how useful it is and what

significant importance might be for our members. But it brings me with a practical question. I have a feeling like that we are trying to [reconcile] water and fire. How are we going to make our members more aware of this process and its importance? But at the same time, it's so heavy that if you try to make, for instance, presentations about it, you have a very high probability that you lose more than half of your members' attention before you're even six slides far in your presentation?

What I would try to suggest, if it's feasible, is to do a comparable exercise during, of course, not the next couple of days, but at a future ICANN meeting, during a full ccNSO, two memberships day meeting, but to have it linked with something that is very easy to grasp for our memberships. Take the ICANN budget and take for instance that they would demand a higher contribution of ccTLDs. That's practical enough to keep everybody focused. And if you could work out a scenario with that in mind that actually shows all the steps, now we have this redaction petition, we have support from the ALAC, we have a decision from the council, etc., it might work to try to feed the process and at the same time keeps everybody's attention, because when we're talking about contributions, I'm sure that we all are more than just a bit focused on that. Thanks.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Thank you. There are many suggestions on what could be done. Now we need people doing it. So, there is this stable. Please go and don't be shy. Sign up for those roles, and thank you very much for taking part in this exercise.

Unfortunately, David had to leave, but he sends his regards to everyone and thanks you for your hard work and dedication. Thank you very much. With that, we finish our workshop.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Katrina.

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible] next part.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, next part is lunch, and after lunch, we have –

BART BOSWINKEL: Oh, during lunch, we have this room, it's the council prep session as usual. We have the slides [inaudible] so you can read it.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**