
ICANN76 | CF – ccNSO & ccTLD-related Board Members
Wednesday, March 15, 2023 – 16:30 to 17:30 CUN

SUSIE JOHNSON:

Hello, and welcome to ccNSO- and ccTLD-related Board members session. My name is Susie Johnson, and along with Devan and Claudia, we are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if you put in the proper form, as I've noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the moderator of this session.

Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, French, and Arabic. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room, and once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

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.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I will hand the floor over to Alejandra, our session moderator. I'm sorry, Jordan Carter, our session moderator.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Susie. This is Alejandra Reynoso speaking. Welcome today to our meeting with the ccTLD-related Board members and the ccNSO. Due to some scheduling conflicts, we will switch the order of the topics that we are discussing today. We will start with the progress and thinking on the holistic review pilot proposal given by ccNSO feedback. For this, the lead would be Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much. I'm very happy to ask the first question. As you might know, in November last year, 2022, the ccNSO Council submitted its comments to the pilot holistic review draft terms of reference. In our submission, we expressed our serious concerns about the scope, structure, and lack of clarity regarding the starting conditions outlined in this draft.

We are very well aware that other parts of the ICANN community submitted their comments, and some of the comments had similar concerns. We would like to know, first of all, specifically, how our feedback has been taken into account, or is being taken into account,

and, of course, more generally, where this process is now, at what stage, and what the next steps are. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. I'll take the first question. I'm happy to answer it. But before I go into holistic review, let me thank .MX and every participant of yesterday's event for this unforgettable experience. Thank you very much. And, well, those people who party hard, they also work hard. And, yes, all your comments have been received. And, believe me, they were thoroughly analyzed and work to improve terms of reference document is underway.

Let me give you some background information. So, as you know, ATRT3, review team, they came up with a list of recommendations. And one of the recommendations is, indeed, to introduce holistic review, which would actually look at, holistically, all structures within ICANN, and at their continuous improvement programs, to ensure that ICANN organizations continue to evolve.

From the Board side, this work is coordinated by the Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee, or OEC, for short. And because the main goal or main tasks of the OEC is to review and provide oversight of all the reviews, all specific and organizational reviews. ATRT3, when they proposed holistic review, they proposed it as a specific review, which would substitute organizational reviews or periodic reviews, as they are called in the bylaws.

So, part of volunteers from the OEC, together with some representatives from ATRT3 team, they started working on the terms of

reference document, which was presented to the community, and, indeed, received a lot of comments, both positive and not so supportive, or, as you said, expressing concerns. What we did, that was the task that OEC carried out with support from staff. We analyzed all the comments we received. They were grouped into several categories. Those that were supportive, those which expressed some concerns regarding the scope, regarding the timing, how long such a review would take, and all those resources that would be required from the community to ensure that we can carry this specific review.

And all those comments, as I said, they were grouped, and we tried to look how we can address those comments, how can we prove clarity of the document, how can we maybe reshape the scope of the pilot holistic review, the goal of the pilot holistic review, to ensure that we can meet, well, first of all, objectives that were set in the ATRT3 report, and then also address gaps which were identified by the Board when the Board approved recommendation 3.5 from the ATRT3 report.

And, actually, we had a meeting, OEC reported the work to the Board on Sunday, so we explained what had been done, so asked for guidance and approval to move forward with the approach that we discussed. And this week we also had a meeting with those people from ATRT3 side who worked on the document to see how they view the work and how we could proceed further.

So, to summarize, terms of reference, the team will continue its work to ensure that we accommodate and address all the concerns that have been expressed, plus ensure that those people who supported the idea expressed in the first [tour] are still happy with the result. And I hope

that very soon we're going to be able to come up with a result of our work. Thank you.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much for such a comprehensive answer, Katrina. I have two small follow-ups. First of all, so we can expect significantly revised draft at some point, right?

KATRIAN SATAKI: Well, at least we're working on the draft, yes.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, so I want to make a short note here that, in principle, our problem with the scope was that it was so vague and undefined, so we basically expect if this will proceed in this way, shape or form, the group which is going to be performing this review will spend a good half of its time arguing about terms of references and the scope. So, we do not take this lightly, and I hope you don't either. So, we are looking forward to see the result of revision. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Due to some scheduling conflicts, I will need to break this topic now, because we do have a follow-up question on this topic. But I would like to go back to topic number one, to take advantage that Tripti is already here, and to ask her the first question that we have, that is, what are the Board's goals for 2023, and are any of them highly related to ccNSO affairs? And this topic is also being led by Jordan.

TRIPTI SINHA: First, thank you very much for inviting me. Could you repeat the second part of the question I didn't hear?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sure. The second part is, are any of the Board's goals highly related to ccNSO affairs?

TRIPTI SINHA: Well, first, once again, thank you for inviting me, and I'd like to congratulate you on your 20 years of being created, so congratulations on that. What are the priorities? We got a whole bunch, and I think everyone knows what I'm going to say. Number one, we really want to move the ball forward when it comes to SubPro, and I think you're seeing a lot of things in action there.

Number two, we did get the registration data resolution passed for requesting for registration data, so that is underway as well. There's a grant program that's underway as well. The next thing is improving community relations. I think things were sort of stagnant because of COVID and so forth. Coming to a meet-me point, arriving at consensus, compromise, might have fallen by the wayside. I think it's time for us to reconnect and re-energize and get work done, so that's another priority.

Efficiencies inside the Board. We had a workshop in October where we're looking to improve our own efficiency so we can move things and expedite things and get things to completion. So that's yet another big

project that's underway. So that's more or less broadly what our priorities are, and just getting things worked on. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Tripti. Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Yes, I would like to add a bit. So first of all, really congratulations on the 20th anniversary, and the event was great. But I can commend that you can see that we Board members who have been there are very brave because we were afraid a little bit that they will again put us on some boats until midnight. So we came here. And you can also see that from the Board, the ccNSO is very important. Not only the Board affiliated members are here and we have our chair, but I can also see at least a couple of Board members also in the public.

So on the topics coming to the Board, we highly value contribution by the ccNSO. I have just today also covered the contribution that is coming from the strategic SOP group from the ccNSO on the budget. And our finance and planning team is also here to listen to the comments you can make.

So one of the things that was always coming from the ccNSO side and was very important for you is about prioritization. It goes to effective work of the ICANN as the whole trinity, and [inaudible]. So I would like to speak a little bit more about planning and prioritization process. And fiscal year 25 process will start in April of this year. And planning prioritization group will comprise of members from the stakeholders group as listed in the framework. And the stakeholder leadership is

being asked to nominate one primary member and one secondary member to participate in the prioritization process by the end of March.

Of course, prioritization means how to effectively work, what are the most important stuff for the whole ICANN. And this is why the ccNSO is very important in this process. But also how best to use our resources and what are the things that might be less important or even things that should not be forever discussed can be moved out of our processes.

So following the completion of the fiscal year 24 planning prioritization process, as the result of the lessons learned process, several improvements to the framework have been incorporated in the framework version three now published. There are enhancements to the framework to clarify the activities that are eligible to prioritize along with the frequency as to how often activities should be prioritized.

ICANN focus remains firmly on the prioritization and allocation resources needed to successfully implement the operation initiatives and functional activities in the draft fiscal year 24 to 28 operation and financial plan and the fiscal year 24 operation plan and budget. The planning prioritization community group is still a new step in the annual planning process and the work of the members is received as input to the Org as they develop the five-year plan and annual draft plans.

The planning prioritization framework has enhanced the planning process and provides an open and transparent approach for the community, Org and Board to collaborate efficiently and effectively during the planning process. Therefore, this framework has improved the planning process. Well, I wanted to be quite precise, so I had to read that part prepared by the financial department, but I think we are also

here to discuss. So, Jordan and ccNSO, if there are any additional questions of how we can do better and how better to incorporate also feedback and input from your side. Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Sorry, I'm going from meeting to meeting and I forgot to mention two other priorities that we have and they're so obvious that I didn't want to make sure I didn't leave them on the table. One is, of course, a primary priority for the Board is to hire its next CEO. So, all of you know that process is underway. I don't need to talk more about it, but I didn't want to leave the room without mentioning it.

And the other thing is DNS abuse. As you know, Becky's been working closely with the contracted parties. We have made significant progress there, so you will hear more about that as well. But there are contractual obligations that are being built into our contracts, so that is significant as well. So, two other priorities that I forgot about just because I'm running and I don't have a list handy and I thought they were obvious, but maybe not to everyone. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you, Tripti, and thank you, Danko, for your comments. It's great to have you here in the room along with your other Board colleagues. Danko, you've kind of stolen the thunder from my next question, but I'm just going to run through it anyway. If we could move the slide on to slide number two and I should introduce myself. I'm Jordan Carter from .au, Internet Governance and Policy Director there and one of the two vice chairs of the ccNSO Council.

Setting ICANN's priorities has been a bit of a priority for us to raise in the community since the 2017 Joburg meeting when there was a plenary discussion about it. It's good to have seen the prioritization framework be built in the first working round of that group. I'm kind of asking this question for completeness because I think you might have answered it already, Danko. But the SOPC contributions that we've made and there's that long background of asking for them. And last year, the new framework was introduced to improve the process for ICANN. Can the community expect any further additional improvements to the ones that you've already described today? I didn't manage to catch them all. I was trying to write them down as you were discussing them. And is it the same framework as you've mentioned that will be used for the next five-year plan and annual operating plan and budget? And I guess the last one is an opinion piece. Do you think that this whole bit of work has improved the prioritization process for ICANN?

DANKO JEVTGOVIC:

Thank you for the questions. I think that we are with the prioritization in sort of a continuous improvement process. Inputs from the community are very important for us because they enable us to build that process that really works and show the results. One of the challenges for our organization is that prioritization process. I think it's so important because it actually changes the way how we approach the work. In the kind of the old style, it was expected that anything that comes up will be done immediately. Now, we understand that resources are limited and the growth—we still have growth, of course, but in a way it's kind of a different environment. So it's a more mature

organization. But also the prioritization process is still maturing and I think more inputs will be needed.

One of the important points that I see is that still some of the parts of the communities need to recognize that prioritization does not create additional bandwidth for the work. It just prioritizes the things that are more important to be done first. And we see very positive results, I believe, on all levels of ICANN of more focus on deliveries. Tripti mentioned the general priorities and I just wanted to add that my vest is on the SubPro because this is something that is now we see really moving out. We will have a tomorrow formal Board meeting and this is something that is happening. And I think it's important, of course, for the G side, but also for a lot of cc registries because it will impact the whole ecosystem of ICANN.

JORDAN CARTER:

Okay, thank you. Do any of the other Board members have anything to add on this process? We're also doing this ourselves inside the ccNSO for the first time, building an improved way of working through our own incoming work requests and making sure that we do our own side of the prioritization task to focus our work as well. We're doing that through the triage committee. Becky.

BECKY BURR:

That's great news. Can you share what you are learning and coming up with with us? Because I think that's part of the continuous improvement. And you guys are always better at the prioritization and planning stuff than we are generally.

JORDAN CARTER:

If we have time, Alejandra, I can speak on it for one minute or we can move on and I can give something in writing later. Up to you. Yeah, the basis of it was to do, I think, an impact effort analysis of the work coming in and then to get all of our work in one tool where we could see it all in one place. So that's all I wanted to say. Both of those are still works in progress. And the secretariat team, Bart and Joke and [inaudible] absolutely integral to doing that. And it's letting us start to see properly the interactions between things, not creating periods of time when we have a sudden unexpected overlap of work, seeing interrelationships and so on.

So it's at an early stage, but that's the direction that we're going in. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Jordan and [inaudible]. We are now retaking the third topic, which we started, because we have a related question from the Board members regarding the holistic review. And it is, how does ccNSO envision and takes care of continuous improvement? And for this, we have Sean.

SEAN COPELAND:

Hi, thanks. I'll take a holistic approach to my response. At a high level, the ccNSO deals with continuous improvement, utilizing regular assessment, goal setting, stakeholder engagement, both directly and indirectly, communication with SOs and ACs, as well as the Org and the Board, amongst others. We then make every effort to evaluate the

incoming information to improve how we operate as a ccNSO. There is a genuine commitment on our part to be better. In fact, during this recent ICANN prep meeting that we had as council, we've looked at existing liaisons and working groups and are expecting by next ICANN to have a determination on which, if any of those, are no longer needed. This is a positive exercise and is directly related to a broader objective of succession planning within the ccNSO, and that includes identifying key areas and positions, capabilities that are required for those, and taking into account people that are wanting to do that and determining what type of improvements they require to achieve that. And then, of course, implementing outright succession and knowledge transfer plans are topics for ourselves.

The ccNSO is also aware that we have a lot of work items that are still needing to be completed over time. We understand that there is volunteer fatigue within our community, and this is something that we recognize is also in ICANN generally and across multi-stakeholder grassroots organizations everywhere. We have no simple answer for that. I wish we did.

Nevertheless, we have done a considerable amount of work over the last year. We have updated our rules twice. We have introduced a conflict of interest and a statement of interest policy. And as you are well aware, we have three PDPs that are in the pipeline.

I do want to bring up that one of the things that is helpful for a volunteer community is the leadership program, of which I was able to take part of. At a personal level, I think that this is something that ICANN should look at, maybe increasing the frequency of that to give more

opportunity to persons coming up and are being noted as potential leaders in the future.

I do want to mention the work of our SOPC group, which you have mentioned. This is a group that, even though they do fairly good work, are still looking to do better. They want to do better, and that's a positive. And then Internet governance is becoming an issue, and that means many things to different people, much as DNS abuse. However, at the end of the day, we have come to learn that being the layer that everything sits upon is relatively important, and I believe you will see us moving forward in there.

Finally, within all of that, small changes are also important. Small changes are also important, and we have discovered that having consistency in language helps, especially our non-English speaking members of the community. And we are slowly starting to work toward having almost like a universal dictionary terminology so that terms are used across our work consistently to help the members of the community. And in all of that, I would hope that you would see that as the ccNSO is becoming a mature entity and going a little bit more beyond transparency and actually looking towards an example of good governance within the community. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, Sean. Those are all great things that ccNSO is doing, but I wanted to ask from a different perspective. ATRT3 report, when speaking about continuous improvement program, envisioned that SO/ACs would have yearly or annual surveys to learn how members see the SO/AC—in our case, ccNSO—and how members see all those

changes, those continuous improvement efforts. Have you thought about surveying members? And I'm not talking about surveys that we have after each meeting. I'm talking about surveys about the organization, how happy, well, generally happy members are with the organization and the way it evolves.

SEAN COPELAND:

So I'll speak to this as chair of the GRC, to which you are formally. It is something that I have thought about. It is something that I do want to bring to the table. One of the issues that I was looking at, Katrina, was I wanted us to have a foundation on good governance, which I believe we get with the SOI, COI, and what has come before. And with that, we have a platform to start realistically going to the members and saying, okay, we have this foundational base in terms of good governance. This is what we are doing across the board with the various work groups. This is where we're projecting we're going to go. And then you can start deriving the questions from that.

So I will anticipate that we will be taking that to the community, 77 or at worst, 78, but it is coming.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Sean and Katrina. And I know that Xavier is here in the room and that he would like to be telling us a little brief comments regarding prioritization as well. Xavier?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Only if there's time. If you have time at the end, I'm happy to do that. If you have other topics, I don't want to hijack your conversation.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I think it would be best to do it now because we are changing topic again. So it's better if you—but be brief, please.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. I'll start by the end of those questions. Has the prioritization process improved? There's a narrow window. At the minimum, I think what we have seen, and hopefully you have seen this too, is that the fact that we carried out that framework of prioritization. And Chris Disspain was the representative of the ccNSO for ...

In that group, it has given the opportunity for everyone to understand a bit better what prioritization is across the community and to also see the benefits in action. Because we've been talking about it a lot before for a number of months or years. This was showing what it is to prioritize and a practical, intended, designed benefit of it was that we prioritized together the work of implementation of community recommendations.

And guess what happens right after? We put in motion that work and then that work was prioritized, funded, and it progresses. And Giovanni Seppia, whom you may know a little bit, is in charge of doing that with his team. And this has been progressing very well. And we're on plan after that prioritization exercise to get that work done. So I think that is a demonstration that it can work.

A small comment. When I mentioned that we should try to organize a prioritization across the community two or three years ago, people were laughing at me, right? But it happened and you guys made it happen and it showed that it was working. So I think that this was at least a small scope demonstration that it can work in our multi-stakeholder environment.

About the next period or next years, in my mind, so the next stage is evolution of this experiment, in quotes, I think it is, to integrate the prioritization across the entire ecosystem. So that framework is bringing the community organizations together to seek input from the community about prioritization. But at the end of the day, when the Board looks at their topics, when the community looks at their topic of interest, and when the Org looks at the topic that they're supporting, it's all the same topics. We're all working on the same things. Of course we are. So we should look at prioritization across the ecosystem, not just community, Board and Org, if you see what I'm saying, because we're looking at the same list.

And by the way, if we look at the same list and we prioritize the same list, then we're all going to be a lot more efficient because we're going to be working on the same things as priorities together. And so that, I think, is the next direction for the next years, is to have a prioritization process and framework that we are all working on together in the same and only one. And that then is allowing us also to be aligned, to be understanding who is working on what, because we're all working on the same things and we're all prioritizing together. So I think this is the next stage based on this relatively small, narrow experience so far. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Very brief comment in response to your question, Tatiana. Community prioritized pilot holistic review, holistic review in general, so we treat it as such. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you very much. And with this, we move to our last topic, that is an update and discussion on implementation and review of the ccNSO developed policies. And for this, I have Sean leading this topic.

SEAN COPELAND: Hello again. How would you evaluate the possibilities to improve the effectiveness of the collaboration between the Board, ccNSO and ICANN staff on the tracking and implementation of ccNSO PDPs? What do you think are distinct roles and responsibilities that should be there to make collaboration the most efficient?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Well, as others have said, I'm very glad to be here and very glad that I was part of the celebration last night. It was a really unforgettable experience, and thanks to organizers and to NIC-Mexico for their invitation. I understand that this question is about implementation. And so I'd like to begin by giving you some information that is possibly outside of the question, but I think that's relevant because you might be interested in knowing what's been happening with implementation of the retirement policy.

On my request as a chair of the ad hoc group, the IANA sent me a short update. The IANA reports that they are operationalizing... Is that a word? It's their word, not mine. They're operationalizing the policy, and their schedule is to have all the work completed by the end of fiscal year. This is June 30. This primarily involves developing internal procedures that would be used in the event of a retirement. So there isn't much left to do. They plan, as I said, that they'll be ready by the end of the fiscal year.

What would happen in the event that there would be a need to make use of the policy before that, they also have a plan for that. The triggering event for the policy is the removal of a country from the ISO 3166-1 list, which would likely be triggered by a country ceasing to exist or ceasing to be recognized by the UN.

While we don't know of any world events that would suggest such an event is imminent, should this happen prior to June 30, the IANA would accelerate their planning and implementation work as a priority. So I think that it is well covered, and the policy is well on its way to finishing its implementation.

Now, about the implementation in general, not only of this policy, but of any future policy coming from the ccNSO. Before going into the question itself, again, I have something else to report, which is that the ad hoc group also, besides advising the Board on the approval on the adoption of the policy, as you know it happened, it also prepared an outline of how future policy proposals should be processed and how that would either lead to their adoption or to sending it back to the ccNSO council and all that process.

But in the event that a policy is adopted, the outline document that we prepared in the ad hoc group says that once ccPDP policy recommendation is adopted by the Board, the group that would be tasked with handling that proposal would remain in place to provide the strategic advice to ICANN during the implementation phase, including advising on coordination with the ccNSO Council as necessary for clarification. And the mandate of this group to handle a specific ccPDP would end upon receipt of ICANN's final implementation report of the approved ccPDP policy recommendation. So there is already some plan for providing a follow-up and advising ICANN Org on the implementation of a policy from the Board's side.

Now, going to what would the ccNSO do during that time and how would that relate to what the Board would be doing and ICANN Org, what we can say is that we are really very looking forward to the output that you could get from the work that you've already initiated I was yesterday in the session where that was a topic and we're really glad that the ccNSO is proactively working on how to best support the implementation process.

And we also understand that that's a really good idea, as you're doing, to learn from the experience of the GNSO that as many other policies under their belt and already developed mechanisms and structures for advising and helping that process. And we're confident that that would lead to a good outcome that could then be adopted and used whenever policy approved by the Board from the ccNSO enters this implementation phase. That's what I can answer to your question.

SEAN COPELAND: Okay. Thank you very much, Patricio. Can I do a little follow-up? Do you feel that going forward or for subsequent PDPs versus the ones that are in the pipeline that the ccNSO Board member seats are the appropriate liaisons? And I only bring that up because in yesterday's conversation, the GNSO was looking at a slightly different model. And I'm just curious what you think about that.

PATRICIO POBLETE: In the outline document that I mentioned, there is a leading role for the two ccNSO appointed Board members. At least one of them, or maybe both jointly, should take the lead in getting the group started and probably chairing the group while it's working and after the policy is adopted, advising on the implementation. I see that as a natural thing to happen. I don't know if my colleagues would have a different opinion or if they would concur to that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. And the fact that Patricio just mentioned, that's about how to initiate the process within the Board. Your question was more about liaisons, right? And while I think that would be preferable to have ccNSO-related liaisons to groups, maybe in some cases, some subject matter experts from the Board would be more suitable as liaisons because they would understand the substance of the PDP. So I think it would really depend on the situation and the topic.

SEAN COPELAND: Thank you so much. That's informative.

BECKY BURR: Just with respect to implementation, and I think Chris will agree with me on that, the implementation troubles that the GNSO has had are things that you can learn from not to do.

SEAN COPELAND: That, I think, is our hope.

PATRICIO POBLETE: It's always a good idea to learn from the errors of others.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, thank you all for your participation. I wonder if there is any other comment or question from the ccNSO community that they would like to ask to their ccTLD-related Board members. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: The plenary session this morning on the WSIS+20 review and the multi-stakeholder model, one of the things that was coming through in the discussion was wanting to see some coordination in evidence between ICANN and other technical community organizations. Is that a live discussion in the Board? Is there anything you could share about that?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Yes, thank you for the question. We see new and improved dynamics in discussions about these subjects in the Board. So, we think the coordination, or how to say it, more dynamic and improved relations with these organizations is something that is very important for ICANN.

As we often discuss, we are all, and the DNS and ICANN and the whole ecosystem is coming through new geopolitical challenges. This is something very important for the Board. So, we think the way forward is to understand more, to talk with the governments in other organizations more, but also to align better and to be generally a better communicator, to understand issues from the others and also to explain our ICANN's technical limit to both governments and to coordinate with other organizations. So, in short, yes. Yes, please.

BECKY BURR:

I think the coordination of work among the I* organizations really fell off during the pandemic and for a variety of reasons. That's one specific area that the Board has identified. But for those of you who were at the listening session on the CEO search, the issue of sort of that kind of interaction, coordination and diplomacy came up over and over and over again. And that was an issue that we heard quite a lot about. And it is an issue that internally the Board was quite aligned with the thinking of the Board.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Well, thank you. Any other topic or comment or question for ccTLD-related Board members? Javier?

JAVIER RUA JOVET:

Hi. Javier Rua for the record, NomCom-appointed ccNSO councilor. I just wanted to convey my personal opinion and I've heard it from others. I wanted to express it to Tripti directly that her statement in the opening ceremony was very consequential, I think. And I was actually

surprised that she went so straight to critical issues that are at the heart of what we do here in ICANN and ccNSO particularly. And the value of the defense of the multi-stakeholder model. And the cc community is, and we say this, our diversity is so reflective of what we strive for in multi-stakeholderism. Just diverse governance models, diverse points of view. And I just truly appreciated the way that the chairwoman expressed herself. And also the feeling that I'm getting from the Board. It was true in the past also. But also what was just mentioned, the listening session, this dynamic of truly going to issues and listening to ourselves. I truly appreciate it. So we thank you. I thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much and thanks a lot, Javier, for your comment. And related to that, I know that very often ccNSO people, when asked about these interactions with Board members, they say, oh, we don't like scripted meetings. So how did you like this meeting and what would you like to see changed to make sure that we do not have scripted meetings?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND:

How about I ask a question that's not on the script?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Exactly. That was my point. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'm not answering your question specifically, but I do have a question. And I guess perhaps in particular because there are people on the search committee for the new CEO. My question is really, I guess, a general question for Board members. So anybody, please feel free to answer. But not having a CEO in place for what looks like potentially a year or more, if we say the resignation happened in December. And as we heard at the main session a couple of days ago, the expectation is end of calendar year or early next calendar year. Given the criticality of the work of ICANN, are you concerned about not having a CEO for a year or more? Recognizing you do have a very qualified interim, but nevertheless an interim.

BECKY BURR: Ideally, we would have a permanent CEO in place, but we don't. And I think that the decision has been that it's better to get it right than to move too quickly. We have the luxury of making that calculus because we do have somebody who's very seasoned, who has been a CEO in the past, who knows the organization intimately. And we also do have great staff, people who are firing on all cylinders. I think just look at the amount of work that's been accomplished in the last couple of months. It really feels like Org hasn't missed a beat. So, yes, it would be great to have a permanent CEO faster, but doing it right and getting the right person, and understanding what the characteristics and qualities of the right person are before we go out and do that. It just takes time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks. I respect the question, but I just want to say that I think it would be a mistake to spend the next year imagining we don't have a CEO. Interim, whatever, we have a CEO. And I think it's incredibly important for all of the community work that's going on and all of the things that we might bring up to the Org, etc., to remember that we do have a CEO and that person is in position and operating as a CEO. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you. Absolutely. I would like to echo Becky's comments, completely agree with her and with Chris's statement. We have a CEO and the Board has full trust in the CEO and the team. And we see the team works hard and the team delivers. So we do not have any concerns. Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: And if I may add, we are very grateful to Sally for stepping into this role so fast and now leading the organization. And Sally has full support. We think that she is doing a great job as an intermediate. And we feel things are as they should be at this moment. Of course, from the governance perspective, having a CEO and succession plans and everything is one of the key governance roles of the Board. But we are a specific organization. And we recognize the importance of doing, as Becky said, doing this right. And currently the situation is stable. Things are, in our opinion, going well. And we will do the best thing we can do. Speaking

as a non-member of the search committee. Because I don't think we should overlay too many roles in one person.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER: Recognizing all the answers, I have to say, to me it sounds a bit like a mixed message. Because on one hand you say, this is very difficult. We have to do it well instead of fast. So it takes a year. Then it takes a year. And on the other hand you say, but we're not worried because we have a very good person there. And if you think about it, it sounds a bit illogical. Because if it's so difficult that you need a year, and you still go on the quest for a year, then why would you do that if you have no worries in the year because there's a very good person there. Keep the person there then. Because if he or she can do it for a year, then he or she can do it for longer than a year as well. You save all the trouble. [Or it is] important that you get somebody who is better placed. And then you have to do it quickly.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Well, to tell you the truth. One of the reasons why I so much love discussions in this ccNSO is because of Roelof's very pointed comments. So I always enjoyed that. And thank you. I think the answer to your dilemma, or however you would put it, actually goes to Tripti's speech at the opening. We are at the inflection point. So we are not worried at this moment. We think we have the right person for this situation. But we see that the world is changing very fast around us. And

we need some of that time to get feedback from the community, to go through these listening sessions, to understand what really we need for the future. And that takes time. And that will prompt the global search that we will do to find a solution for the next significant period.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you, Danko. That's a good clarification.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Just to add one more thing. The apparent contradiction that you mentioned. I think it's not a contradiction at all. Both facts are not one against the other. But they are well aligned. If we need a year to do well the task of finding a new CEO, it is because we have the luxury of having at the helm someone who can give us that time. We are not in a crisis at the moment. We can take the time to do it well.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you all. If it's 30 seconds. Because we are on top of the hour. Please, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: To be clear, this is no judgment on Sally. She is an excellent person who has given you some luxury. But I would also say that a caretaker CEO is a different kind of CEO than the one who is going to be in the seat for the long-term, just by definition, and that you need to take the right amount of time. But I don't think we have a lot of time to put that right and final person in place. Just keep that in mind when going through the search process.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. This has been a very fruitful session. Can we give a hand to our ccTLD-related Board members? And with this, let me remind everyone that we still have our lovely banner at the entrance of the ccNSO room where everyone can please ask for a marker with the secretariat, and put your memories, your highlights, of the timeline on your time of the ccNSO in these 20 years. We will be celebrating the whole year. But we want your thoughts as well. And with this, we end this day's meetings. Thank you very much. And see you tomorrow.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]