

---

ICANN75 | AGM – Joint Session: ICANN Board and ccNSO  
Wednesday, September 12, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:00 KUL

**SPEAKER:** Good morning everybody, welcome to the early morning meeting between the Board and the GNSO. Always a pleasure to meet with the different constituencies and ccNSO, also in special ccNSO's, so much representation of the wealth of diversity around the world. In serving the CC's in their own country and learning from that is something ICANN can benefit from and is benefiting from all of the time. So thank you for being here and for moderating this session we will have Patricio Poblete, who has been elected by the ccNSO to join the ICANN Board as one of our colleagues. So with that, Patricio please.

**PATRICIO POBLETE:** Thank you very much, Maarten and good morning everyone, or good time of the day wherever you are in the world participating in this session. I had the pleasure to be with my colleagues from the ccNSO last night at the ccNSO barbecue, it was a great party, and perhaps it was too great because I see many of my colleagues still have not shown up this morning. Okay, this is a very good location to meet and exchange views and from our point of view and the Board to listen to what you have to say about all matters

---

**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.*

---

of common interest. This time the full board is meeting with the ccNSO community, and we have a set of questions that I understand you have been working on, so without further ado I will pass this on to Alejandra, our chair of the ccNSO Council.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Patricio, and thank you very much Maarten for the welcome, it's a pleasure for us to be here with you today. Actually, it is the first time that the ccNSO Council is meeting with the board in person after the pandemic, so this is a very nice change to see you face-to-face and not on a screen all the time. At least half of the face. It is so good to be here. Well, what we are going to do today is address the questions from the board in a very detailed manner. We want to explore all the topics that are surrounding these questions. It is up there, thank you very much. The question is what collaborative actions should the community board [inaudible] be undertaking to further progress achieving our strategic priorities. So, what we were preparing for this meeting, we found two main topics that we would like to address. One of them is prioritization. And to start with that, we would like to tell you how we are doing things different now in the ccNSO, because we believe answering this question is a way of how to make the work more efficient, and better. And since we have been doing some work internally ourselves, we want to share that

---

with you. And for that may I ask Irina to tell the board what we are doing on the Triage Committee, please.

IRINA DANIELIA:

Thank you Alejandra, my name is Irina Danelia, good morning, everyone. It is nice to be here. As Alejandra just mentioned, I am going to speak on how we do prioritization within ccNSO Council. So as any part of the ICANN community, we feel we have quite a lot in common tasks and activities and it is really challenging to do everything in one time. So [inaudible] somehow to prioritize that. And to be able to do that, we realize that we first need to be quite clear on our strategy. And what we as ccNSO consider to be most important things for us. So, we developed a strategy on one page which is a really short page document. It is quite clear. It identifies three main goals for us. And the first goal is evolve the global policy that serves ccTLDs in the ICANN environment consistent with the ccNSO values and the need for ccTLDs, and the expected outcome for these goals is clearly that we have policies that are suitable for the needs of ccTLDs. And the second goal I identified is support the growth and development of the ccTLDs around the world through the exchange of information and ideas and building a strong relationship. So, to serve the platform for engagement and information exchange, and the expected outcome is that the ccTLDs experience is a positive

---

force and helps their evolution and development. And the third goal for us is to contribute to ICANN's broader work on its core mission and responsibility to advance ccTLD perspective and interests. So that ccTLD voice is a part of key work by ICANN beyond the limited scope of the ccNSO itself.

And definitely we also have a bunch of fundamentals, foundational activities, which are are mandated by ICANN bylaws, that we have to do anyway. So having that in mind, we also get together and [inaudible] all of our current activities and projects, we used [INDISERNIBLE] it is quite good and a convenient way to visualize all we are doing now, and all we have to do in the foreseeable future. So this tool helps us to assess easily the amount of work. And then when we see a new request, or new tasks upcoming, we apply impact effort methodology looking at the impact of these potential new tasks to the ccNSO and how consistent it is with our goals we have identified, versus the resources, which are needed to deliver and to fulfill this task. And this method helps us to assess this upcoming request, and to decide what we are going to do with this. And based on this, we have a triage committee within the ccNSO Council that actually does this work on an ongoing basis, and we also advise the Council on the current top priority each quarter. For this particular quarter, definitely our policy development work, we have two policy development processes ongoing as you might be aware. One is a review

---

mechanism for the decisions regarding ccTLD delegation transfer and verification and retirements. And another one is IDN PDP processes. And then next thing to do for us will be to develop a mechanism to report our progress versus these goals and tasks, and to make it also easily readable and understandable. I hope this helps.

**SPEAKER:** Yes, thank you very much Irina. So as you can see, we've been doing a lot of work, we would like to hear your comments about it. Yes, Katrina.

**KATRINA SATAKI:** Thank you very much. Great to see everyone, even the masked faces. But, we had an opportunity to see each other yesterday without masks. So, thank you very much for the great party. I'm Katrina Sataki, for the record. Thank you very much Irina, for sharing this approach, I have a question, because you mentioned in the goals of the ccNSO, the third goal is to make the ccNSO heard outside, the voice of ccTLDs heard outside of the ccNSO community and contribute to ICANN's work. Yet, when you use this impact effort analysis you concentrate on ccTLDs, so how valuable this is for ccTLDs. So, from my experience, ccNSO, when ccNSO speaks on the global level at ICANN, ccNSO never looks at

---

ccTLDs, it looks at the bigger picture and contributes to the work of ICANN in a very meaningful manner to make sure that things get better, that they are moving. So, how do you balance this impact effort methodology when you look at how important and how difficult it is for the ccNSO to address a task or an incoming request, and yet contribute to the global ICANN process? If I made myself clear. Because this was not entirely clear to me. Thank you.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you Katrina. This is not an easy question, and I'm not sure I can give you a universal answer that will cover all and every situation. But in any particular case, I believe we will find a way to assess whether this particular activity is strategic and broad enough and really requires our involvement, all this can be considered outside. It works on complete examples. It is really hard to give it a universal answer that will cover everything.

SPEAKER:

I have a question about this policy development processes that are currently being worked on, as we expect that the first half of the ccPDP will arrive at a successful conclusion this week, and the second half of ccPDP3 seems to be also approaching a conclusion, so is the work on IDNs. We know that policy

---

development processes on the ccNSO do not happen very often, and that is by design. Because most policies are local matters, and if we look at the horizon from a strategic point of view, are there any other matters that the community thinks will meet policy develop processes after we get done with the current ones?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you Patricio, for the question. Right now we are very focused on what we are working on currently. And so far we have not discussed any potential new ccPDPs. But what the triage committee is doing is reviewing the ccNSO strategy frequently. So, we have, if I remember, a two-year plan. With the reports that we will be getting, we will see if anything needs to be changed, because again, this is the plan, but it's not fixed on stone. If we see eventually that we need to focus on something else, we can change our priorities there. Yes, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much, basically, as I understand it all, it is partly also really a next level of engagement, I really look forward to CC's basically collect a good practice experience to gather, in a way that would be useful for the ICANN community. This will be very much appreciated, I know the diversity, [inaudible] some global truth may come up, global good practice lessons may come up that we really look forward to benefit from.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Katrina Sataki again. One more question from me. I know that ccNSO actively participated in this first pilot prioritization framework. What are your thoughts on the process, what are your thoughts on how it compares to your experience, and what improvements would be helpful to make sure that this prioritization framework works better? Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That one's for me, Katrina. Good morning, everybody, this is Chris Disspain. I sat on the pilot program; I think it went really well. It's hard to draw, you can draw lessons from it in respect to the structure of it. But given that it was dealing with a very specific set of recommendations, it was only dealing with the external recommendations from reviews. Until we have done a proper one, for wanting a better way of putting it, it's quite hard to draw any further conclusions, I will say one thing which is that at the start of that process, [inaudible] and his team came to the pilot panel committee, whatever, with a strawman set of proposals and that was incredibly valuable. There is often talk about should straw people, straw beings, be provided or not. I have to say, if we had not had that as a starting point, if we started with a blank sheet of paper, we would still be going. So, that was a key point

---

in my view. Because the people in org kind of know this stuff intimately. Whereas the people on the committee tend to have their own pet project, which is fine, but they have their own project they want to deal with. So that depth of knowledge that comes from org, into the pilot, came from org into that pilot program was incredibly important. But we'll see, I'm going to sit on this coming one now, I think the real test will be this, and we will see what happens after. I hope that is helpful.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks Patricio. Matthew Shears for the transcript. Irina, really appreciate the detailed outline of your prioritization process, it is incredibly helpful and I was going to ask the same question as Katrina about the impact assessment. But, one of the challenges I think we all face is how do we know when we are finished with a piece of work. And how do we know we need to put it aside so we make way for additional items to work on? What is the process for retiring something out of your prioritization, and actually then bringing in something new? What is the balancing you have to do there? Thanks.

IRINA DANELIA:

There is no formal process which is defined and written down in guidelines. But we agreed that first of all our working plan is a

---

two-year plan. It is ongoing, and we see what activities are finished, what is done, and what we can add as new activities. Secondly, we agree that we assess our current main priority every quarter. So we first get together as a triage committee, and look if the activities which are our priority for Q3 of this year, are they still ready for Q4, or Q1 of next year? And if so, okay, we keep it, if not, what is more important for us right now? The same as Alejandra mentioned with the strategic goals. Well, currently we have a need for policy development, so this is one of our top goals, when and if these two policies we currently are working on will be developed and approved, there might be some implementation and also a follow-up, but if we see no current need for any new policy development, then we consider this goal achieved for this particular period of time and look for a new one. The idea to keep it alive, keep it moving on, and probably not try to clear with us [INDISERNIBLE] which we probably mentioned five years ago, but then they were never fulfilled, okay, if it has not been done in the last five years, maybe it's not relevant at all. And let's move forward and do whatever is needed currently. What is important today.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much for the conversation, I would like to take this as a segue to continue with our topics here. One of the things

---

that the triage is very useful for us, is as Katrina was asking, how do you deal with all the things that are incoming to you. That is where we group them, and evaluate them and decide which ones we need to invest our efforts now or which one we can either skip or pass for the time being. And with this, I would like to come to the topic of how to bring that in a way to ICANN for example. [inaudible] has made a comment regarding having too many things running at once in ICANN, and to be careful to not have too many big things running in parallel. Because again resources are not infinite. And there is a concern on how that will be impacted and I believe that Tatiana might give us a little bit more on that.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much Alejandra. I hope that I can lower my mask when I am speaking, hope nobody minds. So, when I saw ICANN org's response to that comment of the ccNSO, something really stood out to me because indeed ICANN org appreciated the concern and highlighted that many things were running indeed in parallel. And the things running in parallel were mentioned. Work Stream 2, ATRT3, SubPro, so what stood out to me, is in addition to perhaps [inaudible] priorities and prioritization, what should be on the agenda is agility. So, how to deal with things so they do not pile up. Because Work Stream 2 is nothing new. But what I also was thinking is that the community itself, cross-community

---

working groups for example, and Work Stream 2, or various policy development efforts like EPDP, which is also piling up, or ATRT3, worked kind of miles to finish everything in time, and then it keeps piling up, and piling up. So how can we deal with what is coming in, while not forgetting this community effort that keeps piling up, and what kind of lessons can we learned? For example, two years ago we had this discussion, whether the layer of ODP, operational design phase, has to be added. Was there any lesson learned from this? Did actually help to achieve the goals? Do we as community reflect how we address what is piling up? Do we as a community reflect and take some effort? What kind of dialogue can we have here to actually not keep things piling up instead of just acknowledging that yes it's hard to do with them, but we still have to? This is just an observation. Please take it as a start of the dialogue, I think we are all contributing to this, right, we as a community, ICANN org, ICANN board. Any thoughts on this?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes sure, there is a lot of faults about it and also the Board is thinking a lot about this. There is much on their plate, which is also part of the bottom-up model [inaudible] up up, and the priorities between different things and this is why we started the priority exercise. I think we've done a good first step and there's more to do. It is very key to understand what the real priorities

---

are and how we can avoid things. But it's also to work together on making it happen. For instance, the number of public comments that have been coming out during last month, I think if you feel like this is too much to handle at this moment but you really want to say something, say that. And ask for an extension for that purpose. Because what we can't do either is say “well, let's not do this” for some of the things that are crucial too. It's really that. The other thing is, in general, what I find also in the board to be [inaudible], if you are trying to do everything, everybody, nothing will happen. So also, let's prioritize within ourselves, have different people assign different parts and coordinate. We cannot do it all with everybody all of the time either. So, I think, these [INDISERNIBLE] from my side. And Göran can tell more.

GÖRAN MARBY:

First of all, I really like the discussion and I am happy, the process and the resourcing for org, for board and for communities, an essential question. This discussion did not really exist two years ago. There are so many things that we're now trying to do to work together about it. I internally, and I think Xavier, I don't know if he's here, I think we're running together... Hey, Xavier. [INDISERNIBLE] Together with the community, [inaudible] I think we're running like 40 different topics right now where we're trying

---

to improve. Different processes to get better at this. But one thing I really want to say which I am grateful for, which I think we're going to get even better, it's the coordination between the SOs and ACs. Because remember, the board at some extent, and me to full extent on the other side of a fire [inaudible]. I mean, you are the ones who, I mean, there are bylaws driven things, but you are the ones who set the standards for when to do things, so you are the ones who books on the PDPs and all of that. It's you together. So the coordination between the SO and AC leaders, [INDISERNIBLE] I remember one of the first meetings we had in the SO and AC leader group back in Abu Dhabi and Manal presented what she called the scary list, which she doesn't share with everybody else, because to some extent, all of us are also depending on GNSO, because when the GNSO decides to do any PDP for something, many of us get interested. So it's sort of, the SOs and AC leadership, so I figure, is one of the most fundamental, and I know Xavier is working with the SOs to get that going. But then we will always have the situation where... When I speak to my staff, who has been around for a long time, they never been, not even a transition, was as hectic as this is. During a very short period of time, we got all the big PDPs and +250 review recommendations, plus the Work Stream 2, who is not a review. Avri has reminded me to tell me that all the time, because we sometimes call it a review but it is not. If you take all those things together and then you add a Covid into the

---

mix, plus a lot of work, you can't resource any organization or institution from those tops. So what we've been trying to do and we don't always do things right, we are trying to open up the doors so you can see what we do. So we are much more transparent about Work Stream 2, where we all review recommendations to give a [inaudible] feeling to the community. We actually things. That means of course that everybody has to read all the reports, but that's another story. I don't think there's a simple solution to any of those discussions, but the conversation and dialogue is the important one. And then we can openly stare to each other and say “We have to prioritize”, and that also means sometimes that your project will be down prioritized. Because prioritization means that something has to be done before something else. That's the not-so-fun part of it. And it might be your project that gets down prioritized compared to something else. So, I really want to say thank you for the conversation and your membership in the SO and AC leadership is very essential.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Do you want to reply? And then Matthew and Katrina.

---

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to reply. Tatiana Tropina for the record. And Göran, thank you very much for bringing this up. Actually, I was afraid to mention GNSO and the other parts of the community because we are here in this extremely effective important and global community who might deal with a bit less big PDP issues as GNSO, but we depend, the implementation and prioritization of what we get done depends on the entire community of course. So, I appreciate it very much, and this is why I also think it is important for us as a community to discuss openly. Do we want additional layers to be added to something? Do we want something to be dropped? You mentioned Work Stream 2. I also remember a few years ago there was evolution of multi-stakeholder model project that took some resources, I don't know where it is now, but it can be probably in that pile of things to deal with. So, I just wanted to say that yes, I completely agree with you, I do appreciate that you mentioned that it is actually the entire community. But, in a way, as now being on the ccNSO Council, I see how it extremely affects us and how it would be very beneficial to really prioritize our interests as well. Although GNSO is maybe bigger and we all depend on it.

GÖRAN MARBY: I hope you feel that we do prioritize ccNSO and give you good support. And, because Xavier is in the room, I will ask him to post

---

in the Slack updates on Work Stream 2 and updates on the evolution of the multistakeholder model and all the other things he's doing. And I can see that he is now running to his computer and will put into the chat. Sorry to disturb you, Xavier.

SPEAKER: I have Matthew in the queue and then Katrina.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Tatiana thank you for that. Because, let's be realistic on this. This isn't an issue that is going to go away within the next six months or the next 12 months, but if you look at this in a kind of a bigger picture and a more strategic sense, the more that we prioritize, and I know we are going to talk this term to death, but as Chris mentioned, we now have a framework within which prioritization is going to take place as a part of the annual strategic and planning process. So that's institutionalizing that prioritization process, so hopefully that over time will actually reduce that backlog and actually give a sense as to what should be worked on first, what should be funded first for implementation etc. So there is that. They is streamlining of PDP processing that is underway. This is on another important part that relates directly to the multistakeholder model and its effectiveness. So, there are all of these things are being put in place over time, and I am hopeful,

---

I'm a cautious optimist, that these particular initiatives combined with others will actually help to reduce that backlog. And inform us as to what is important, but community still has many decisions to take in terms of what it wants to prioritize, what it wants prioritization in terms of funding and things like that. So I think that, if you look at it from a totality, we are moving with the right kind of initiatives and embedding the right processes, it's just going to take time to move through the backlogs so to speak and get things underway. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Katrina Sataki for the record. It is impossible to disagree with your assessment, Tatiana. I think that everybody at ICANN has realized that by now. But there are two things I want to say. First, there are you know, there are many recommendations. And if you go to ICANN wiki page community, [community.icann.org](http://community.icann.org), and you go to pages dedicated specifically to reviews, you can see a status of their implementation. So currently there is very frequently updated information on how recommendations are being implemented. That's one thing I wanted to stress. The other one, and well maybe I will get strangled for saying that, but there is one thing that I really liked about what Irina said. And yet Tatiana said that, well, we should make things not pile up, but at the moment we have a pile. And

---

we can think about not piling them up, but now we have a pile, and what I loved in Irina's comments, she said that at the ccNSO, if we have not done something for five years, then maybe we should just forget about it. And maybe this is something that the community could think about, thank you.

SPEAKER: Javier?

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: Javier Rúa-Jovet for the record, buenos dias. I would like to make a statement and a comment about the importance of ccNSO in this context of diversity and hearing the community. I've been in several communities at ICANN, I started as an observer in the GAC and then I was in ALAC, and then I was a little bit in the GNSO via Work Track 5. What I can say about the importance of the ccNSO, particular importance of the ccNSO voice, is that ccNSO is probably the most representative community of the multi-stakeholder model in the sense that there are purely governmental entities, purely private entities and everything in between, within a community, as well as individuals as myself because I'm a NomCom named individual, so it tends to be overlooked, but ccNSO is really particularly representative of the multi-stakeholder model versus purely multilateral things or purely private things. So I wanted to leave that on the record because it is truly an honor to be part of this group and see its

---

work that it is so diverse and so representative of many different voices. And I think it's a statement about prioritization itself. That the things that come out of the ccNSO represent a wide variety of interest that have been consensually agreed upon. So, thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much everyone. This is Alejandra for the record. Well, now that we have covered the first part regarding prioritization and how to make things work better, we would like to move on to the next part regarding the collaborative actions and collaborations. We would like to discuss a little bit on what collaboration means for the ccNSO and what we would like to see to actually work together with ICANN. And for this, may I please ask Chris to address this.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you Alejandra. Chris Disspain again. It has been fascinating listening to this conversation, I knew that I was going to speak at this particular point but I didn't realize that we were actually going to spend most of the first half talking about what I'm going to talk about, which is what's been very interesting. We thought when we looked at this question and we started talking about how to respond to it, that when it comes to the collaboration thing, given that ccTLD community is expanding, there are more

---

people, new people come, people get replaced given that the board has turnover, people go, people come, that it might actually be quite helpful to go back to the first principles very briefly and to think about what it is that the ccNSO and ICANN, how they relate. And of course ccTLDs are here because they want to be, not because they have to be. And their relationship with ICANN and their involvement with ICANN is all about supporting the multi-stakeholder model. Doesn't mean we always have to agree with everything, but we support the model and that is why we are here. And if you think about the policy for a moment, the ccNSO does not set policy for ccTLD's. ccTLD's set their own policy in their own country or territory. What the ccNSO does is it sets policy for the way that ICANN relates to ccTLDs. So it sets policy on retirement, it sets policies on stuff like that. And of course it sets its own internal policies for how the ccNSO works, but that's kind of admin stuff, so we don't need to worry too much about that. And as Javier said, the diversity of this community is important to ICANN as is the legitimacy that the ccTLDs bring, because frankly, if the ccTLDs weren't here, then ICANN would look much more like a trade organization because you would be interfacing with the people you have contracts with, and then you'd have the community representatives as in At-Large and so on. So, the quid-pro-quo for all of that is when it comes to interrelationships between ICANN and individual ccTLDs it's that we talk to each other, but if you want to discuss something about

---

a ccTLD, you talk to that ccTLD, and if you want to discuss something about a group of ccTLDs or the ccTLDs as a whole, come to the ccNSO and talk to them. And that's all that we really expect. We don't expect any more than that. It is nice to get things done if we ask for them. It would be lovely for example, and this is not a dig, it's just a point, our webpage needs updating and I appreciate that is not a priority but it would be nice if that could happen at some point. But, fundamentally this is a cooperative and a relationship that we, I think almost all ccTLDs treasure and we want to it to develop and grow . I will leave you with one more point which is that I ran a session at Wolfgang [inaudible] summer school in [inaudible] a couple of months ago and I had a panel, [INDISERNIBLE] and a couple of other people, doesn't much matter what it was about, but [Faddie] said “we should never forget that th multi-stakeholder model is sacred.” Now, you can look at that and think that's quite a funny thing to say or interesting thing to say, and it's probably a slight exaggeration, because of it is sacred then we must all be apostles. But it is very important and we treasure it, and it matters. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Just as you know, about our website, we spent... So one of the things that ICANN didn't do for about twenty years was to build a document management system, so we spent the last three or four

---

years trying to build a document management system where we discovered we have about 200,000 documents that we all have to index, go through, read and make sure they're in the right places. The next big launch we have is also all the board material which is a big thing. One of the interesting things with your website is it's not even on our website, it's a completely separate website. So we don't even know what is there. But ccNSO is actually the first external website that we are going to build into the new document management system. So, you are actually first in line of the external ones. And interestingly enough, we have like 30 external websites with their own sort of non-document systems that we are going to bring into the same place, so for instance making things searchable for people within the system. So, yes, you might say that you are late and you wanted your website updated, because that sounded so easy. But we're now going to embrace you into the ICANN environment also technically going forward. And I am looking forward to that because it is going to take a little bit of... We've never done this before. It's a giant leap for ICANN and a very small step for mankind because it should have been done 25 years ago. But please feel welcome into the world.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks Göran, and I know you know this, but I just want to make sure that it's clear that that was not my main point.

GÖRAN MARBY: But you still made it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much for that and for letting us know we are first in row, even though, again, that was not the main point. Regarding the communication as well, I would like to then touch a little bit upon on how things get done and it's mostly on volunteer work. And just to clarify a few points regarding how volunteers are motivated in the ccNSO. So our volunteers are really looking forward to exchange ideas, share information, collaborate with each other and try to help the ccTLD community. It is something that we need to take very much into consideration when we are in need to put more resources into work. And sometimes it is difficult for us to find volunteers that would like to invest their time and effort outside of that, outside of the ccTLD world. It is something that we should be mindful about. And also, with this, I would like to stress a little bit also on the fact that having an open and fluid communication is key for us to be as transparent as possible. It is better to have more information and often than silence, or than publishing somewhere that we are not

---

aware that exists. Just to make those points. And with this I would like to know if there are any other comments or questions? From anyone?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you Alejandra and thank you Patricio, it's a pleasure to be with all of you here. Pablo Rodriguez, for the record. The one thing that has come to my attention and has come to my attention for a while, is the fact that as we continue to move forward with as it has been called the pile of to do things, we continue to get more things on top of that pile. So prioritization, without a doubt, is key. Reviewing and reconsidering if those new things that we are getting is a new evolution of previous discussions and previous elements. And the way which we begin to consider those issues, it will allow us to find new ways in which we can collaborate with the board, with Org, even among ourselves. And at the same time, it will also help us manage our expectations in terms of what we can do, what we should do. And that will definitely at ease much of the anxiety that many of us experience when we are thinking, well, I'm not getting the attention I deserve. So, the main thing, the main topic, or the main message that I would like to continue to stress and that we all continue to say is that communication, communication, communication is key in order to make sure that all of these

---

issues are being addressed. And in this particular case I believe that more communication is better than less communication. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks a lot Pablo for these remarks. I hope I sound less mushy than with the other microphone, on this one. Two things: communication is key, and we know that, but the other thing is that it's also key to make sure that the next things we do are really things we want to do and how we want to engage with that. And I think we are conscious because I see this consciousness of the workload, not only here but also in other parts of the community. But let's be really conscious about that, and from our side and the board side I will say we are pretty conscious of that too. The other point I wanted to reflect back from the GAC session yesterday which is indeed in line with the [INDISERNIBLE] If it's not done in five years, maybe let's not do it. Let's change it a little bit, but do look back at all the work that you have been committed to and per item. And maybe the item you agree to [inaudible], is it still necessary? And just spend a couple minutes on that every time, so we don't take things forward or keep things on the pile that don't need to be there anymore. Just a thought.

---

**TATIANA TROPINA:** Tatiana Tropina, for the record. I actually find it very interesting, because this is exactly what I raise my nameplate for, and what Pablo said. I want to bring it to what Katrina said about 5 years, that we have to just look at this and say, okay, we do not need it. Two points, first of all it brings me to communication. Because some of these projects are still probably perceived by the community as their work. So communication is the key to say, do you still want this? Let me make an example out of my head, I do believe there's a lot of synergy between ATRT3 recommendations and Work Stream 2. Has anybody looked how this can be merged? Just, you know, theoretically. No, we don't. We dwell on what we did and we want this to be done, but as Katrina said and I fully agree, let's communicate and see maybe if we do not. Maybe we are already dealing with something that covers something we did before. So, it all comes to prioritization again and communication.

**GÖRAN MARBY:** It's funny, it's not funny, it is interesting or whatever, it's early, it's Wednesday in an ICANN meeting. It's funny enough, it feels like I've been on a meeting for the last nine days and it's only three days. We created structures together that doesn't make that kind of flexibility you just mentioned even possible. And for instance, just give you something. When a review recommendation comes

---

to the board, and let's say that the board agrees with it, but the way it describes impossible to do. Let's say and I think I have an example is that when someone says... I can't remember, was it SSR2, was something that said "you should use standardization like this". Which the board agrees with, it's just that we use another one. And we can't actually say yes to that recommendation, we have to throw it away. So the board has very... the thing you are saying...and I am not saying the board should be able to change recommendations PDP, it's just that the board and them has no one to really go and talk to because the review recommendation is already done. So some of those things that we all think are smart, maybe we should have a discussion about how we can make things slightly more flexible. Because we often talk about process is no fun, but it's actually true that you go through the bylaws [inaudible] and that's where it comes from. So I think it's one way, we often talk about prioritization. Like it's a magic thing, but it's only two things we have to do, one of them is to better prioritize, and the other thing is actually can we do things differently? We would never avoid it. The fact that we have too much to do, all of us, my team and your team, everybody's working like whatever it is called because we have too much to do. And part of that work is because we set up procedures in the transition, in other ways, that are sometimes very inflexible. The way the board gets a recommendation, when it took a year for us and together with GNSO [inaudible] to fix one recommendation

---

because we did not know how to do it procedurally.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: We have a queue. So there is Chris, Pablo and Irina. So, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks. So, Tatiana, I think you are right but Göran I think you're right as well. There has to be a pathway through. I put my hand up originally to give an example. If you look at the IGO stuff, the board met with CPH, Contracted Parties House, yesterday and we talked about what happened with those recommendations and what Becky said was quite right. Is there's GAC advice and we have to make sure that we deal with that GAC advice. Now, as a simple example, the bylaws says there is a process where the board disagrees with the GAC advice and you have to go through that process, that is true, that is what the bylaw says. However, you could go to the GAC and say, instead of having this process, which runs for six months, why don't you give us a new piece of advice that says you're happy with everything and we can proceed? Just as an example. Now, that's not in the bylaws, is not written down anywhere, but as any lawyer knows, if two parties to a contract can agree that they are not going to do it that way, they are going to do it another way, and as long as they agree, it is fine. So, there are ways you could move around. You're right because when you get recommendations from committees and

---

reviews, there is no process for dealing with that. And there should be because things move on and things change. But there are other opportunities, shortcuts can be negative, but you understand what I mean, thanks.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

Thank you, this is Pablo Rodriguez again, from the registry .pr, Puerto Rico. One thing that we have to keep in mind, and to provide a little bit of context to this, is that ICANN is a complex system. And complex systems are not to be confused with complicated systems. Complicated systems can be solved with lots of money and expertise. But complex systems are characterized by a continuous evolution in which gets redefined each part, and by the time you get to touch one of those topics it has already evolved in your hands, and now we're talking about something similar but not quite the same. Consequently, and making reference to what was referred to earlier, is that we need to reconsider and revisit so many of these topics because they continue to evolve. And many of what we consider solutions today will be the problems that we will be dealing with in the future. The problems that we have today are the solutions of the past. So, who has the ability to see so far into the future and see how one decision today will affect other departments, other areas, no one person is capable of doing that. So, we have to be

---

mindful of that. And begin to find ways in which we can act, yes perhaps, a little bit faster, a little bit more efficient. But keeping in mind that those decisions that we make today can very well become the problems of the future. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Irina.

IRINA DANIELIA: Thank you Alejandra, Irina Danelia, for the record. I really like the recent discussion regarding the possibility to assess what we still need to do and what we can probably skip. And understand it is quite difficult also because there were volunteers who put their time and effort on developing some proposals, some recommendations, and somehow the courage is needed to say that it's not relevant anymore and this should not be implemented. But there must be a way to deal with that. And probably, it is not a slow, another two-year investigation and a review and the three-years-long process. Probably an easier solution. But that is about what we have now. But if we look in the future, we are starting new reviews, we are starting new cross community groups, etc. Can we look at the possibility that these new projects will not bring us 55 recommendations which we will have then to implement? Is there a way to somehow assess and limit the expected outcome of these efforts to the reasonable number of recommendations or things to do? But to make sure

---

that they are the most important one. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Katrina Sataki. Thank you very much Irina, I absolutely agree with you. Even more than that, currently, if you look at the public comments page, you will see that currently there is a public comment period open for the terms of reference of the pilot holistic review. And it is very important that the ccNSO looks at the terms of reference document and provide your comments. Actually, in the terms of reference document I could separately talk about the process, how it got developed, which I think also is a very good example of how we can move faster and more efficiently. But I will talk about the document itself, so if you look at the document and the way the pilot holistic review is envisioned, according to the ATRT3 recommendation, you will see that one of the items that is being addressed by this document and hopefully by the review, is how they group is expected to come up with recommendations, and how they are expected to evaluate those recommendations, so that we, as you said, we don't come up with 50 not so important things to do, but rather address the fundamental issues of the system. So please, please, please look at the document and we are looking forward to receiving comments from the ccNSO. Thank you.

**SPEAKER:** Thanks, just very briefly, Pablo thank you for your comments on the complexity of the ecosystem. That is absolutely correct. We will be opening, we are in the planning stages for the next strategic plan, so we will be opening that probably in the first or second quarter of next year. So we will be asking you to look ahead, to look into the future. So, at that point in time, let's bring all those ideas about complex systems and everything else. Thanks very much.

**PABLO RODRIGUEZ:** Thank you so much.

**ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:** Thank you all. This has been a very delightful conversation. And thank you very much for having us here. With this I would like to ask if it would be possible for us to get a summary of the highlights of the answers that you received from the questions from the board, from all SOs and ACs, so we can see the outcome and what are your next steps with this information. Thank you very much.

**MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:** Thanks Alejandra and thanks everybody for coming to this meeting. It is been a very interesting, rich discussion and some

---

---

very important points have been made which I'm sure will not be lost. Thanks everyone, and this meeting is closed.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**