MARRAKECH – ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 1 (2 of 3)
Tuesday, June 25, 2019 – 10:30 to 11:20 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

BARRACK OTIENO:	Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. We are starting the next session in two minutes. I request you to take your seats. Jacques and Regis, if you can join me up stage, please. You can take the long chairs.
	Okay, good morning, once again. Let's take our seats. It's 10:30 AM. It's the first section under the Working Group Updates will be led by the TLD-OPS. They have interesting information for us on disaster recovery and business continuity planning. Without much ado, I want to give the floor to Regis and Jacques to lead us through the session. Over to you.
JACQUES LATOUR:	Alright. Thank you. Wow. Where is everybody? They're coming? The slide deck that we have is pretty much the same one as the last time. We have 20 minutes to go over the same slides that we had the last time.
	Today we're talking about the TLD-OPS update. Welcome to the ccNSO Meeting Update. We have 20 minutes to go forward. No, not another boring TLD-OPS! So, the options you have right now

are a) run away b) sleep c) daydream d) play solitaire, that's a card game or e) read emails. You can do whatever you want.

We actually have good stuff to talk about today. Anybody here who doesn't know what TLD-OPS is? One, two, three. So, we have two. Quickly, TLD-OPS, what we did is we're trying to bring all the ccTLD security contacts together in one contact repository where we have about 280 people on that mailing list, on that community group. If there are security issues, we can share that with other ccTLD contacts. We do workshops and we share information between ccTLDs for security issues. We've been at it for a couple of years now and we keep adding more and more ccTLDs and that's pretty much what we do.

At the end, I've got slides with links to get more information. Then, if you're not part of TLD-OPS, at the end we'd like to talk to you and add you to our group.

That's the email that we send every two weeks with all the contact information. In there, if you need to reach somebody from another ccTLD, you'll have the name, the mobile phone number, and the information to reach them. So, high-level, that's what it is.

The main reason we're here today is to talk about our workshop update. We use this project management tool. It seems to be

working pretty good. That's exactly where we are, where the arrow points. ICANN 65 meeting, [inaudible].

What we did is, two ICANNs ago – Kobe? The first workshop, Abu Dhabi. I think at the Abu Dhabi ICANN meeting, we had a disaster recovery workshop. We had a bunch of people. We got together and we came up with an idea to build a DR/BCP playbook for a ccTLD to be usable in case of disaster.

Since then, we assigned [inaudible] from dot-EU. He was appointed the team lead. And since the last two ICANN meetings, we actually made progress with the documentation. Thursday we have a working group meeting to review the documentation that was produced so far. I can see we're pretty pleased with what we have in terms of documentation.

One thing we did is the playbook that we agreed to build, to take all the ISO discipline of DR/BCP down to something that a smaller ccTLD can use readily offhand. The goal was to focus on ccTLD events and to simulate a couple of major scenarios with templates that are usable. So, we finally got together and actually we worked on that and we made progress on that part.

So, now that we have good documentation, we need to test it. So, what we were thinking to do is at the Montreal ICANN meeting, TLD-OPS members, we're planning to have a DR/BCP tabletop simulation exercise. So, we're planning to simulate a registry

compromise. So, somebody got in the registry. They got full access to whatever inside. Then, we want to use the documentation that we built for the disaster recovery playbook and step-by-step see if it's usable. So, we want to initiative an event, to mitigate the event, to do the lessons learned. So, the full life cycle of a disaster, but to simulate that in a workshop and find gaps that we might have in the documentation.

So, the goal is that we started the simulation. You open up the guidebook first page and you run through the entire scenario. We're planning to have … I think the best step is for TLD-OPS members only to participate at that workshop. That's the question we had is should we do that? Our goal is to make it members only, because the last time we did the DR/BCP playbook workshop it was open to everybody. Not everybody got involved afterwards because they're not part of TLD-OPS. Any feedback on that, if it's a good idea, bad idea? Is this [inaudible]?

BARRACK OTIENO: I think we have the feedback, the forms. Maybe we can vote by a show of hands. You raise if you are for the idea or not for the idea. He is seeking your response.

JACQUES LATOUR: Yeah. So, raise your green card if we should do another workshop, red card no. By the way, when you have green card, you mean you're volunteering as well. Then, the next one is open to TLD-OPS members only. That means we have 280 contacts in our list from ccTLDs and these would be the people that participate in the workshop. Otherwise, we might end up having a lot of people that want to be there to see what happens and not contribute to the documentation and the process. No yellow. So, green, TLD-OPS members only. Red … Green, red, go, yellow. One green, alright. So, TLD-OPS only. Sounds good. That's it for us.

BARRACK OTIENO: A round of applause for them. Any questions or comments on the progress made by TLD-OPS before Regis and Jacques sit down? Any comment or any question? Please, before you leave, there is a hand raised. Pierre Bonis, please, if you can take the mic.

JACQUES LATOUR: The answer is no. It works.

PIERRE BONIS: Just a quick comment to thank you, Jacques and Regis and all the TLD-OPS members. I think you are doing a great job and we are very … We want to see the deliverable in Montreal. It's very useful. I talked with a lot of our African counterparts in [inaudible] AFNIC.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

They are eager to rely on the work you are doing and congratulations. Thank you.

JACQUES LATOUR: You're welcome. I think one good thing is a lot of the larger ccTLDs, we actually do simulation, but not everybody has a chance to do that in the proper way. So, hopefully, it will be a good experience.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What's the conclusion, open or not? Okay, it will be TLD-OPS members only. Thank you.

BARRAACK OTIENO: Thank you. So, next we will have an update from the Guidelines Review Committee. Katrina is here to take us through that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. The Guidelines Review Committee has been pretty active. I cannot say that we have achieved everything we would have liked, but nevertheless, I'll give you more update on some of the work that was done.

We're still working on [inaudible] work stream 2 recommendations and we have almost finalized the guideline – well, general guideline – of the selection of ccNSO appointed members to various working groups that do not have specific guidelines of their own.

We also prepared some comments for the council statement that was on the Independent Review Process Standing Panel. Many members participated in the working party that worked closely with our independent reviewer. We discussed the draft recommendations and report.

That's general, but the most important thing that we worked on was this coordination with the GNSO on the Special IFR, Special IANA Function Review. I don't know if you remember, but there is such a thing in the bylaws, IANA Function Review. This is what we are struggling with.

In special cases, both ccNSO Council and GNSO Council may agree to initiative a Special IANA Function Review. For that, there is a specific procedure, meaning that at first … Well, you know we have this Customer Standing Committee and they keep an eye on the PTI for us. If there is an issue, they try to resolve it with PTI. If it does not work, they have remedial action procedure, which means that they have three steps of escalation.

If they didn't manage to resolve an issue, there is next step escalated to PTI Board. When that does not work, the next level is ICANN CEO. And if that doesn't work and the issue is still there, hasn't been resolved, the third step is ICANN board.

If all these three steps fail and the issue is still there open, then the CSC can raise this with both ccNSO Council and GNSO Council and this is where we start discussions. We start discussions with the community, with other SO/ACs. This is where we decide whether we want to launch public comments to facilitate input from other communities.

At the end, we can decide that we want to launch this Special IFR to address this specific issue that we haven't been able to resolve in any other way. This must be done in close collaboration between the ccNSO and GNSO.

GNSO has created a drafting team and they have worked on some draft documents to describe this procedure, how this might happen. We had several calls actually with the draft team members and with GNSO support staff to exchange views on the document and on the process as such.

Here, the staff prepared a table with procedural steps. All these steps are involved in discussions around launching special IFR. Here, we can see all those steps. We can see entities that are supposed to take action on that particular step and will

ICANN
POLICY FORUM
65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

[inaudible] how long it takes and some source documents if there are any and comments. So, we have six procedural steps, so to speak. Then, also some more information about what happens, what are the recommendations, what could be recommendations and what we are supposed to do with that.

So, currently, we're working. We still continue working with the GNSO draft team to make this procedure efficient and more or less … Well, first, I think that the probability of us even reaching the point where we need to start discussing a Special IFR, the probability is pretty low. Nevertheless, if it does happen, it means that the issue is really very important and we need a mechanism to ensure that we can handle it properly.

So, Special IFR has been high on our radar. With that, I think that's all I have from the GRC side. If there are any questions, I'm ready to answer them. If not, please follow us on the web. If you wish to participate in the work of the GRC, please send your request to ccNSO secretariat and you will be added to the working group. Thank you very much. Thank you, Barrack.

BARRACK OTIENO: You're welcome. A round of applause for Katrina. Any questions? I'm still looking around. Okay. Next we will have a slight change on the agenda. Pierre Bonis, if we can have an update from the

Internet Governance Liaison Committee, starting by introducing your team members to this new committee. Welcome, Pierre.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you, Barrack. Hello, everyone. I will try to be quick. This is the first update of the Internet Governance Liaison Committee. Thank you. For those of you who don't know what it is, we decided in Barcelona to establish a group within the ccNSO so the liaison is something that has to be defined because we liaise with ourselves for now but we decided to launch a group on Internet governance. The goal of this group is to coordinate and facilitate the participation and the input of the ccTLDs in Internet governance related discussions and processes.

There has been some volunteers and the Council has been kind enough to allow me to share this groups. There are other groups within ICANN that are working on Internet governance topics: the CCWG and the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. We have not reached them yet because the purpose of it is mostly – and I will come back to that – to share information amongst ccTLDs and not really to influence at this stage any position from ICANN on these topics. So, for those of you who are attending or working in the CCWG, this is not a duplication of the work. This is more a platform to exchange information.

So, you see that there are quite a lot of members in this IGLC. You see them on the screen, so I'm not going to read them out. If it's possible, I would like the IGLC members that are in the room to stand up, for you to identify them and to go to them. Thank you very much, Young Eum, and thank you for attending the calls very late in your country. I think we will change the hour. You can go Young Eum or to me if you want to have some more information.

You will note that there is no North America ccTLD manager in this group. In North America, there are plenty of ccTLDs, so maybe if someone wants to volunteer from this great part of the world, we would be very happy to welcome you. So, just come to me, please, and say that you are interested. We would be very happy to welcome.

We asked ourselves a few questions to establish a kind of roadmap for this group. The first question was about the relevant topics for ccTLDs. We tried to do a list that is not too long. And we will focus on these topics in the next month. So you see that within the group we identified seven topics that are of importance. It doesn't mean that there are not other things that are important, but we have to focus on one limited number of topics – local content, IDNs, regulations, technical, digital divides, cybersecurity and the role of the ccTLDs as promoters of the IGF.

We ask a second question which is how do we interact with the ccTLD community? The first step is to have this kind of date with you every time we have the opportunity to do it but there are many other ways to interact.

So, yes, of course regular updates at ccNSO members meeting. There is a Wiki. The Wiki place is very important and thank you to Joke and [Maryam] and the team to help us updating this Wiki. This is a place where we share information when we give dates and places where you will have the next IGF meeting, for instance, or major events about Internet governance in our respective countries. So, even if you are not a member and you want to share any information on something that happens in your country or is organized by your registry, please come to us and we will update the Wiki.

And of course if there is something – and there will be – that is of importance that we want to share with the community, we will add some lines in the ccNSO newsletter.

So, here you have the links. You can go back to the terms of reference also if you want to check that we are on track and we are not doing something that we are not supposed to.

With that, that's all, except that I just want to know that we have a face-to-face meeting on Thursday. Yes, on Thursday at 3:15. So, you are all invited if you want to join. That's not a closed meeting,

of course, and that will be the occasion to elaborate a little bit on the relevant topics. So, if you have something to add or discuss, please join us on Thursday at 15 past 3:00. Thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay. A round of applause for Pierre Bonus. Any questions to Pierre? Yes, please?

YOUNG EUM LEE: This is Young Eum Lee, dot-KR. Not a question but a comment and an additional invitation to join the group. I think this group is a group that has just been formed and this group represents one of the kind of groups that Katrina was actually referring to when we're talking about not everyone is really aware of everything that is going on, but Internet governance is an issue that basically all of us are interested in. I was actually surprised to see so many people joining various times in the world during our teleconference and everyone seemed to be very interested, but unfortunately not many of them were able to make it here.

But, for those of you who were able to make it here – and if you are interested in Internet governance issues related to your CC, then you're all very welcome to join us in our meeting on Thursday. Thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay. Thank you very much, Pierre, once again. So, next we will have Giovanni giving us updates and leading us through an interactive session on the SOP. I think he deserves a round of applause as he comes and be prepared to get up from your seats because we have flipcharts around and you need to be in one of these locations. Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: That was the intention of the first flipchart. Can I have the clicker? So, it's an interactive session. The most active will get two invitations for tonight because there are no more invitations. Am I right? Okay. You get two. We'll bring them.

So, just a quick update on where we stand with the ICANN planning process. We had a quite an interesting meeting yesterday with the ICANN Finance, multi-stakeholder, engagement. Several teams.

A few days ago, ICANN has published two key documents. This is the way they are defining the documents. They announced the publication of those two key documents on the blog and those two key documents are – the first one is the draft high-level operating plan and budget for fiscal year 2021 to fiscal year 2025. The second one is the financial projections for the same timeframe.

Those two documents will be the key documents for ICANN, and on those two documents, ICANN will roll out their activities in the next five years.

The operating plan is a very high-level document and it shows initiatives that are linked to the five strategic objectives. As some of you may remember, the strategic plan for the next five years was recently approved by the board.

Which is the period of the strategic plan? Barrack, you're excluded. Which is the period and the timeframe? Come on. Nobody? Sleeping before lunch? Okay, nobody is getting lunch. Sorry. Do we have lunch? Okay, there is no lunch in any case, but nobody gets lunch.

So, the strategic plan is 2021-2025. It's the same as the operating plan that was approved by the board and the board tasked the ICANN staff to produce an operating plan to translate into actions the strategic objectives. There are five that are included in the strategic plan that has been approved by the board.

As I said, the operating plan is very high level and yesterday we were explained that the 16 initiatives that are included in the operating plan are possible initiatives that this community, including the ccNSO community, can propose other initiatives. So, the work that the ccNSO strategic and operating plan committee will do in the coming weeks –the public comment

finishes on the 5th of August – is to make sure that we submit comments on the 16 initiatives that are presented at very, very high level in the operating plan and in their financials.

The document is very short. It's 13 pages. Anybody can go through it. The document says that for each of the initiatives, there should be a first paragraph saying why the initiative is important for us, for ICANN to achieve the strategic plan goals.

That is true for the first initiatives and then probably it got lost a bit in the cut-and-paste and in the narrative, so not for all the initiative. There is a clear paragraph that says why that initiative is so important for ICANN, for us, for the community.

So, the exercise I'd like to do today in the next 55 minutes or so – and I need you to be proactive and awaken and not [inaudible] because you're going to get lunch eventually. We go through the five strategic objectives as approved by the ICANN board in the strategic plan, and for each of the strategic objectives, there's going to be a list of initiatives that ICANN is expected to roll out in the 2021-2025 timeframe and we'll try to understand them and also understand if those are the right initiatives that ICANN should roll out to deliver on the strategic objective and to make sure that the strategic objective is achieved.

The initiatives, according to ICANN, according to what's written in the operating plan, are really key projects that ICANN should

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

work on and they distinguish themselves from what ICANN is calling the operating activities which are day-to-day actions that any organization should roll out for its management. So, this is the distinction that you can read in the first pages of the operating plan for those five years.

So, let's start with first strategic objective as approved in the strategic plan which is [inaudible] the security of the domain name system and the DNS root server system. If you go to the operating plan, you see there are two initiatives. The first one is promoting DNSSEC and [inaudible] deployment and second one is coordinate security in the DNS ecosystem. Any comment on those two initiatives?

Those are really high-level initiatives. There's not much description in the document, according to ICANN, according to the consultation they had so far, those two initiatives are crucial to achieve that strategic objective. We can say, yes, we are fine with those. We can propose more. We can say no. But the promotion of DNSSEC should be a day-to-day activity rather than a specific initiative. It's up to us to decide and I'll be happy to hear from you, because again, in the coming weeks with the Strategy and Operating Plan Committee, we would like to consolidate a first draft of comments that were produced. Any volunteer to say something? Roelof. I'm picking up somebody because I know that

ICANN
POLICY FORUM
65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

in the Netherlands, there's been a lot of work supporting DNSSEC. Thank you, Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER: I'm a bit confused by the remark that you made, should this be an initiative or should this be day-to-day business. I'm not sure that if we say, well, let's make day-to-day business that it will get enough attention.

I'm just a bit intrigued by the fact that one is very broad, coordinate the security. And then there is DNSSEC as the only standard that they think to promote. I think there are others as well. I think this ICANN meeting will have a lot of discussion on DoH. I think most of the attention in those discussions will go to how it will be implemented or how we think that [inaudible] will implement it, and not to the protocol but the protocol itself is a good protocol and maybe that is something that ICANN can look into as well. I think they're more, as a registry, we look into more security measures and standards than just DNSSEC. And maybe ICANN should do that as well.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks a lot. Good point. Anybody else? Yes? [Nick]? That's my daily exercise today.

[NICK]:	I wanted to make sure you get some exercise and have a break from speaking all the time. So, strategic objectives. Strengthen the security of the DNS and the root server. Fantastic, because [inaudible] apple pie. I'm curious that the second bullet point effectively seems to just say coordinate security. Is that the best thing that they could come up with? Because it's very generic and I'm not very impressed if that's the result of many months of strategic planning.
	The second thing is we've been talking about DNSSEC for years and years and years about promoting deployment. The definition of insanity is to repeat something and expect the result to be different, right? So, what's this different from the previous strategic initiatives to promote DNSSEC? Thank you.
GIOVANNI SEPPIA:	Thank you, [Nick]. Very clear. Crystal clear. Some of you may remember recently, it was between February and early March, ICANN has published some blog entries about the importance of DNSSEC and how important it should be for each registry/registrar to support DNSSEC at multiple levels. I guess this initiative follows up on what they publish on the blog. Yes, please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Yes. I made it before Peter.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Okay. You were first.
GIOVANNI SEPPIA:	Okay. You first and then Peter. You first and then Peter, please. Yes.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	I was first. I think it's important but we need to do is try to push the aspect of DNSSEC, the security of the DNS, more at a business level to be able to write a business case to show the value of DNSSEC. One of the latest examples in a couple of mailing lists is the seatbelt in cars. It was invented I think in the late 1800s or early 1900s and it took laws and it took a lot of regulation to enforce people to wear a seatbelt. And [inaudible] new sounds bother people. But that's what security is. DNSSEC is a pain, but in the end, when you have an accident and you turn it on, it will protect you. But we need to do a business case to show to [Alexa 1000 or 10,000] that you need to start wearing seatbelts because one day it's going to save you. So, I think that should be an approach that we should take instead of being more technical.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks a lot. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Peter Koch, DENIC. Yeah. Okay for the first bullet item but the second one, I'm not sure how to read this. One way to read it is that it is a not-so-very-subtle metaphor for content regulation through DNS takedowns. And just having been in the GAC session earlier this morning, all the alarm bells are already ringing. So, it would be very important to narrow the focus and make absolutely clear what is outside the scope even if we don't know what is in there.

Then, whatever the DNS ecosystem is, that would not only – or may or may not apply to the registration part, the very much hyped, I must say, incidents or observations from earlier this year didn't necessarily only happen technically on the DNS side, but often the registration side.

Whether or not that is ICANN's business in the whole DNS ecosystem or in the gTLD world only is again something that we might want to have an eye on.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks a lot, Peter. Really good point and indeed there are lots of alarms ringing in different constituencies. Yes, Jörg?

JORG SCHWEIGER: Yeah. Jörg Schweiger with DENIC as well. Referring to the first point, if we do take a look at DNSSEC deployment, actually the deployment right now is quite high. We do have some parts of Africa where DNSSEC is not deployed but I think that is not the issue. The real issue right now is if we would want to stress DNSSEC, then we would have to stress its usage. We would have to foster uptake by registrars. We would have to foster validation and that is something that is really missing.

So, we or the board should be a little bit more precise in its action what to do with respect to increased DNSSEC deployment and I think that is important that we not only work on deployment but on the usage of DNSSEC.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Jörg. Again, I'd like to say something on that I said probably not so clearly at the beginning when we started this exercise. What ICANN is currently telling us is that this our exercise. So, they have highlighted some initiatives that they believe are crucial to achieve the objectives but we have the power to say, no, we believe they're not crucial. We believe they should be presented differently. We believe those are not initiatives but should be day-to-day activities. This is what ICANN is telling us. And that's because this is the first round and first

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

round will finish of the 5th of August, and then late in December they will publish an updated operating plan and budget with more details and including details of the activities that are currently missing in the document published a few days ago.

So, are we all in agreement that these two should be kept as initiatives or is there anybody strong sentiment to have this as a regular activity rather than a specific initiative? Because this is also what ICANN is asking us. Yes, Allan?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. Allan MacGillivray, from dot-CA. I personally see these as activities. Currently, what they're doing now, I would've thought that a strategic objective is something much more normative and I would put it very simply. This is something we're going to do that we're not currently doing now. So, I think they need to be a bit more pinpointed. They have to have much more specific objectives, metrics, and something for which they can be accountable for achieving or not achieving. I don't know how you would determine that they failed to coordinate security or they failed to promote. I think they have to say … I think this is building on what Jacques is saying. We need something much more specific that they can say, "Yes, we're going to deliver a business case, so as to improve DNSSEC use by X%" or something like that. Thank you.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks a lot, Allan. Indeed, what they are now saying to us again is coming not from the document but from the meeting we had yesterday with some of ICANN staff is that they were not able to produce this at this stage. They are looking forward to hear from us about what they have highlighted and then the next round they will be able to include KPIs and specific deliverables.

So, activities and initiatives. Shall we go with the green card as we do have green cards, red cards, yellow cards, blue cards. Do we have blue cards? No? Okay, green card, we keep them as initiatives. Green card up those who like to have those kept as initiatives. Green card up. Okay. Those who like to have this moved to day-to-day activities, green card up. Okay. Thank you.

We move to the second objective. We have five objectives. The second one is to improve the effectiveness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model of governance and here we have four initiatives. The first one is evolve and strengthen the multi-stakeholder model to facilitate [inaudible] and includes participation and policy making one. The second one is a cut-and-paste, bad one, so it stays there. Sorry. The second one is developing internal and external [ethics] policies. The third one is review and evaluate current meeting strategy.

Yesterday, there had been some comments already about the one that is about the development of internal and external [ethics] policies and also about the review and evaluation of the meeting strategy. Is there any comment from any of you about those initiatives? Should we support any specifics or should we say, no, we believe that the development of internal and external [ethics] policies is something that any organization should be having as a day-to-day activity rather than a specific initiative? The same for regular meeting evaluation and review. Anybody? No? We're happy with those initiatives? Yes? Anybody from the working group, ccNSO, SOP committee who said yesterday we believe that special [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't feel like the last two are really the initiatives and I think it's just everyday operations and everyday activities. So, we can talk more about [inaudible] whether this needs to be more concrete or more specifically formulated. But the last two just surprised me, so I would definitely exclude them.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, [Lina]. Rosalia?

ROSALIA MORALES: This is very broad but looking at the points that are included in this section, it seems that it's all looking inwards. What about ICANN's role in the world when it comes to Internet governance?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: That's another objective.

ROSALIA MORALES: Okay.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I think that these strategic objectives are quite important because recently we have been hearing a lot about the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model as well as what is called the fatigue of the multi-stakeholder model to involve more people. This is what also Katrina was saying earlier this morning. So, I think it's quite important that any initiative that ICANN is going to roll out about this objective is quite crucial for all of us, for all the community. So, do we believe this is important? Do we believe that, again, the internal and external [ethics] is something that should be moved to a day-to-day activity rather than be an initiative? Same for the meeting strategy which ICANN has been reviewing and evaluating almost every year since I joined the ICANN community. Okay, nobody wants lunch. Nobody? Yes, please. The mic is coming.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	[inaudible]. Actually, I take a look at [inaudible]. There is a [inaudible] very important for the multi-stakeholder, let's say, multi-laterism. So, I am not sure because [inaudible] some kind of concerns on such a [inaudible] multi-stakeholder model because different countries, different governments, they have really different consideration for such kind of Internet governance. So, I'm not sure our proposition from the ccNSO for such a kind of concerns what our [inaudible] and how to [inaudible] multi-laterism. So, that is my question. Thank you.
GIOVANNI SEPPIA:	Thank you. Any other comments? Can I ask you to raise your card, the green one, if you believe that those four initiatives are valuable to achieve, contribute, to achieve the objective or should we again move some of them … So, first of all, do we believe the four of them are good to achieve the strategic objective? Please raise your green card. Do we believe that the four initiatives as presented on this slide are good? Yes, Roelof?
ROELOF MEIJER:	Maybe just to remind, Giovanni, because you asked us if we believe that they are good. They are so [vague] that they might good. But we have to wait the final plan where they can elaborate

ICANN POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

on these four points before we can actually judge if they're moving in the right direction. So much evolve, develop, review, enhance, improve, and it depends on the way where you stop, where you think you're satisfied that you have improved enough or enhanced enough or evolved enough.

So, if you ask me if I believe that these are good, I find it a very difficult question to answer. I have some faith that it will help us move in the right direction but to be able to judge it, we have to see more I think.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. I can only [subscribe] it's an extremely good point. This is also what we have told yesterday to ICANN staff in the room that those initiatives are too high level. They do not enable us to properly comment because, again, there is little explaining the text that ICANN shared. But this is what ICANN is asking at present, so I think one strong point we can make as the ccNSO SOP is executive summary of possible comments. We highlight what we have submitted for comments [inaudible] difficult to provide comments on such high-level elements. So, this could be one of the options. Then, we can comment with some details on some of those initiatives, but again I fully agree with Roelof and this is again one of the …

For those of you – probably most of you – who have not read the document, you will see that the narrative is completely different from one initiative to another. There are some initiatives you may be able to understand a bit more but some others that are really a couple of paragraphs that are incredibly high level, let's say, to be diplomatic and they don't say much and they don't have [inaudible] to understand what's behind what's written.

Another element that the SOP has highlighted yesterday is that we have no elements to understand the process, the rationale, that ICANN has basis for having those initiatives as the top initiatives included in what they share with us. So, it is not explained consistently throughout the document. This is something that should be an [inaudible] of the ICANN planning team to provide us with this kind of detail that may help us to understand why one initiative has made it into the list and some others, they didn't.

So, we leave the strategic objective with those four initiatives at present, but again we'll take out of this that, again, we are not so much in … We do not have the capacity to comment at this stage.

The next one, because [inaudible] the strategic objective evolve the unique identifier systems in coordination and collaboration with relevant parties to continue to serve the needs of the global

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

Internet user base. This is the strategic objective in the strategic plan and there are three macro-initiatives.

The first one is to formalize a framework for [inaudible] cooperation and coordination among the domain name, [internal] numbers and protocol parameter communities on risks associated with the evolution of the Internet system of unique identifiers. The second one root zone management evolution. And the third one is promote and sustain a competitive environment—[audio cut]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019