
ICANN78 | AGM – Joint Session ICANN Board and ccNSO
Tuesday, October 24, 2023 – 10:00 to 11:00 HAM

FRANCO CARRASCO: Hello and welcome everybody to today's joint meeting between the ICANN Board and the Country Code Names Supporting Organization. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior. Interpretation for this session will include seven languages which are Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, Spanish, Portuguese and English. You may click on the interpretation icon in the Zoom and select the language you will listen to during the session. Please note that our panelists are kindly asked to state their name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. This discussion will be between the ICANN Board and the ccNSO members only. Therefore we will not be taking any questions from the audience today. However, all participants may make comments in the chat. You may use the drop-down menu in the chat pod and select respond to all panelists and attendees. This will allow everyone to view your comment. To view the real-time transcription, you may click on the show captions button in the Zoom toolbar. Having said that, I will now hand the floor over to the ICANN Board Vice Chair, Mr. Danko Jevtovic.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you, Franco. Welcome to the joint session of the ICANN Board with the ccNSO. I'm speaking on behalf of our Board Chair Tripti Sinha. She had some parallel meetings, so she had to be there. But I'm happy to welcome our friendly ccNSO bunch. I can recognize that some of

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.

these Board and stakeholder community meetings we had a bit of a challenge to fill in this table. But I see this, we are a very friendly bunch all together, so I'm happy to see that the table here is full. But also, ccNSO Council members are free to use the microphone, as Franco noted. So with this, I'll just kick off the session and welcome Alejandra, Chair of the ccNSO. Please.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Danko. Thank you for having us here today. It's our pleasure to join the Board for a good conversation. And with this, I believe I should pass it on to Katrina and Patricio to guide us through.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Alejandra. Good morning, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, as we have also remote participants. So Patricio and I will chair this session from the Board side, but Alejandra and Biyi apparently will do that from the ccNSO side. And to break the ice that we do not have, we would like to start with the first question from the Board. The one that we submitted to the ccNSO, because we know, okay, I know very well, that the ccNSO is very always willing to experiment, to come up with new ideas and test different approaches. So I know that you had a very interesting session on Saturday. And it would be really great to hear your feedback from that new approach that you tried and what you've learned and what would you recommend to other SOACs or to the Board in the attempt to implement continuous improvement program across different communities. So Alejandra, back to you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, thank you. Thank you, Catriona, for the question. Yes, the ccNSO is known to try some innovation during its sessions. And this time we were trying to have a bit of a, let's say, productive networking. So to have more people interacting in the room and also giving us input on how to move the work forward. On Saturday there was a workshop that used the open space technology. And today we will have a session that will use the World Café methodology. But to give more details on that, I would like to hand it over to Sean to tell us a bit more about it. Please.

SEAN COPELAND: Sure. Sean Copeland for the record. I guess that kind of blows out my background I was going to do for my question. Because it is related to this. Yes, we held an open space technology session Saturday morning. I was very thrilled to see the number of people that came out at 9:00. I'd say there was between 40 and 50 people in the room. It was a different format than we are used to. Usually we're up on a dais and everyone is out in the audience. And we're talking, I don't want to say talking down, but we're talking at the participants. And then we take some Q&A. With this, the intent was to have everybody being equal, on par with each other. And it was to explore a mechanism or a methodology to elicit participation from not only the regular people that always do, but also for people that are shy or otherwise not likely to participate. And from the metric of participation, I would say it was really, really good. We ended up having three breakout groups, if you will, or three sessions. Two of them went for a lot longer than what is normal in terms of ICANN world, which is something to consider because the logistics are

different. But people were really engaged. The work product that came out of it, I've got to tell you, I was really surprised with. It was much more extensive and much more thoughtful than I would have thought, to be honest, at the start of it. It was an experiment. And it's an experiment that I would hope that we continue to do within the ccNSO and an experiment that I would hope that other SO and ACs would do. And I hope that in terms of the continuous improvement position that the board is working on, that it be adopted.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Thanks, Sean. What you're saying matches what I've heard about it and what I've read from the notes. So how could we go about if we wanted to know more about how exactly this approach works? What do you think would be a way to transfer the methodology to other participants in this community and in the board? To the board also?

SEAN COPELAND: I've actually spent some time thinking about that, not expecting the question, so I'm happy that you've asked it. I think for this type of methodology and the one that we're also going to try later on today, the World Cafe, there will be value for the board to look at [causing facilitation to be taught.] So if you recall the leadership program that you guys put me through, thank you very much for that, there are programs that do this, and I think that it would be very good for staff, for members within the community to be exposed to that type of facilitation to create a further leadership core within ICANN to extend this type of knowledge throughout the organization and enable greater participation. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Sean. Any other comments or feedback from other members or councilors?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. The beauty of the technology or the exercise that we had was the fact that we didn't just have people from the ccNSO in the room, we also had other people, so it was more like a cross-community kind of engagement, which enriched the whole exercise and made it a lot more productive for every one of us.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: What we found out to be super useful is to have a different setup than usual, as in not to be restrained to our classroom setup, for example, but to actually be able to do something different, because that sets the mindset of the participants. We would like it to have been a little bit more perfect in the layout, but in any case, we worked with what we had, and that helped us to do these things differently. So this is something that in the future we would like to continue doing, and now we learned that we need to plan a little bit more ahead in advance for such things. But doing things like this actually changes the mindset of the people, that instead of, okay, I'm going to sit in the table and listen to people and maybe interact, if called upon, [inaudible] into action. So that would be something to take away from that activity, and something that could be implemented not only in a small setup, but in a larger setup. And what we wanted to seek also is that in these type of methodologies, it's the audience or the people that arrive who set up

the base of the session and the interest on the topics that they have. So maybe sometimes we could have something planned out to discuss, but the audience may have something that they think is more important, and it will be obvious. So I think that's something to take into consideration.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Thank you very much. And with that, Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG:

Just quickly in response. I think it's great to know that it worked out really well, and I think we definitely should take that back in things like as we develop the strategic plan, for example, as we even look at the holistic review, for example, this type of, I guess, setting methodology might actually get us more ideas, and I think that's really useful. Yes, thank you, Edmon. And I remember the saying, the definition of insanity, right? It's doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. So I'm glad that you tried a different approach and got different results. Alejandra, so maybe now to you for the questions to the board.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay. Thank you very much. So the first, it's more a topic, really, that we have, is regarding the ICANN's position on the Global Digital Compact and the WSIS+20 review, and for this we have Jordan to lead us on this topic.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Alejandra. Good morning, everyone. I'm Jordan Carter, .au, and speaking here with the vice chair of the ccNSO Council hat on. Nice to be talking with you today. We're talking about the Global Digital Compact and the WSIS+20 review, and the hook there is the recently published CEO's goals for the FY24 year, and goal six there talks about engaging the WSIS+20 review. It says that ICANN will develop and implement a communications and engagement strategy to address this process. There's been a fair bit of community dialogue about this in plenary sessions. You may know that the ccNSO has some sessions on this topic this afternoon, and we're also noting that as part of getting ready for these processes, the global technical coordination session tomorrow afternoon here in Hamburg.

By setting and accepting the CEO goal, the board will obviously have some expectations about the communication engagement strategy and the impact of that strategy in this GDC and WSIS debate. So without wanting to have a micro answer to every bit, the sort of questions we're interested in are things like what does the board consider would be a good outcome of the WSIS+20 review in the GDC? Will the new permanent CEO be working on this goal, i.e. will there be continuity? Do you see a role for ccTLDs and the broader ccNSO in achieving the outcome that you would like to see? And how will ICANN's communications and engagement strategy help equip those of us in the community to be part of this process? So something in response to that would be super helpful.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thanks, Jordan. Certainly this is something that the board has been considering. And Danko, I think, can give us more details about what we're doing on that.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Yes, I'll be happy to. I'm speaking for Tripti, but I also see that Sally has joined us in the room, because this is the CEO goal. But thank you for the question, Jordan. And we've been together to the IGF in Kyoto. And we know, you know, and ICANN has firmly committed that we are committed to the multistakeholder of internet governance. And we support the continuation of WSIS and the renewal of IGF. Optimal outcome from the WSIS+20 for the open signal interoperable internet is to maintain the status quo on the WSIS, the achievement to turn this agenda and the WSIS+10 outcome documents beyond 2025. This is a preferable to less optimal outcome, such as discontinuation of WSIS or rejection of the multistakeholder model by the UN member states. So in the IGF, there was a lot of discussion about that. We heard broad consensus that the multistakeholder model is important. But still, IGF was kind of gathering of people who think the same, and it is a multistakeholder event. So we need that to achieve this outcome. It's necessary for the ICANN Org, board and community to collaborate to ensure that government is participating in negotiations that have the positive narrative regarding WSIS in relations to the internet. So from the board's point of view, this is very important topic. And this is the reason why in discussions with Sally, we assigned her as one of the CEO goals, and we see criticality of this process. So Sally, I would like to ask you to speak more about your goal and how you view that we can achieve it. As the first step, we need to find the mic.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you for the question. Really important question. Yes, that's quite right. We had a long discussion with the board, we being myself and my executive team with the board about this goal. Such that we now refer to it casually inside the organization as goal six. So everybody knows which one it is. The first thing is that I think it's important, Jordan, that you know that we put this on the CEO goals as a very intentional decision. Up until now, the process of managing ICANN's engagement with the WSIS agenda issues and the UN and IGO issues have been managed out of our government engagement team. And that's been an ongoing process. So it's not that we don't have a strategy. We do. But it's been sort of here, if you like. Now what we said with the CEO goals, and I initiated this, we said no, we need partly because of some of the conversations you and I had had and some of our colleagues and we've been having all year, we need to put this at the top of the tree. We need to prioritize this. It needs across ICANN, and I mean the org, resourcing structure that is prioritized, that we have enough people and enough resources in to get the job done. So that was the first thing.

Now clearly you then have to devise a strategy. So the board agreed with that completely. And they said we agree, in fact, we urge you forward. Hence the discussion at the board. And the point was we discussed the wording of the goal, what the deliverables would be. And the conclusion we came to was that it is an outreach and engagement campaign, primarily. That is the activity that we collectively need to engage in, which I know is exactly what many of you think already, because we've talked about it.

So the question then is really about coordination. Because that's the question I've been asked by many stakeholders is, what is ICANN going to do? And this is what we want to do, Government X, stakeholder group Y, can we coordinate? And that's been building, including a lot of people in the technical community, for example, many of whom are having exactly the same conversation with me.

So what we have decided to do, this is now the org, which is the Danko's question to me, what are you actually going to do, Sally? And your question is how does this work? Is we, I've appointed two project sponsors, a project team is set up now. And we will put together a framework for the ICANN to begin with inside the ICANN Org to make sure I've got everything aligned. That will be shared with the ICANN community through our existing structures, so SOAC structures, this sort of structure to say here's what the framework looks like. Bring your things as you wish to, to that, so that we can coordinate. And then we can collectively agree, I would see it as a concentric circle, if you see what I'm saying. So this is going on in the middle. This is what the ICANN community is doing in its different parts. Here's how ICANN can contribute to communicating about what that is to ourselves as a wider group. And then we have to work out how do we bring in other partners who might want to communicate with us or participate with us who are not in our immediate ICANN community, but we might want to be part of that process. So that, sorry if that's a bit detailed, Danko, that's probably more than you wanted. But hopefully, Jordan, that answers your question. So priority is priority, resourcing, leadership. I will also be quite involved in that myself because of course I have that kind of

background and with my other hat on, that is the team, my engagement team who will do a lot of the lifting. I can see Chris's hand up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So thank you, Sally, for the answer. And I just want to point out that from the board's perspective, CEO goals are valid for the COE either interim or the next and ccTLDs and ccNSO could be crucial in reaching out to the governments in their own national capitals. ICANN government and IGO engagement team is ready to talk to any of the ccTLDs and I think we might follow this up with the concrete steps of how to coordinate better. Thank you Sally for the answer.

SALLY COSTERTON: Absolutely, no problem. Thank you for the question. I'm conscious Chris had his hand up though.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just a thought, I was going to mention the government thing and the CCs obviously talking directly to them. The timing is pretty short so I don't think we can like bounce from one ICANN meeting to the next, not that I'm suggesting you are going to, but this is really important.

But one thought that I had and I mentioned it in the ccNSO the other day is, and it depends on how brave/courageous we want to be, but it strikes me that it might be an interesting thought to work on setting up our own technical quote unquote forum in New York, perhaps sometime before this whatever it's called of the future thing is happening in September. So actually we are there and if people choose

not to come, that's their choice. But if we actually take ourselves there because we don't have a separate voice in the thing, if we set up our own, that might actually be an interesting thought.

SALLY COSTERTON:

So we are working, this is what it looks like, I'm not being facetious, literally this is what it looks like. That we are coordinating the input, so clear actions, I'll make sure the government engagement team and it's also my regional guys because they are the CCs' main day to day partners so you are working with the guys in region as well as [Veni's] team, but that's why I've put together a cross functional team inside the organization. It might seem like a detail but for many—Yeah, Jordan says no it's not a detail and you're right. Because this is much too important and also time is not on our side, Chris, I'm deeply aware of that. So this is why we've got a full project structure going. We've got to work that plan. And it's not just the WSIS, we can't say we'll do this and then we'll show up in two years' time. There's a series of key UN events. The GDC is one, the event you were talking about is another, there's about three or four over the next 18 months that are part of that project plan and we need to be present and we need to be participating. So a lot more to come on this. But really important question and thank you very much for it.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you, Sally and Danko for those comments which I find really reassuring and encouraging because that level of prioritization is important. And just an observation, this will be the first time in a long time that ICANN and the ICANN community have had a target or a

process within the UN system to work together on. And I feel like our experience in the pandemic of all having to suddenly work remote only for a while has probably gotten us more into practice with ongoing quite fluid coordination and dynamic responses to things. So I think we're all here for that and for continuing to engage and to coordinate on that. One last quick thought from me. I really like the language of the campaign that you mentioned. This is not an information brochure type event. This is not just telling what we do. This is arguing about why it's a good way to keep the internet moving. So we need to move from informing to advocating, I think, in a proper professional way. And I think with your background, Sally, I think you'll be a great person to be leading some of that work on the ICANN side.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. Javier.

JAVIER RUA JOVET: Thank you, Alejandra. And again, this is Javier Rua from Puerto Rico, ccNSO, councilor named by NomCom, so I'm not directly associated to a ccTLD. But to emphasize the importance of the voice of ccNSO in these conversations, I think it's been said that CCs bring particular legitimacy to our voice because we represent the whole spectrum of governance models and kind of like business models also. So some are very close to governments, which is very useful, and some are at the other end of the spectrum, you know. And even individuals like me in this voice. So I think CCs and ccNSO brings a particularly legitimate voice and that helps move these conversations in a good direction. So thank you for your answer, Sally.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Javier. And back to you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: For this question, I think.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Do we have any other comments on this? Any questions? Okay. I think we are done with this topic. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: So thank you very much. In that case, we move to your second question, which is about the clarification of the procedure for requesting a bylaw change. And here, if I may, first of all, thank you very much for providing context and concrete examples of successful and unsuccessful attempts to initiate bylaws changes. If I may, I will use those examples to illustrate the process.

The first successful example was when the ccNSO submitted a request to change the bylaws to introduce IDN ccTLDs, because before that, the bylaws did not allow IDN ccTLDs to become members of the ccNSO. So those changes were the process of a ccPDP, discussions within the ccNSO. It came up with discussions. Then we had a clear proposal for the bylaw change. It was well thought through. It had the emissaries and all other related issues that needed to be changed in order to ensure that IDN ccTLDs can participate in the ccNSO on the equal footing.

So here we have ccNSO suggesting change for ccNSO membership. So it's clearly within the scope of the ccNSO, and ccNSO is the body within ICANN which can propose those changes. So first of all, it's important who proposes changes and what is the scope of those changes. Secondly, again, is it clear what changes are required? And again, in this case, we had it very clearly articulated. We had a clear proposal for the change, and it was also very well discussed within the ccNSO membership and even more than that. So there was no problem with moving that change forward.

Now if we look at another example, and that was an example of IFR frequency. There was a suggestion to increase frequency, but at the same time there was another suggestion from another group proposing to keep the frequency. So those were two competing proposals. So initiating a bylaw change without having discussed that and having come up with an agreement within the community, probably not the right vehicle. So we should have discussions before that. And therefore in this case, this IFR, next IFR was thought to be a good vehicle to discuss and come up with agreements. So what exactly do we want? And once there is an agreement reached, we can move forward with a bylaw change. So who proposes? How well it has been discussed? Is it really clear what changes we want? And also from practical perspective, is there a way to be more efficient? So combine some bylaw changes to make sure that we can have one process for those changes.

And here I have another example from IFR review. We had a suggestion to update Article 18 for Registry Stakeholder Group, just to make sure that it's more efficient and it works better. But then we saw that there is another Article 19, and Article 19 speaks about special IFR. And there

we had the language which proved to be very difficult for the ccNSO when we wanted to start the first IFR, meaning that we needed members from ccNSO members and non-members. So that was changed for Article 18 a long time ago. But it needed to be adjusted for Article 19, because hopefully it will never be the case. But if we need to have a special IFR, nothing should prevent the ccNSO from having full representatives on that team. So those changes were combined into one and moved as a package, and we'll talk about that more during the community forum on Thursday.

So again, there are many practical and maybe not so practical, but process-related considerations that need to be considered. Is the process clear and can it be - well, that's obviously not because you asked the question. Can it be improved? Again, yes. But one thing that I can say for sure, that whenever there is a thought or need, at any time you can reach out to ICANN legal team and just raise awareness, inform them that, okay, this is the thing. And then you can talk further about the process, about how we get all communities involved in the discussion and how we come up with a clearer result. Because again, initiating -- okay, putting an idea of bylaw change on the table is not enough for that to result in a particular change. The board cannot unilaterally change the bylaws. Those changes need to be discussed within the community, and we need to agree on a precise wording to be added to the bylaws or changed in the bylaws. Maybe Becky would like to add something more?

BECKY BURR: No, I think you actually covered it exactly and completely. The precision is - and the affected community coming from the affected community would be the key things.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Katrina, for addressing this matter and for the clarification. I think that what would be useful is to have this in, let's say, like a written procedure, like these are the steps to request a bylaw change, so not only us that now heard of it, but anyone in the ICANN community can also do that and to see, okay, we need to do this checklist before doing it and know the exact procedure on how to follow up. And I wouldn't say the bylaw change requests that we requested are unsuccessful. I would just say pending. Because there is one that I believe that actually checks all the boxes, like, for example, the CSC review came with a recommendation also on modifying the frequency of its reviews, and that's ongoing. I know that's ongoing, just to say that. Is there any other comment or question on this particular topic?

I would like to take the opportunity to ask if you really believe it's during the IFR that this recommendation should come from, as in to change the frequency, or is it something that maybe it's something that could be done upon the request of maybe GNSO and ccNSO, or is that the best way forward?

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, I can say that the request has been noted and it has been already on the documents for the input to the IFR, for the upcoming IFR. So the IFR will be notified about the request. It does not mean that there

should not be discussions in parallel with that, but at this point, yes, that is envisioned for the IFR to discuss. But again, it's always the community that decides how to move forward, how to discuss proposals, and so on. It's a bottom-up process. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Yes, please.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, just quickly in response, I guess it's probably a good idea to document the process or the checkboxes that is required. So I'm just thinking out loud here, how do we take that further? I guess it doesn't require another cross-community working group. We could just ask staff to draft something out and throw it out and see if that makes sense. But I think documenting in some way, shape, or form, based on the current bylaws and stuff is probably useful.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yep. Completely agree to Edmon.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Same here. I don't see any more hands up on this topic. Shall we move to your second question now?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks, Alejandra. Yes, the second question from the board to the ccNSO is what would be your suggestion to the board to make the board's interaction with the community and individual groups more

useful and productive? As you can imagine, the board is always looking for better ways to have this communication. And in particular, you may remember that before we used to come up with a set of questions and ask exactly those same questions to each part of the community. We're not doing that anymore because we think it's better to have questions that better fit each community. That's one example. But we'd like to hear about what ideas you have about how to keep improving this communication.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Patricio. And to address this question, we have Chris and Pablo. So Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Sally. This is Chris. It's a really interesting question. I suppose I start with a question back, which is how would being more productive, how would that be a success? What would that look like? What do you mean by being more productive? Do you mean gathering more information? Having more insight into what's going on? Or is that the sort of area we're looking at? I mean, asking different questions of each group is a very sensible thing to do given that not every group has an answer to every question. But expand a bit on what you think success would look like if it was more useful and productive.

KATRINA SATAKI: It's a good question. For me, it would be that you leave the room after your discussions with the board saying, okay, it was a good discussion. We learned answers to our questions. We shared our concerns. And

from our side, it would have been, okay, so we noted this. We will work on this. We will change, improve this. And for me personally, a very good outcome would have been in the satisfaction survey, if people would say it wasn't scripted.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's never going to happen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Chris, thank you for surprising us with [a bad] questions so I can maybe just reflect on my opinion of that. I think we all strive to make the whole system more effective. So we are discussing delivering and all of that. So obviously the most important thing is to communicate. And for the board, the most important thing is interaction with the community. And that's why we are thinking how to do it better. That's why we are also rethinking these community sessions that we are having yesterday and today with you and the other parts of the community. So in our thinking, we want to hear your opinion how to do it better. What the board can do to create conditions to understand each other better, therefore for the whole system to be more effective.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. That makes sense. I think I've got a couple of thoughts. These formal—I'm going to call them formal sessions—are obviously important. And it's an opportunity for the councils or the organization of the SOs and ACs to talk directly to the board. They are structured by necessity. And you hit the nail on the head. They are not often conversations. A lot of the time it's well, we'll tell you what we want, the

questions. And you get told, and I know this, you get told these are some of the things that you can—ways to answer the questions. And that's fine. But that's not necessarily giving you information or giving you a feeling for what's going on in the community. This is just, you know, here's some questions in advance. Let's talk about them. And you kind of get some feeling of what's going on in the community from the public forum. You know, if there's a disaster happening, you'll know about it probably. But that's not nuance. And that's not getting into the community and enabling you to operate as a board in the most effective way because you can predict what's going to happen because you're hearing stuff and seeing it for yourselves as opposed to hearing it third party and stuff like that.

So one thought that I had, and I acknowledge right up front that this would be a real stretch. But the board could consider liaisons into the SOs and ACs. So that a board member was appointed as a liaison to the ccNSO. And that person was actually at the ccNSO. The ccNSO would have to say, you need to not be in the room for this. That's perfectly fine. But that the board member actually attends, or maybe more than one, attends the ccNSO sessions, attends ccNSO calls. I did say it was a stretch because it involves time. But that way, in each of those organizations, those SOs and ACs, there would be a board member who would be plugged in to the nuance, to the side comments, to all the stuff that goes on that actually helps make informed decisions. So that's just a thought from me. And it popped into my head this morning when I was sitting here. But it seems to me that what's lacking is that really kind of the little things that build the big thing. And if the board wants

to—And I know the board wants to be more involved and more community effective, that certainly is one way of doing it.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

Pablo Rodriguez from the registry .PR, Puerto Rico, for the record. One of the things that I like very much what Chris is proposing, because earlier, when Alejandra was speaking, she was talking about, and she paved the way for something very interesting, which was instead of this type of format in which we sit here together and we're speaking to a group of people, what if we try a different format in which it provides a sense of a conversation going on in which we're closer, not so distant, in which we are not prescriptive, rather more conversation. But if that takes too much time, because you're so busy with so many things board related, then two things pop into my mind. One, part of the functions that you perform, rather than performing them during an ICANN event, perhaps you should consider performing them at a different time, such that you have more time available to you, and engage with the various SOs and ACs. At the same time, Chris's recommendation or suggestion is also good, because if you cannot allow to celebrate some of your functions in other times than the ICANN conferences, then you can have those liaisons that can help out. What is important here? When do we begin to speak frankly with each other, when we trust each other? I know [inaudible], I know Katrina, I know Patricio, you know Nick, you know Stephen, you know Chris, we're friends, we talk. But the thing is that we have a continuous influx of new people coming in, and they don't know you, they don't know me, they don't know the others, so they may not be as open to speak their minds and so on. So we need to create opportunities to develop that confidence to know each other, to

know each other at a personal level, and then we're willing to speak and say, you know, when in this particular meeting I heard such and such, but to be honest with you, I really feel, or my group feels, and that's when the real conversation takes place. So I would like to put that out there for your consideration.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Chris and Pablo. Well, just to Chris's point, and that was exactly when I joined the board, I was very, very afraid to lose the connection with CCs and all the hot topics that CCs are discussing. But I learned a lot from Patricio, and we, first of all, we are on the council mailing list. If we can, we always join council calls to listen to your discussions. We also participate in various working groups. So I'd say that this works well, but you're absolutely right, during ICANN meetings, we can't attend ccNSO meetings as much as we would have loved to.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Also having the formality of, you're absolutely right, and CCs I think have always been very good at this. It's not quite so good necessarily in other parts of the community, but having the formality of actually having someone actually appointed, it creates its own momentum because you've actually got that. And the example I would give you is the CCWG had board liaisons to it, and that was actually a very important thing. Now, if you think about that, why would you only do that on special occasions? Why not actually do it all the time and accept that there's a cost to that of time? I get that. Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, I think, thank you, Chris, for that. And actually I think the board has actually started having regular liaisons now, especially with the PDPs that are happening in the GNSO. And I think we should do it even more regularly. But if I heard you correctly, you're talking about not just for the working groups, you're talking about potentially having liaisons to the council. And that's probably, that's an interesting suggestion. And I think we definitely should explore that further.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: I just wanted to say that as a board member, I feel that our ccNSO appointed board members are well plugged into community. And of course, they're in the board to care for their fiduciary duties and interests of the corporation. But we feel they're very well plugged into community and able to bring us the information and nuanced information from the community. And other point to add to Edmon, on I see May 2021, the board has adopted the guidelines for board members serving as liaisons to ICANN community groups. It has been developed in the Government Advisory Committee and accepted by the board. And I think your suggestion is interesting, but we need to think a little bit more about that because we are having, for example, ccNSO appointed board members, if we send a formal liaison, are the same people or different people or how all that works together, and also given the workload of the board. But obviously interesting team and good part of the answer to our question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Personally, I would think having ccNSO appointed board members as liaisons would like repeat what is already being done. I think it should be different people who have different sort of leanings, you know, so that makes it makes interaction a lot better.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It would be quite a useful board education exercise for new board members who may not necessarily have as much information on the community as others do, to say your first thing is go be this. And I was expecting a yes answer straight away, Danko, because I didn't think you'd have to think. But no, I mean, it's absolutely, of course, it's an idea that it may just be worth picking up and seeing where it runs to.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, I think we covered all of our agenda points, unless there is any other comment or question that we would like to raise right now. A surprise question. Unscripted question. If not, well, thank you very much for having this joint meeting. We think this went much better than last time. We tried, actually, an effort not to over prepare for this. So we would be more as unscripted as possible. But thank you for having us. And over to you, Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you. I tried to add to this unscripted sense of things by stepping into Tripti's role very unprepared. So I think it worked well. And as always, it's a pleasure. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just before we go, can we just check in with Pablo? Where's the next ICANN meeting, Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: In the event that you don't know, the next ICANN meeting will be in March. From the 2nd to the 7th of March in Puerto Rico. So we're looking for you there. Please make sure that we'll be there.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]