
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – ccNSO Council Public Meeting
Thursday, June 16, 2022 – 13:15 to 14:30 AMS

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Council Public Meeting. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I, along with Bart Boswinkel, are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute in Zoom. Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar.

Thank you all very much. I now hand the floor over to Alejandra Reynoso. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Claudia. This is Alejandra Reynoso, ccNSO Council chair. And we are now starting ccNSO Council Meeting

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.

184. Welcome, everyone. It is a pleasure to be here and to see most of you here in the room. Just a quick reminder to all councilors. Please do join the Zoom Room and add, in your Zoom ID, the word “councilor” so it will be easier for us for voting to check on your names. For this, may I ask Kim whether we are quorate?

BART BOSWINKEL: On behalf of Kim, yes, you are.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. As usual, let me share with you on the chat the URL to the wiki—here it is—where you will find all related documents for today’s agenda. We will have a slight change in structure of the agenda. We will start with the administrative topics. Then we will have some substantive topics where we need to discuss and make decisions. And the third part, it’s updates and other matters that we will go through them only if time permits. And in the end, we will have any other business. Okay?

So moving along, we’ll start with the administrative section. All relevant correspondence is published in the link that you see in the agenda. And we did receive the request for appointment of members and liaisons to the CSC. This will be in item C5. I believe that we are looking at a different version of the agenda in the

screen. But it is mostly the same. But this is a late version. If we can find the latest one, it would be very nice. Thank you.

Okay. Moving along, regarding minutes and action items. The minutes of our latest Council call were published. And in the action items, all of them are completed except we have one open. That is the chair and secretary to confirm the details regarding the appointment to the FY24 Operations Plan and Budget process group from the ccNSO. We still haven't received any formal request for that but that's open. Other than that, everything has been done.

Moving to item three, we have made a couple of intersessional decisions. We appointed members to the DNS Abuse Standing Committee and to the ccPDP3. And this is the end of the administrative part. Any comments, questions?

Okay. Moving along. Now we are going to get into the substantive part of the call. And for this, we will see the Adoption Base 2022–2024 of the work plan and triage method for update the work plan. And I would like to give the floor to Jordan. Please, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

Hello and thank you, Alejandra. And good afternoon, everyone in the Netherlands. And hi to everyone else around the world. Sorry I'm not with you in-person. If you haven't already heard from me

during this week, a badly-timed COVID diagnosis meant that I was not able to get on the train from London.

This is an update that you will have seen some of the material before. As the Council, we have already discussed the prioritization approach that we're going to be taking, looking at the impact and effort required for our work. And earlier this year, in workshops, we worked through a strategic framework to guide that prioritization work.

So I don't want to spend too much time on the triage method, per se, but just to say—and shortly, I'll hand over to Bart—that what we're doing with this resolution is to adopt the base workplan for 2022 to '24. And that's the workplan that will guide our work from 1st of July this year until 30th of June in '24. That's the workplan that we update every year at around this time. We've done it earlier in the past but we wanted to pull it to a 1 July start date so that it matched ICANN's financial year, or fiscal year, as I think people call it.

So the base workplan was presented. And we've started using a new tool to put the workplan into management called ClickUp. And we'll give you a chance to have a look at that shortly as well, just to give you a bit of a demo and a sense of how it works. There are some resolutions which will be to approve the workplan for the year, essentially.

And then the next thing we're going to do ... And we hoped to have this done by now but a few different people had COVID at annoying times in April and May so we missed a couple of triage meetings. The next thing we'll do for the July meeting is come back to some proposed priorities, what are the top priority items, using the methodology that we've talked about before, and get the Council's agreement or otherwise to those.

And once that's done, each quarter, we will do a report back to the Council on how we've been going against, the plan, identifying areas where we've done what we said we would do across the ccNSO or areas where we have missed deadlines, for example, just to give us all a common view about what's happening. And also, we'll be able to organize so that people can view their ClickUp tool to check in on the workplan at any time it's needed.

So I think that's the introductory comments. I think I'd like to hand over to Bart to take us through, at a high level, the workplan info that was circulated in the C1 topic e-mail a few days ago.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thanks, Jordan. I hope you can see it now. Yeah. There you are. So this is a tool that Alejandra uncovered to be shared with the triage committee. I'm going to use this sandbox to illustrate what Jordan was talking about and then I'll show you the overall—it's

similar to the sandbox—the base workplan. But I'll use this one to show you what will be done shortly.

So let me explain the basis. As you can see, there are three major goals. These goals match with the purpose and goals of the ccNSO as adopted by the Council. So that's the policy, serving the community, global platform functions, and contributing to ICANN. And then there is, I would say, a miscellaneous category that's foundational activities. And I will go into a little bit more detail in a minute.

As you can see, within policy [serving] ccTLDs, there is a policy function that's clear. And we've got the IDN PDPs which are under development. That's why you see them in progress. And you also see a few open items. These are effectively items which will come the way of the ccNSO. That's the implementation of the retirement policy, implementation of the review mechanism, and implementation of the IDN ccPDP. We know it's coming. We don't know when. But that's why they've listed. So that's with respect to the policy function.

The global platform function, you see a lot of. And this not at the level of the working groups, although the working groups do the work. It is around the topics themselves, so the activities around, for example, DNS abuse, ccNSO meetings, outreach and involvement, Internet governance, TLD ops, etc.

And there are some other topics, again open, which are, I would say, on the dance card. So capacity building for ccTLDs. There might be a discussion, going forward, whether or not the ccNSO wants to get involved and along the same lines as with DNS abuse, so ccNSO and capacity building. At one point, there might be a discussion. Universal acceptance of IDN, Council already had a discussion about it.

And maybe because we talk about the 2022–2024 plan is a review of the ccTLD financial contributions. Again, it was five years ago when this was done. According to the relevant guideline, it needs to happen every five years. And that’s why it’s included as an open item and is still a topic for the triage committee, whether the advise the Council to—and then for the Council itself. And maybe, even assuming the review mechanism will be done in this period, a review of the accountability framework guideline—whether there is an impact of the review mechanism, as you may recall. So that’s the platform function.

What I’ll do now—and this will make you—just as an illustration of what you can do with this, I’ll open up the ccNSO meetings. And as you can see, we’ve listed all the upcoming ICANN meetings. And if I would go into another—but I won’t—overview, you will see a Gantt chart where they’re all scheduled out. And it’s the same thing with all the activities themselves.

So next one, and the third major bucket, is contribute to ICANN's broader work. So that's the CSC effectiveness review which is currently ongoing. That's why you see "in progress." And then the various public comment views. And then the final one is foundational activities, renewal of ccNSO website, internal appointments, which is quite a lot, as you will see. So the Council elections. You will be discussing the Board nomination process, 2023, etc. So that's with respect to the internal appointments. And there are the external ones like the NomCom community award, CSC, RZERC, etc. and Board seat.

And then finally, the foundational activities of the ccNSO, which again is included, is the internal policies. So that includes the maintenance of the ccNSO work plan and the internal procedures as you can see. And I will use this as an example. That's why I'm in the sandbox. Updates, for example, to deal with the rejection action and approval guideline and to deal with the update of it.

The triage committee, as you could see in the background document, has identified a series of criteria to prioritize the work item. So one is must do. And must do, effectively, means it needs to be done according to the Bylaws. So normally, there is no reason not to do it, no matter what the impact.

Then you have new work items. And the first assessment of the triage committee will be whether the impact, so therefore the value of the ccNSO, will be high, medium, or low. And the

standard for the review will be the goals document and the purpose statement of the ccNSO.

With respect to effort, there are, I would say, two parameters. One is the community resources. That means is the expectation that it's just a very small number of volunteers that need to be involved—for example, appointments? So that's one or two. Or is there a high community resource required? So that means a working group committee or even the full ccNSO. So that is with respect to the resources.

And then what also drives the effort is the duration of the involvement. Is it long-term? So that's six months or longer. Or is the duration short, so less than six months? These are the parameters along which the triage committee intends to assess the various not-must-do working items. That would be the next phase of the triage plan. Jordan, do you want me to show something else or does this suffice in your view?

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you, Bart. I think that's a good demonstration of this tool, just so people have a sense of what it looks like and some of the things that it can do. It can also let us see all of the tasks in the work portfolio for the ccNSO, listed by priority. So once we've done that work as a triage committee to propose to you, at the next meeting we'll come back and use this tool again to show you

what the priorities that we've marked are and have a discussion about them.

So I don't think we need to present the PDF that has the distilled workplan because I will hopefully not surprise you by saying that there should be no surprises in the workplan. All of the big chunks of work are ones that are familiar with us. We haven't tried to sneak in any new random tasks for the ccNSO to do in this plan. So I think we can move to the resolutions.

But before we do, I've just got two things. One is whether there are any questions from anyone in the room. The other is whether there will be any additions or any comments that any triage committee members would like to add to what Bart and I have said. If there are any committee members, first off, that would be good to put your hand up. Not expecting anything but just in case.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. Yes. Even though this is a Council meeting, I do see that we have one question from the audience. And Jordan, I don't know if you can see it on the chat. It's from Annebeth Lange.

JORDAN CARTER: I can see the question. Yeah. Annebeth, hello. Hi. Sorry not to be seeing you in person. Shall I read it out, Alejandra, or do you want to? Alejandra, I can't hear you if you're talking.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. You can answer the question. No problem.

JORDAN CARTER: In fact, I can't answer the question because I don't know what the answer is. But if someone else does, that would be good.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. We will reserve that for later. I was trying to hear you with my headset first and then I tried to hear you here. I see I should use the headset because the echo is a little bit—not letting me understand you perfectly. But thank you. Any other questions or comments from the Councilors? Yes, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: May I comment on Annebeth's question? The triage committee has effectively at least two roles. The traditional role was to advise Council when and if a new work item would come down the path of the ccNSO. So if there is a request to participate in an effort, like for example SubPro new gTLDs implementation, or others which are not really directly related to the ccNSO work items, that function is still there.

And probably, and going back to Annebeth's question, if at one point there is a request to participate in that effort, then it will go through the triage committee. It will make its assessment

whether to include it, or to advise the Council to participate, and then include it if the Council agrees to participate in that effort if there is an appointment.

One of the recommendations of the triage committee could be, “Yes. We’ll inform the ccTLD community. And if an individual ccTLD or representatives from ccTLDs want to participate in a working group of another SO/AC, then it will not be included in the workplan.” At least that is my expectation—and just my own expectation. But this is the way it plays out in the ccNSO workplan.

So there might be one action following a request that will not be included because it probably takes more time to include it, and have the discussion, and update the workplan than sending out the e-mail because it’s a one-off event. I think that captures it, Jordan. Don’t you think?

JORDAN CARTER: Yes. I do.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you both for the answer to Annebeth. Any other questions or clarifications from the councilors? I see Nick. Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah. Thank. I think it's an interesting point that Annebeth raises because there are community initiatives where it's unlikely that we're going to be specifically asked, as the ccNSO, to participate. So I think to that extent, we're going to be relying on the community to say, "Actually, this is an area where the Council ought to take a position," or, "The ccNSO needs to be involved."

Obviously, the issue of geographic names in the ... [inaudible] this point. Exactly. We've spent so many years fighting the country codes' protection of the geographic names. Whether it's the alpha-3 or alpha-2 codes in gTLD, it's an area we've got direct interest. And we have invested a huge amount of time and resources over the years.

So I think there's an interesting point about horizon scanning. I think it is probably within the remit of the triage committee. The whole new gTLD Subsequent Procedure things have been going on for about 10 years now and I've slightly lost track about whether it's something important.

I think relying on community members who are a bit closer to these things to say, "Hey. Actually, something important is happening here," and then to raise it with the Council so that we know that we should be assessing it versus the other priorities. And if it's something that's coming up and we know roughly when it's coming up, then we can block that time out as needing some potential resources and not put too many conflicting things in if

we know that there's something which is important and which is going to require some time and resources.

Obviously, the whole point about the prioritization for us is that there's a limited amount of time, and people, and capacity to do it—to do everything. And it'd be nice to do everything but we can't do everything so we need to decide carefully where to apply our time.

And I do think that Annebeth raises a good point. This is something that we've invested many, many hours over the past couple of decades fighting about. So let's make sure that our processes for prioritization don't mean that we end up excluding ourselves from these sorts of initiatives where ... You don't have to do a huge amount but it's really important that we do have our interventions and we need to keep an eye on it. And that's a good point.

I don't know whether there's an easy answer because, obviously, there's so many things going on. But this is one, obviously, which is of high interest and we need to be very careful on, I think.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. I completely agree with you. And I see that Annebeth has said that she will be following and letting us know if she discovers anything that we should get involved with. Thank

you all. So I don't see any other hands up. So we have a decision in front of us. For this, may I ask for a mover?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I'll do that.

BART BOSWINKEL: Alejandra, there is one hand from Gopal. There was one.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sorry. Oh. We have one more hand up. Yes, Gopal Tadepalli.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you very much. Greetings to you all. This is Gopal from India. I have a quick question. I've seen this nice idea of prioritization of the tasks. And on page number two, there's a very nice diagram. What are the tasks that are so easy and give high anticipated benefit? How many of them have you cleared so far? I'm surprised that there will be high-benefit and easy [inaudible] tasks in numbers. Page number two of the document [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: Gopal, could you please type your question in the chat and I'll try to respond in the chat so we'll continue? You're breaking up.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Will do that. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Gopal. We will wait for your question in the chat. Jordan, may I ask you to please check on the question and maybe, if possible, answer in chat when it's there?

JORDAN CARTER: That's fine.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: If I understand correctly, it's about how we measure that an activity might be easy to carry on, so what we consider effort to be invested. And it's the resources that we have. But still, that's what I understood. But just in case it's something different, if you can have a look at the chat. Thank you, Jordan. Okay.

We're having movings and secondings. So to recap, Pablo was moving and I saw Jordan was seconding. Any questions or comments on the resolution itself for councilors? Okay. I don't see any so we will move for the vote. And for voting, we will use the Zoom Room. So only councilors, please. Use your green ticks if you are favor of this resolution or your red crosses if you abstain or are not in favor of this resolution.

Very well. I see green ticks. Thank you very much. You can put them down now. And just for good measure, is there anyone who

would be against from councilors? I don't see any hands up. Thank you very much. This has been approved.

Moving along to the next action item, we will have the adoption of the revised ccNSO application form. Joke, would you give us an introduction on that, please?

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Hi, Alejandra. Yeah. Happy to do so. So on the 2nd of June, the amended ICANN Bylaws has been published. And there were changes to Article 10 and section B that are relevant for the ccNSO. Starting from the second of June, when the new adopted Bylaws became effective, it is possible for IDN ccTLD managers to become members of the ccNSO. In order to be able to make sure that they can access the request form in order to be able to become members, the form needs to be adjusted.

Currently, there's a drop-down menu which only contains the ASCII ccTLDs. The IDN ccTLDs that are currently delegated into the root zone need to be added. And there are also some changes in terms of terminology referred to. The primary contact, as we previously called it, is now the representative of the ccTLD manager. So those terminology changes need to be reflected as well in the ccNSO membership application form. And proposed changes to the form have been added into the background materials that have been circulated to Council prior to this meeting. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Joke. Any questions regarding this item? We had already seen a little preview on our last Council call. And the document was circulated for suggestions and edits. But still. I see no hands up. Thank you very much. We have a decision to make so may I have a mover? I see Javier. May I have a seconder? I see Jenifer. Thank you very much. So this is the decision.

Any questions regarding the resolution or the decision that we have in front of us? I see none so let's go for the vote. We will do it the same way. So please only councilors, use your green ticks if you are in favor, in the Zoom Room, and red crosses if you abstain or are not in favor. Thank you very much. I see only green ticks. You can put them down now. For good measure, I will still ask. Is anyone against this decision. I don't see any hands. Okay. So this had been approved. Thank you.

Now we are going to talk about the adoption of the timeline for the Board seat 11 nomination process and appointment nomination of manager. We have discussed this also in our last Council call. We had decided that it was good to shift a little bit the timeline from outside of the AGM in ICANN75. And the timeline has been shared with us in advance. So do any of the councilors have any questions or comments regarding this? Okay. I see none. May I have a mover? I see Chris is a mover.

JORDAN CARTER: Sorry, Alejandra. I do have a comment to that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh. Sorry, Jordan. Yes, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks. I just wanted to reiterate the point I made in the e-mail list about this board seat. We seat our Board members for three years. And because of the six-month lead time that's needed in the empowered community process, this timeline sees us kicking off the process almost 18 months before the new Board member or existing Board member takes their seat. And I think that's a problem.

So I completely am happy that the timeline that we've got meets the requirements that we have to meet in the ICANN Bylaws—that it stages it out perfectly. I've got no complaints about it and I'm happy to vote for it. But I just think, at the same time, it's fundamentally irrational that it takes this amount of time for us to do this process, even with the background checks.

So I don't think it's a priority, per se. But I think it's something we should keep in mind for the next time we take a look into the broader ICANN Bylaws to say that doing things this far out isn't very helpful for the integrity of the decision-making process here. That's just my opinion.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. We can definitely talk more about this. And then, if we think that it's appropriate, we can, of course, try to go for a Bylaw change. That is, within itself, not an easy task but not an impossible one. So your comment is duly noted and let's keep the conversation ongoing. Any other comment? Yes, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Alejandra. Jordan, I agree with you. I'm wondering whether you think most of the timing issues are—or rather, do you think any of the timing issues are—our issues? Or do you think they're pretty much all because of the way that it's structured within ICANN Bylaws as opposed to the way we do things?

JORDAN CARTER: I would have to go through it with a fine-toothed comb to give a high-quality answer to that. But I think the key sticking point is the requirement for the ECA to certify it six months in advance of the AGM. So I think that's probably the lead time issue that squeezes things most for us. But this is not an area of specialty of mine.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Just recapping. We had our mover, was Chris. Did we have a seconder already? No, right? Thank you, Sean. Sean is

seconding. Thank you very much. So now we have a decision in front of us. And any question regarding the decision itself?

Okay. I see none. Let's move for the vote. Again, please use your green ticks if you are in favor of the decision or your red crosses if you abstain or are not in favor. Okay. Thank you very much. I see only green ticks. You can put them down now. For good measure, is anyone not in favor of this decision? Okay. I see no hands up. This decision has been approved. Thank you so much.

And now we are moving on to the item number four. Again, it's also regarding timelines. It's the adoption of the timeline for the ccNSO Council election and appointment, election of process manager. Here, again, we visited this during our last Council call.

And this particular process was completely tied to the last ICANN meeting of the year, the AGM. But we thought it would be unwise to have such a tight timeline this year because the AGM is so close. It's closer than usual. It's in September instead of the end of October or beginning of November. And we agreed that it made sense to have more time to do our process the usual way. We have the timeline shared in our pack. And I would like to know if there is any questions regarding the timeline.

Okay. I see no hands. Very well. Then we go to the mover and seconder. May I have a mover? Okay. I see three hands. So Demi for mover. And I see Pablo has his hand still up so Pablo for seconder. Thank you so much. Now we have a decision in front of

us to adopt the timeline and also the election manager. That also happened in the last one. Any questions about the decision that we have in front of us? I see none.

So let's go for the voting. Now you know the process. Please use your green ticks in Zoom if you are in favor or your red cross in case you are not. Okay. I'm going through the list. Thank you all. I see only green ticks. Please. You can put them down now. Is anyone against? I don't see any hands up. Thank you very much. This has been approved.

Moving on to the next item, we have the call for expression of interest for the Customer Standing Committee. As I told you at the beginning of the call, we now formally received the request to do the appointment. Brett Carr is the member whose term is ending. His term is not term-limited but still the process needs to happen. And we have a proposed timeline. It is in front of you. Do you have any questions, comments for clarification?

I would like to say that there will be two steps. First, the committee in charge of this will need to handle the members first and then the full slate of the CSC. And the councilors that are appointed for this task are Irina, Jenifer, Biyi, Sean, Jiankang, and Javier. Just a quick reminder that this is coming your way. And I don't see any hands up for comments or questions.

So let's move to the next part, which is may I have a mover? Stephen, thank you very much. May I have a seconder? Chris,

thank you very much. So we have a resolution in front of us. Any questions regarding the resolution itself?

I don't see any hands so let's go for the vote. Please use your green ticks again, if you are in favor, or your red crosses in case you are not. Okay. I only see green ticks. Thank you all so much. Please, you can put them down now. And for good measure, is any of the councilors against this decision? I see no hands up. So this has been approved. Thank you very much.

Okay. Now we have the appointment of the chair and vice-chair of the Internet Governance Liaison Committee, the IGLC. Pierre Bonis has been chair of the IGLC since it was created and he will step down at the end of ICANN74. The proposed chair is Annaliese Williams and Abullah Cemil as vice-chair. Any questions or comments? Any questions, comments? No? Very well. May I have a mover? I see Javier. And I see Tatiana as a seconder. Thank you so much, both of you.

We have a decision here. And I will read this one. It's, "The ccNSO Council appoints Anneliese Williams as chair of the ccNSO Internet Governance Liaison Committee and Abudullah Cemil Akcam as its vice-chair. The ccNSO Council thanks Pierre Bonis, as inaugural chair of the IGLC, for all his relentless efforts to ensure that the IGLC is of permanent value to the ccNSO and broader ccTLD community as evidenced by the successful session organized under the auspices of the IGLC. The secretariat is

requested inform Anneliese, Pierre, Abudullah, and IGLC accordingly and publish this resolution as soon as possible.” Any questions regarding this? I see none.

Let’s go to the vote. So please use your green ticks if you’re in favor, your red checks in case you are not. I only see green ticks. Thank you very much. You can put them down. For good measure, anyone against? No? This has been approved. Thank you very much.

Now we have another appointment. We have the chair and vice-chair of the Meetings Programme Committee. Barbara Povse is chair of the MPC and she will step down at the end of ICANN74. And the proposed chair is Everton Rodrigues from .BR and Gudrun Poulsen from .FO as vice-chair. Any questions or comments? If not, may I have a mover? I see Jenifer, mover, and Sean as seconder. Thank you very much.

I will also read this resolution. “The ccNSO Council appoint Everton Rodrigues as chair of the ccNSO Meetings Programme Committee and Gudrun Poulsen as its vice-chair. The ccNSO Council thanks Barbara Povse wholeheartedly, as chair of the MPC, for all her work, inspiration, and wisdom to ensure that the meetings organized by the MPC remained of high quality and relevancy for the ccNSO and brother ccTLD community, even under the dire circumstances and impact of the pandemic since March 2020. The secretariat is requested to inform Barbara,

Everton, and Gudrun, and the MPC accordingly and publish this resolution as soon as possible.” Any questions regarding this decision.

I see none so let’s go to the vote, please. So you know. Green ticks if you are in favor or red crosses in case you abstain or are not in favor. Going through the list. I see only green ticks. Thank you very much. You may put them down now. Is anyone against this decision? I don’t see any hands up so thank you very much. This has been approved.

Very well. So that concludes the part of all the decisions that we had to make in this Council. Now we moved on to the chair, vice-chairs, councilors or regional organizations updates. I do have some topics to discuss with you. They are on the agenda. It’s regarding the roundtable, the one-on-one with the CEO, and the interpretation pilot. I think we have someone with an open microphone. Done. Thank you.

Okay. So right before the ICANN74, there was a roundtable of the SO/AC chairs. That lasted just half a day. And what was discussed is how do each SO or AC prioritize its work. There was a sharing of the tools that are used and the criteria that is used to make the priorities of their own work inside.

And also there was a review of the health and security measures that were going to happen here in ICANN74. We asked also if we could have any preview of what could be the look of ICANN75. And

the answer that we got is that feedback from this meeting was needed first to see what ICANN75 would look like.

And they gave us an e-mail for feedback. And I will come back to this later because we have an item on the agenda regarding that. And there will also be a survey circulated to the wide community regarding ICANN74. So that will help plan ICANN75. That was just on Sunday that we had this call.

The one-on-one with Goran Marby, this is a standard call that we have before every ICANN meeting. This call is with me and the vice-chairs. It was over Zoom. And I would like to know if Biyi and Jordan would like to say what was discussed over there, if you would like to start.

BIYI OLADIPO: Okay. I can start.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Biyi.

BIYI OLADIPO: Okay. We looked at a few things around what ICANN74 was going to look like and had brief discussions around the structure and every other thing. And then we were asked to raise topics of interest. Jordan raised some issues, which I believe he's going to talk about. And I also raised a couple of issues.

And of special interest was a project that ICANN is bringing to ccTLDs in Africa. Initially, we had had a call with [Laurent Ferrali], and the African councilors, and the leadership of the ccNSO where we were informed about the project. And the general feel is that this is good. It's going to assist the development of ccTLDs in Africa.

And what we all agreed is that the project should be properly set up in that they need to understand what the needs of the ccTLDs were and also be able to assist them appropriately. And also the importance of involving the regional organization, the AfTLD, on how the project was going to run.

Generally, Goran took ownership of the project, and this project was announced, and he actually mentioned that the project was going to be announced at the ITU-D, which was going to happen the following week after the meeting that we had with him. This actually did happen. The announcement was made and a press conference followed after that. And the names of 10 ccTLDs in Africa were mentioned which would be the pilot of this project.

We agreed that this project is essential because a number of ccTLDs in Africa need to be helped. And the success of it, then we'll move on to the next one. So this, for us, was quite interesting and we are looking forward to seeing how this would come. But the general feel is it has to be done properly and the views of the

actors and the ccTLD operators will need to be taken into consideration.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Biyi. Jordan, would you like to say something? I remember ... Oh, yes. Go ahead.

JORDAN CARTER: You say what you remember first. Go on.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. I was going to say do you remember the topic regarding the WHOIS disclosure system—that we were asked to seek for feedback regarding that?

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah. There were two things. Just to let you know, we did make the point again. And there was a bit of a discussion about the waiver that people were asked—the legal language in the waiver that people were asked to attend the ICANN meeting. I think Goran acknowledged that the wording maybe wasn't as kind as it could have been. So there was a bit of a discussion about that which has been raised by some of you with us.

The other point was we're now calling it WHOIS Disclosure System. Goran just asked us this. This isn't a consultation. It's a

pre-pre should we talk about this kind of discussion about whether there would be value in letting ccTLDs opt into it.

And I think, without having thought about it in any great detail, I think the idea would be that if we, as ccTLD managers, had registrars working with us who were also working with gTLDs and making use of this system, it might be a nice simplification for them if they could also get access to ccTLD registration data through the integrated system that will be developed.

But it wasn't a proposal. It wasn't an initiative. It was more a just gentle wondering is how I'd put it. He's scratching his head and wondering a bit aloud with us. I think, Ali, you asked Goran whether he wanted to put it on the agenda for this meeting for us to talk about and he said not really, was my memory.

But those are the only two things I'd mention. It was a nice, friendly meeting. And I'll hand back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Jordan. And that was the summary for the one-on-one with Goran. And looking at the time, I think I should move on to the next one that is in the interpretation pilot. This is something that I'm really excited to talk to you about. Remember, in the past, I talked to you that there was an inquiry whether we could have interpretation during the ccNSO sessions. And it got approved. So we will have some interpretation in two, maybe

three languages, starting on ICANN75. And I would like to ask Kim for more details if possible.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Thanks, Alejandra. You actually covered all my notes here. The topic of 75, one difference, one change you’ll see is that it will include interpretation—as Alejandra said, two, maybe three languages. This is good news. The pilot was approved again for 75, 76, and 77. The pilot will be then evaluated after 77. One of three things could happen—the pilot will be scrapped, the pilot will extend, or there will be budget found to keep it ongoing.

One thing to note, not all sessions will have interpretation. So we will continue work with—unless we want it. I will work with the Council leadership, the working groups chairs, committees, to see which sessions will actually benefit the most from it.

On another note, a comment, I was really just the conduit for this program. Alejandra and Carlos Reyes from ICANN Org were the real shepherds of this project so a special thanks to them. Sorry, Spanish and French.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Those are the top two?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Those are the main ones. Yes.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And maybe Arabic.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Correct.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So thank you very much. As you see, it's up to us that this pilot succeeds. So it's too early right now to give any more details. But when we do, I will ask everyone to spread the news because maybe this will be something that will get our outreach more effective.

Okay. Now, moving on to the next item in the agenda, it's number nine. It's the update of progress for Board consideration proposed on retirement policy. For this, we have Patricio Poblete joining us in the Zoom Room. Hi, Patricio.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Hello, everyone. I wish I was there. That was actually the plan until some unexpected events prevented me from being there. Thank you very much for this invitation that fills an important need to communicate what's happening with the ccPDP-3 policy recommendation on retirement for ccTLDs. We should have done this sooner. And I think that we should continue reporting on what's going on in the future. If we can go to the next slide, please.

Once the Board receives the report from the ccNSO with the proposed policy, it has been mentioned the Bylaws mandate that the Board shall meet to discuss the ccNSO recommendation as soon as feasible after receipt of the Board report from the issue manager. That’s true and that’s what we did. Actually, we discussed that very early after receiving it.

But the full article—we can advance to the next slide—places some condition on that. It says, “Taking into account procedures for Board consideration.” And that’s really important. There are procedures. And the reason for that is that the Board has to decide—and that’s what comes next in the article—if this proposed policy is or not in the best interest of the ICANN community. And for that, it needs to study the matter, has to do some due diligence. And finally, when it makes a decision, it’s has to provide the rationale for it.

So it is not possible to just have a vote as soon as the policy was received, which was something that Nigel and I thought that perhaps could be done. But then I understood that it wasn’t that easy.

So, if we go to the next slide, we can see that that procedure involves a number of things—first, providing public notice so there can be a public comment period. We have had public comments before. I was a member of the committee—the working group that worked on this. So I was very aware that we

have sufficient public comments on this. But nevertheless, there is a mandate that there had to be another public comment period and there was.

There is also a mandate to advise that GAC and that was done, too. There could even be a need for a public forum, which I think that we can escape, given all the opportunities that have been available. Next, please.

So what happened since we received the policy back in September? In the October workshop, the policy was presented to the full Board by Nigel and myself. And it was discussed as mandated by the Bylaws. And the agreement was to create an ad hoc group. Why an ad hoc group? Because the Board has received proposals of new policies from the ccNSO so seldom that there wasn't a structure in place for that, unlike what happens with the GNSO policies, which by the way, have to follow a process, also mandated by the Bylaws, with very similar language. And it does take time for those policies to be processed as everyone knows.

This was posted for public comment from November until January. The GAC was notified in December and the comments were received in January. The BGC, which is the Board Governance Committee, approved the charter and the composition of the ad hoc group, which is composed by Avri, Becky, Katrina, and myself as the chair, with support as subject matter expert by Bart, and also with participation from the IANA

and Legal. We have a meeting every two weeks since. Next, please.

And what have we done? We did first a high-level analysis of the proposed policy. Then we had a detailed reading of the policy and we found no major points of concern. The IANA, on their side, did a study on what it would take to implement this. They found no issues that could generate problems and they saw that this could be accommodated very well within their current procedures.

And a list of pending issues has been collected. And they have yet to be considered one by one. Not all these issues will be or should be dealt with by this group. But some will. One that I think will not be is the omission of the retirement from the carveout of the IRP. The language in the Bylaws only makes an exception of the IRP for delegations and redelegations and says nothing about the retirement. And that omission has been pointed out by legal. Of course, there is also this issue of using the word “redelegation.” That’s supposed to be deprecated. That’s something else to fix.

I hope the ccNSO will handle this and probably the same ccPDP-3 group that continues to work on a review. But that’s an example of the issues that we’ve noted and that need to be addressed. And we’re awaiting a check on other potential issues. Next, please.

The analysis and the decision that needs to be made on the proposed policies for top priority. But we have a second priority, which is another task that was given to us in the charter of the ad

hoc group, which is to study and make a proposal about how to handle future ccPDP proposals so we won't need to do this in an ad hoc way like this time. There has been some preliminary work on this topic and it will probably be something along the lines of the caucuses. But as I said, this is our second priority. So we will go. We'll do a deep dive into this once we are done with the main task, which is the current proposed policy itself. That's my update and I welcome your questions. And also, as I say, this communication about what we're doing is something that we should continue doing in the future. So I would welcome invitations to report to the Council again in the coming weeks and months. I hope for not very long. But that's it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Patricio, for the update. I do see a queue forming up. The first one is Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank, Alejandra. Hey, Patricio. Good to see you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Good to see you, too.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: You can't really see me but anyway. Could you go back a couple ...? I've got a couple of questions and comments. Could you go

back a couple of slides for me, Kim, please? That's the one. Start there. Patricio, can you explain why a decision of the Board in October to set up an ad hoc group wasn't finalized and the group didn't start working until March?

PATRICIO POBLETE:

That's a question I asked myself a couple of times during that time. There needed first to be a charter to be prepared. That was a task assigned and it was completed. It took longer than I expected, I must say. But I also understood that these are matters that go through an internal process in the Org. And once there was a draft, it was checked on by Legal. And then it had to find its place in the agenda of the BGC. Bottom line, something that I expected could have been faster ended up taking two months. There was also Christmas and the New Year in between. I suppose that also helped with the delay.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Sure. Thank you. Could you move on to the next slide for me, please, Kim? I get the high-level analysis thing, no problem. And I get the detailed reading, finding no major points of concern. And IANA, no problems. So where I'm at a big loss is this list of pending issues has arrived from where? Because if a detailed reading found no major points of concern, then why is there a list of pending issues? And who decided what they were?

PATRICIO POBLETE: The group. Anytime said, “What about this?” we made a note of it to consider it later. This thing of not being major points of concern is my judgment. So I don’t think that in this list there are any major points of concern. But there are some loose ends that we should try to tie.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. I’ve just got one more which assuming that—on the last slide, assuming that the subsection of work that you need to do in respect to future ccPDP recommendations is of less importance—isn’t going to delay, shall I say, doing PPD-3, are you able, then ...? Has this ad hoc committee and/or the Board set themselves a timeline that you’re able to communicate to us?

Because it seems to me that if we have a timeline that we can hold you to and you’re prepared to be held to, then that’s fair. But if the Board is just asking us to sit back and wait without any indication of timing at all at this stage—and that’s the message that you’re delivering—then I think we would probably be wanting to communicate with the Board. I certainly would be recommending we communicate with the Board and ask them to provide us with a timeline. Do you have any clues about how long it might take?

PATRICIO POBLETE: The formal answer is no. The group has not set yet an explicit timeline for our future work. So I wouldn't be in a position to give it to you right now. I can take that question back to the group and report. My personal estimate is that we're very close to complete our work on that first top-priority task. I would be very surprised if I would be reporting in several additional occasions about that work. But that's just my personal estimate. I can promise to go back to the group and come back with an answer.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Patricio. I see Nick and Stephen so I will ask you to please be very brief because we are running out of time. We have about five minutes left of the call, just to time it.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Always brief. Thank you very much, Patricio. It's really nice to have the feedback. I think one of the things I'd like to have is we should have had this feedback six months ago. It's not really a surprise that the IANA haven't found any problems with it because they were involved in the whole flipping process of designing the thing. So similarly with the GAC, we presented this a number of times to the GAC as we went through the whole thing. It's not a very complicated process. It's taken us five years and it's still counting before we've even done it.

It's just really terrible that it's taken so long and it's been so inefficient. And then the Board process is effectively duplicating the same things that we went through when we were formulating the process in terms of public comments, and GAC input, and IANA input, and everything. It's just really, really frustrating, I guess, that you think we've done it, wrapped it up in bow, all ready just to be rubber-stamped, and then we find that there's months, and months, and months more delay to repeat some of the things that we've done. So I understand what you're saying. It's nice that we should have known this. But it's frustrating.

And from the point of the prioritization that we have to do, we've only got a limited amount of people, and volunteers, and time. And we've got to be more efficient about how we do this—just trying to work out is it just that ICANN is just rubbish at everything and five years is a reasonable time to do something quite simple? It's just really, really disappointing, I guess, that we've come to this point and we still don't really know when it's going to be done.

I'll shut up because I think I made my point. But I do appreciate you giving the update and it's been great to have that. But we've got to be better, surely, at doing these things. This is not rocket science. This is quite a simple policy to do something pretty straightforward. Just because it's discovered that retirement is not part of the carveout from IRP, I don't think that really changes the price of fish. So just need to crack on with that. Thanks.

PATRICIO POBLETE: I must say, Nick, that I share your feeling. You talk about the five years. Well, I was there two. So I know what we did. And it was a little bit of a surprise to me that we had to have yet another public comment period. But that’s what the Bylaws mandate.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. And Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Patricio, don’t take this personally. It’s really directed at the entire Board. This creative inaction, I think, is not only inexcusable. I think it’s insulting to the volunteer community that, as Nick pointed out, has worked a long, long time on this policy. I don’t understand why it appears the Board got caught flatfooted when this policy was delivered to them. We’ve been working on it for years. The Board’s known that. The working group has been the butt of jokes within the Board for taking so long, if I understand correctly. So it should not have been a surprise when this policy pitched up.

And it’s been over six months. You can’t tell us how much longer it’s going to take. We have no idea. The working group has no idea what the “other issues” that you’re referring to in your slide. It’d be nice to have some semblance of communication from the Board to the working group of any concerns or questions that you

might have. We've heard nothing—nothing—from you guys since the policy was delivered to you for your consideration other than acknowledgment that the GAC said they were okay with it.

And from a communications standpoint, this stinks. I think it's completely unacceptable, not only for the members of this working group but for the entire community—not just the ccNSO but the other SOs/ACs as well that may be sending policy up your way. This has got to be improved. The communication simply has to be improved. There has to be a hell of a lot more back and forth between working groups that propose policy that's up for the Board's consideration.

This has just been a black hole. It's just unacceptable and it's insulting, in my view, to the community. And it's ironic that we're having this discussion at an ICANN meeting that's dedicated to policy development when it's not at all clear, to me at least, that the Board is interested in actually accepting any policies developed and presented to them. Thank you .

PATRICIO POBLETE:

Stephen, I thank you for echoing my words at the beginning that communication is important and that we should have done this much sooner. I do not agree at all with your use of the word “inaction.” I hope that what I've presented today is taken by my colleagues as anything else but inaction. There's been action. We

are working on it. I wish that some of these processes were faster but they're not. And we're doing our best.

One thing I can assure our community is my personal evaluation that I don't see, actually, any obstacles that would be in the way of this becoming adopted policy. We just have to go through the proper processes. If there had been anything that could endanger the adoption of the policy, I'm sure I would have come back to the community sooner because that would have meant that in all these years that we were working on it, we did something wrong. And I totally think that that's not the case.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Patricio. And thank you all. I think it's clear that we will get more updates from now on and communication will improve. We are almost running out of time. But I would like to go briefly to our next point. Any feedback that you wish ICANN to know regarding the ICANN74 meeting should be sent to the e-mail that I'm putting in the chat. And with this, I would like to give a quick reminder on the ccNSO Satisfaction Survey that has been sent to your e-mails because the ccNSO would also like to know your feel of the sessions during ICANN74.

Again, due to time constraints, we are going to skip the section D and we will move straight to any other business. In any other business, we already have a letter from CENTR to ICANN CEO. And

I wonder if Nick will give an introduction. I know that Roelof is here and might like to comment on that. Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah. Thank you. Obviously, I'm from the European region and this is a European matter, primarily. But obviously, ICANN is doing a lot of political lobbying with the Commission in Brussels to influence legislation. And I guess they seem, in this case, to have overstepped the mark in terms of ccTLD policies and not really matters for ICANN, the Board, or the Organization to make direct interventions with legislators in our territory to essentially promote gTLD practices or things like that as being good for the ccTLDs in the European region.

And I think this is a worrying step here. I know, obviously, the GDPR thing was a bit of a disaster for ICANN. I think they could have done it much better. But I'm not sure whether this is the right way to go about it. I think, certainly, the letter sets out the concerns from the regional organization for Europe.

And I think it's going to be a source of unhappiness and friction between the European ccTLDs and the ICANN staff/ICANN Organization members, which is really disappointing because we've always enjoyed a really positive relationship with them previous to this. I just wanted to highlight the issue. I think it's an important enough one that we need to have it on our radar, unfortunately. Thanks. That's all I'm saying.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. Roelof, would you like to say something?

ROELOF MEIJER: Just briefly. Just to make sure, I'm speaking in my role as a member of the CENTR board. What Nick referred to is an amendment that ICANN proposed to the European government on the NIS2 Directive, or the draft for the NIS2 Directive, in context of the negotiations about that directive. And that amendment specifically mentioned ccTLDs. So there is a content part and there is a procedure part in this thing.

We were alerted by CENTR members that expressed a concern. They were alerted by their governments or contacted by their governments. We felt this was of strategic importance, mainly because of what Nick just mentioned, the procedure, but also because of the content because we got the impression that the amendment suggested that gTLD-like procedures should be imposed on the ccTLD registries.

We discussed that yesterday with the ICANN CEO and the government engagement staff. And we concluded together that the content part was a misunderstanding. ICANN did not mean that gTLD-like policies should be imposed on ccTLD registries. We also discussed about the procedure. And we have agreed that to avoid misunderstandings in the future, ICANN will, from now on,

communicate with CENTR if it makes reactions to European policy initiatives that impact ccTLDs. And we've also agreed that we will intensify our collaboration and synchronization in these policy matters.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks, Roelof. That's good to hear. I guess, obviously, NIS2 is a high-interest area and very controversial. What becomes European policy, as we've seen in data protection, sometimes becomes global policy. So these are very sensitive matters, as you well know. But it's really nice. And thank you for taking the time to update us and to have that meeting with ICANN as well.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Thank you very much, Roelof and Nick, for the update. Definitely, coordination regarding these delicate matters is very, very important. And it doesn't hurt to remind the [feeling] ccTLDs to be contacted first regarding matters that can be later relegated to governments so it can be coordinated correctly.

Thank you all. With this, I know we are a little bit over time. Sorry for the tech team. But I promise this is one 30-second last thing. It's all the thank yous that we have for the entire ICANN74 meeting.

I would like to start to thank Roelof Meijer and the .NL team for the wonderful ccTLD gathering—that it was heartwarming event

where we could catch up with many friends while missing the ones that couldn't come but still remaining hopeful to see them in the future.

We would also like to thank Barbara Povse for being the chair of the MPC, Pierre Bonis as inaugural chair of IGLC. We would like to thank the MPC, Tech Working Group, SOPC, TLD Ops, and all the ccNSO working groups for organizing the sessions for this meeting. Thank all the volunteers that contributed to the work of the ccNSO for sharing their experiences to the broader community, in-person and remotely. Thank you to the secretariat for their outstanding support, production of materials, and patience. Thank you all for attending this session. The meeting is closed. And please, councilors, remain in the room. We need to take a photo.

BART BOSWINKEL: You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]