ICANN81 | AGM – ccNSO Council Meeting
Thursday, November 14, 2024 – 13:15 to 14:30 TRT

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Council call. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I'm the participation manager for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session questions and comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, French and Arabic.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English and please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you and with that I will now hand the floor over to Alejandra Reynoso, chair of the ccNSO. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you so much, Claudia, and welcome everyone to the ccNSO Council Meeting 211 on the 14th of November 2024 at 10:15 UTC. As usual please, all councilors, log in into Zoom and don't forget to add to your Zoom ID ccNSO Council so it's easier to search for you while doing

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.

the votes. I'm going to add to the chat room as well the wiki where we have all the documents for the session. And we do have some remote councilors and having been in a remote session myself when everyone else or majority is in person, it's very useful if possible for us to put on our cameras. So, if that's something that you can do so Jiankang can see us from his computer, that would be lovely.

So, are there any other business that we already need to take into consideration? Okay. Seeing none, I will ask this again when we get to that point. As a final point of order now at the start of the meeting and to alert Nick, we will be making decisions on the Board Se at 12 nomination process. And I assume, Nick, that you will not participate in those decisions but please don't leave the room. It will be recorded in the minutes that you did not participate.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Sorry, I'm a bit far from a speaker. Yes, I completely understand and agree and if you would like me to step out of the room at any point in time, then I'm very prepared to do that also.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, but it won't be necessary. So, with that we go now to 1.8 to see quorum. And for this, Claudia, may I ask you if we're quorum and if we have any apologies?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, we are quorum and I haven't seen any apologies.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Claudia. With this, let's move to the next one. Does anyone have any updates to their statement of interest? Seeing none, then we continue to Item 2, the Relevant Correspondence. We have not received letters relating to the items of today's meetings but you all have the link to the correspondence.

And moving on to Item 3, Minutes and Action Items. So, the minutes of our last Council meeting have not been able to be circulated. There was a too short time between that meeting and this one. Knowing that we were preparing for the ICANN meeting and having the ICANN meeting itself, so there's some more time needed for those to be available to us but they will be circulated around in two weeks.

And moving to the action items. Even we didn't have the minutes on time, the action items were taken from the notes that were circulated because it is important that we take those action items and can continue our progress. So, that's what it's listed here. So far all are completed. Are there any questions regarding the minutes or the action items? Seeing none. And thank you.

Okay. So, for the sake of time, I do suggest that we take agenda items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 as read. Those are intermitting decisions or intermitting decisions by the Triage Committee and all the written updates, unless there are any additional questions or updates. From my end, I do have one and it's that we just held this morning a community forum regarding the approval action and no concerns were raised. As you may have noted in Sean's email sent out to the community yesterday, the closing date is 11th of December for the community forum time, and we still have 21 days after that to respond.

So, any comments? And I will please ask the secretary to help me with hands in Zoom room because it is a little difficult for me to see them in my computer setting right now. So, if no further comments, then let's move on to Item 10. And it is the update on the bylaw repository. And for this, may ask Bart to run us through it?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, just briefly. The update that was in your packet it's also posted on the wiki space. If you would compare this version with the version from a year ago December 23, you will see some items have been removed and there have been some changes to other items. One is the request to adjust the frequency of the CSC effectiveness review. Again, that one was part of a discussion with the Board and it will be followed up. So, that's noted. It's still an open action item. So, adjusting that for your recollection, the CSC frequency was every three year in August. We took the decision to defer it for one year, allowing a change in the bylaws for over a year, so that's recorded now.

The second one which has been added is the bits about, and that's the change as well, including a section on the alternates for the CSC because the bylaws spell out who can be a member of the CSC and we do have alternates. And there is a suggestion to include it in the bylaw so include it. And the other one where you can see it's a little bit on track in that sense is limitation of the bylaw provided accountability mechanisms. It's still under discussion as part of the review mechanism and of the policy development, so PDP4 for your memory.

There are two major changes effectively. One is changing the exclusion of disputes regarding delegation and re-delegation. That language needs to change to reflect the current language used. So, that's transfer and revocation but retirement needs to be added as well as IDN ccTLD, the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. So, that's the suggestion for that change of the fundamental bylaws. Almost similar of what happened this morning around the disputes regarding the grant program to be excluded from the IRP and reconsideration. These are the major items that have changed, so back to you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. Any questions or comments for Bart? Okay. Seeing none, let's move on to update by chair, vice chair, councilors, regional organizations and secretariat. There's one up there that it's for me. It's a Chair update on SO/AC roundtable. What I can tell you is that the roundtable happened on Friday, last Friday and we agreed on setting up a working group to review the meeting strategy with a very well-defined charter and time frame. My understanding is that it will be comprised of eight participants plus eight alternates appointed by the SO and AC, so a maximum of 16 participants in total. ICANN Org will be a participant as well and will have different proposals to issues they already know they're struggling with.

And the expectation is that this working group will have results by Seattle for the SO/AC chairs to have a look and give a sense of those results. And after that, it will go to a "long" public comment so everyone in the community has the opportunity to review it and have their say on what is proposed. And optimistically, it will go to the Board by Prague. So, this is what was discussed there. Does anybody have any other updates or questions or comments? Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Alejandra. Jordan Carter .au, ccNSO Council member for the record. I think this is the right time to do this. Just to let you know that there was a meeting of the WSIS+20 discussion group which was a sort of informal dialogue group to get people in the community who are interested in the WSIS+20 issues to have an informal dialogue space with some of ICANN's government engagement people. It's going to meet occasionally. It's informal. It's not recorded. It's not a minuted body. It doesn't make decisions. It doesn't commission work. It's a kind of exchange of views thing.

From our community, it's got Chris and I on it I think and Peter Crocker as well. Peter's somewhere here. So just to let you know that that happened really. I don't know if we need to go into any of what the discussion was this time but feel free to ask any of us if you like and I will try to undertake at least to drop a quick email on the Council list after each meeting if anything interesting happens.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. Anybody else? Okay. Seeing no hands, let's move on to Item 12. We have ccNSO membership application of ccTLD manager .bd Bangladesh. And for this, may ask Demi to introduce us to the topic?

DEMI GETSCHKO: Thank you, Alejandra. This is Demi for recording. One of the main objectives of CC and as we discussed is to expand our membership and have more CCs joining the ccNSO. Then we have this very happy news that the application of Bangladesh passed through the duly revised team of the secretariat. And I think it's very good for us to have one of the 10th most populated countries join the CCs. So, in my opinion, my position is of course we are very happy to have Bangladesh inside the club and hope the other countries will join us soon. Thank you. Maybe Joke can expand a little bit on the application but I think it's all fulfilled okay.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you, Demi. So, the secretariat reached out to the IANA services staff and they confirmed that the application indeed came from the current contacts for the ccTLD and there were no pending requests regarding the .bd ccTLD. Thank you.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Thank you, Joke.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Demi and Joke. So, are there any questions on this topic or comments? Seeing none, we will use Zoom for this because it's easier.

So, may I have a mover in Zoom? I see Pablo and Olga. So, Pablo moves and Olga seconds. Thank you. Okay, Jordan, for next time. It's by raising your hand. So be prepared. We have several decisions. So, we do have a draft resolution in front of us. Is there any questions regarding the resolution?

Seeing none. Okay, now we just go to Zoom to do the vote. Remember green ticks is for approval. Red crosses is for objection. And this is only for ccNSO councilors. All right. I see only green ticks. This has been approved and let's give a warm welcome to .bd as a ccNSO member. Welcome.

Moving on we now have Item 13. It's the approval of the generic invite letter. As you know, some ccTLD managers, to become members of the ccNSO, they need some help with documentation. And that's why we drafted a letter that was suggested as part of the documentation needed. The draft was circulated to the Council for review and the final version is submitted now for approval. Do we have any questions or comments regarding the topic? Okay. Seeing none. Looking at Zoom as well. Okay.

So, with that, we do have a resolution in front of us. So, we do need a mover and a seconder. So, in Zoom I see Jennifer first. So, thank you, Jennifer. And Biyi seconds. Thank you. Now we have the decision in front of us. Any questions regarding the resolution? Okay. Hearing none, let's vote as we did last time. Green ticks or red crosses. I'm going through the list. I only see green ticks so thank you very much. This has passed.

Now we move on to Item 14. It is the extension of the duration of the ccNSO Policy Gap Analysis working group. Well as you have there in the background of the agenda, according to the charter, the working group had to be introduced by ICANN81. And in order to address them and their related methods, the working group has completed part of its work but still needs to explore some gaps that have not emerged in practical terms. So, therefore this working group seeks to extend its mandate to ICANN83 allowing to present its results in Seattle and present its recommendations in Prague. So, are there any questions or comments or something, Jordan, you want to add?

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Alejandra. Jordan Carter here for the record. I'm chair of the Policy Gap Analysis Working Group. In the members meeting, we said that the two next action items between now and Seattle would be to finish the analysis of the IANA list of issues and to recommend if any needed to be follow-up, and if so, what process to be used. And we also said we would update the overview document if feedback came in to require it. So, that takes us to 82. And then the phase after 82 and until 83, that very short break from early March to early June would be the chance to decide whether we see any other gaps that aren't on that IANA list in the policies procedures guidelines and so on.

I was quite vocal in promising people that the group would have a short duration and August 2024 to June 2025 is not exactly what I would call short, but nor is it exactly what I would call long. So, I think that's we've got a working method now, we've kind of got our skates on and hopefully we won't have any more disruptions like the Board questions on the PDP3 process. to divert the same people away. So, hopefully it's okay to step through to those additional two meetings and hopefully it means the working group members won't decide that they have to leave as a result.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. I really hope they don't. So, we do have a decision in front of us. Are there any questions regarding the resolution? Okay. Seeing none, it is time for voting. Again, green ticks for approval and red crosses for objection.

BART BOSWINKEL: Who are the movers and the seconders?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, sorry, I forgot about that. Let's do it now or after the voting because the voting ahs started. Is it okay? Okay. So, let's do the vote. Okay. Well, now I see three raised hands. I saw Olga and Wafa. I'm thinking they meant to move and second, correct? I see nodding. Okay. So, there we corrected on the way and I saw only green ticks on the room. With this, it has been approved. And we hope as Jordan mentioned, that it doesn't take too long to finish the work and we are grateful for the work you're already doing at this point.

So, with that let's move on to the Item 15. It's the appointment of members to working groups as well as chair and vice chairs. And this particular item, it's a little bit long. And I'm very grateful for all the volunteers that we are to appoint and also for the election of new leaderships. We compile them in one resolution to make it easier and we have, well, the new leadership for the SOPC or reinstated. It's Andreas as chair and Irina as vice chair.

For TLD-Ops, Regis as chair and Nicholas as vice chair. We have Jennifer to chair the OMC, Sophie Mitchell to be appointed as member to SOPC. Pensri and Mourad as members of UAC and Nikki Leeson as member of the OMC. And in your list, we are missing Suleiman as member of to the DASC. This information came a little bit late to the agenda, but we will include it in the minutes.

So, are there any questions or comments regarding this item? Okay. Seeing none, we have a resolution in front of us and now I will ask for the mover and seconder in time. So, I see Sean as a mover and Pablo as a seconder in Zoom. Thank you very much. So, regarding the resolution are there any comments? Yes, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Alejandra. This is Pablo Rodriguez from the registry .pr in Puerto Rico for the record. I would like to thank all of those that have stepped forward to serve, and I congratulate them and thank you for your service.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Agreed. Anyone else? If not, then it's time to vote. So please use your green ticks or your red crosses or thumbs up. Thumbs up for Pablo.

Okay. All right. So, I see green ticks. Thank you all. This has passed. And also, well, thank you again to all the volunteers that are joining the working groups and to the new leadership of the working groups. Maybe an applause is in order.

And talking about volunteers, now we move on to Item 16, that it's the call for volunteers and expressions of interest. We have some pending roles to fill. As you remember, the ccNSO liaison to the ALAC was pending and we decided that we would launch a new call for expression of interest. We need to appoint two ccNSO representatives to the Excellent Award Selection panel because so far it has been Pablo and Olga, but they are term limited. We also need a call for volunteers for the SOPC and for the GRC.

Are there any questions or comments regarding this item? If anything, I can already tell you that there is some interest in the ALAC liaison position. Some people have approached us, so I think that we will cover it for this time. If no comments, may I have a mover and a seconder? I see Jordan as a mover. In Zoom, please. And Biyi as a seconder. Thank you. I'm sorry for the setup of the meeting, but it's very hard to see sideways, so that's why Zoom is our best option. So, we have the draft resolution.

PETER KOCH: I'm sorry, Alejandra, just for clarity.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes.

PETER KOCH: Zoom seems to have lost contact.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sorry?

PETER KOCH: The text displayed on screen is behind. We would like to scroll up a bit so we know.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. That we didn't have the agenda on the right side on this screen. So, can we move a little bit up, please? Go into the decision a little bit or further down. That's it at the beginning. Thank you. All right. So now we do have the decision in front of us. Any questions or comments regarding the decision? Okay. Seeing none, now we go to the vote. So please go to Zoom and you know the drill. Green ticks for approval and red for objections. And if there are any abstentions, let me know.

Okay. Going through the list, I see only green ticks. This has been approved. So now the Secretariat will post the resolution as soon as feasible, and then we launch the for volunteers. Thank you. Now we move on to Item 17, and it's the progress on the ccNSO Council election. And for this, may I ask Joke as our election manager?

JOKE BRAEKEN: This is Joke for the record. So, the call for nominations has closed, and several candidates stepped forward. For two of the regions, there are more than one candidate, whereas there's only one seat available. So, that means that elections will need to be held for both the Asia-Pacific and for the Latin American Caribbean region. The elections will start on Wednesday, the 27th of November, and will end on Wednesday, the 18th of December. Ballots will be emailed to the ccNSO emissaries before voting begins, and the election process concludes seven days after the ccNSO Council publishes the election report. New Council terms will commence at the end of ICANN82 in March 2025. Q&A session with the candidates was held earlier this week at ICANN81. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Joke. Do we have any comments for Joke? Okay. Seeing none, moving on, now we go to the Item 18. It's progress on Board nomination process. We have several sub items here. Can we move the agenda that we are displaying, please? Thank you. To Item 18 at the beginning. Thank you. So here we have a proposal from the GRC, and for this I will ask Sean to tell us more about it.

SEAN COPELAND: Thank you so much, AJ. Sean Copeland for the record. So back in March when we were in San Juan, Council had the GRC start working with continuous improvement, and from that we did a session in Kigali, a World Cafe session, and we did a subsequent session online virtually. And one of the themes that came out of that was our participation and voting, and different ideas that came from the community for us to look at.

Through happenchance, we end up having an election cycle for Board, and it gave us an opportunity at an early point to try to see the impact of some light ideas that had come to the floor. And what you're looking at is two items that we are going to test or are testing. The easier item, the one that doesn't actually need input from Council, is Pablo has willingly offered to do a targeted outreach for us to look at the impact and effects of that. The other that does require Council's input is we want to publish how people, or not how, when people are voting that they have voted.

And in the agenda, you will see what that would look like. And there are two benefits from this. One of them is a little bit of moral persuasion. People seeing other people voting, they may be encouraged to vote. The secondary benefit to that on the same line is that people may in fact feel glad to see that their commitment to the community is being acknowledged. So, what those are both positive and easy things to see.

The second item and benefit that comes from this is that will allow us to actually target and look at the TLDs that are not voting, and see if we can determine why they are not voting. And this may end up being very beneficial for us in bringing in those TLDs from the cold, if you will, into the community to participate more. And for that, we do need Council's blessing to do this. So, Bart, have I missed anything? No? Okay. And of course, just so you're aware on this item, I will abstain, as is my nature.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, thanks, Sean. Do we have any questions or comments for Sean? I do see, Peter, your hand in the room.

PETER KOCH: So, this is Peter, and I should have introduced myself before, probably. So, it's Peter Koch from DENIC, one of the three European councilors. Question to Sean, actually two questions. One is the text mentions two ccTLDs, ASCII and IDN. It's a bit more complicated, I believe, because we might have emissaries. So, has that been taken into account? And my second question is, do I understand that the progress will be displayed live, so to speak, so while the voting is going on?

SEAN COPELAND: On your first question, Peter, what we're looking at is basing it based on the emissary for the particular TLD region, because there may be overlap.

BART BOSWINKEL: Because if you look at it, some territories will have two ccTLDs. One is an IDN ccTLD, or multiple IDN ccTLDs, and an ASCII ccTLD. However, this is to express that every territory or the vote of these multiple entities are done through an emissary, there are only two or three cases where the members, if you look at it, so the ASCII and this IDN ccTLD are different. And this is where the emissary becomes really important. But that's why the suggestion is to list only the territory, because that emissary represents all ccTLDs, both the ASCII and the IDN ccTLDs of the territory.

SEAN COPELAND: And then in terms of your second question, yes, it will be published on a daily basis, and Joke has graciously offered to do this for us as an election process is going on, so we will see that.

BIYI OLADIPO: This is Biyi Oladipo, .ng for the records. This question is for Sean. This list that would publish is going to be available for everybody to see, or is it just for the election manager to see?

SEAN COPELAND: It is for all of us to see, yes. It is not just for the election manager. It's a tool for us.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And for us, it's not just the Council, but the community. It's public. Any other comments or questions from anyone? Yes, Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks, and I apologize for intervening again. I'd just like to ask Sean, has the GRC considered that that proposal might influence the election in different ways, to put it mildly?

SEAN COPELAND: We did have a discussion about that and what the impact would be, but then we looked around at different entities, organizations, and geopolitical voting methodologies, and there's a consistency that shows that showing you voted is not considered a violation of your privacy or what have you. But we did address and look at that as an item.

PETER KOCH: I'm sorry, that was not what I asked. What I asked was not about the privacy of the voters, that would be a different concern, but the influence on the voting itself by, for example, focusing campaigning on the remaining open votes.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: May I? Just to see if I understood this clearly. So, the only influence that we think might happen is to motivate ccTLDs to vote, because what will be presented in this list is if they have voted or if they haven't yet, not what they have voted on. So, that's why-- No, it's not what you meant. Yes?

PETER KOCH: I think I understood that this is not showing the results, but only the fact that the country or territory has voted. But of course, that gives some information to the candidates.

BART BOSWINKEL: Peter, I think if you look at it, the candidates will or may influence or, say, reach out to emissaries or ccTLDs anyway. Ultimately, it's the emissary. And one of the things, that was one of the reasons not listing the emissary, that they have voted. And in that sense, going back to the various World Cafes, et cetera, one of the other considerations was that and for doing this, this allows people who are familiar in this environment and who attend these meetings, but who are, I would say, removed from the emissary, because he's in another part of the ccTLD manager, to inform the emissary.

So in that sense, it's a bit of a trade-off, because at times, the emissary really doesn't know what we're talking about. And in this way, it works both ways. At the end of the day, you need to know the emissary in order to influence it. And the people within the ccTLD manager are the ones who will know the emissaries. This came up, especially in Kigali, where people mentioned, say, I work with the operator. I attend ccNSO meetings. I attend regional meetings. My emissary is somewhere within the ccTLD, which is a government agency.

They really don't know what we're doing. And this way, they are alerted and can follow up with their emissary. Say, from a candidate to know who the emissary was or is, it's probably very hard and impossible. So, in that sense, it takes care of itself. I hope that answers or addresses your concern.

PETER KOCH: I'll take that as a response. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Any other comments or questions? Any other comments or questions from anyone? Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: One more thing. And this is really also, this is more a meta point around this one. This is really trying to test the continuous improvement framework as well. If it doesn't work, if it doesn't increase, say, compared to previous Board seat, that will be recorded as well. We will note it. So, then the question is, should we continue or should we not continue? In that sense, it's really a test.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. So, seeing no more hands up, I guess. Let me check Zoom. Okay. Can we move further on the agenda to the decision? And for this, I will need a mover and a seconder. Again, in Zoom, raise your hand. I see Jennifer moves and Wafa seconds in the order that I see the hand. So, thank you very much. Now, can we move the agenda to the decision, please?

Thank you so much. Now, we do have the decision in front of us. Are there any questions regarding the resolution itself? Okay. Seeing none, let's go to the vote. So, please use your green ticks for approval, red for objections, objections, and it's noted that Sean is abstaining. I note that Peter is objecting, and I see Nick's hand up.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Just to say that I'm abstaining on this resolution.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: You're abstaining?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. So, is Peter objecting? Ale, can I ask Peter? Peter, can you explain why?

PETER KOCH: I took Bart's explanation as a response, but I don't think my interpretation of cost versus benefit as risk of influencing in the wrong way goes in the opposite direction than what Bart said. So, I think that risk of the influence is not worth the experiment here.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So, you're concerned that knowing who has voted is--

PETER KOCH: The point is more who has not yet voted, which is the whole purpose, I understand, but there are two consequences of this, right? The one is, yeah, I can go to somebody and nudge them friendly, but independent of who the candidates are and anything, on a matter of principle, I don't think that this is an information that should be closed before the end of the voting.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I have some sympathy with that view. I think any information that is published, you can anonymise it and say 20% of the African region has voted or whatever, right? Are we intending to say, as I'll just use this as an example, Nominet has not yet voted, in essence?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you. We've been doing that. We've been telling periodically how many have voted on certain topics, so that has been done. This is a new proposal to actually have listed the territories that have voted to have it publicly. We usually have this summary saying--

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, at the end, absolutely, I agree 100%.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Even during the elections, I've seen--

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, but it doesn't say who though, does it?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, we have never said who.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And I think the issue is, and I just think it's worth discussing, the issue is, this is an election. It's the thing that we do that has the most outcome of affecting the Council or, I suppose, putting somebody on the Board in the same way. And I think Peter raises a really interesting question, which is the reason for doing it is to show that there are countries, the territory hasn't voted, that they should get their act together and vote. The question is, is there an influence on countries that haven't yet voted to see which other countries have or have not yet voted?

And you think about it within the region, especially in regions where there might be cultural and linguistic differences between various parts of the region. Is there a possibility that publishing a list of who has voted during the process could have an effect on other people's votes, or that they don't vote? That's the question, and I think that's quite a-- I think we should think about that.

BART BOSWINKEL: If I understand Peter's concern, I don't want to speak for your behalf, but I hope I captured it properly, so I know that my response to you was proper. Is his risk that he notifies, if you list people who have not voted, they will become subject of influencing, lobbying, etc.?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's also true. I think that is an additional point as well. Because where you have an election, you might very well become the subject of lobbying. There are varying degrees of cultural difference in the way that people view lobbying. Some people think it's perfectly acceptable, others find it very difficult and embarrassing, and I'm just wondering-- So, I think that point also has merit, that they may in fact throw open the possibility of a-- And let's be clear, it's an individual who is voting. They may be voting for their ccTLD, but it is a person, and that person may end up being lobbied, phoned, emailed, etc., etc., and that may be problematic.

BART BOSWINKEL: But that individual is not listed. The thing you see as a territory.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: But it's obvious, isn't it? We all know where the territories are, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: No, you don't. You don't know who the emissary is.

PETER KOCH: Can we just pay attention to our chair for a moment?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: My apologies.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Now I see that we are discussing this. I think that there are some new ideas that we haven't thought about. So, my proposal is to ask everyone now, so, I see that you still have your green ticks on, so please put them down for a little while, because I want to ask you a related question. Is if you think you have enough information to make a vote now, or shall we defer this to December so we can have some time to think about it, and then make a decision then? So, if you think you can make a decision now, put your green tick. If you think we should defer, then a red cross.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Before you ask, can I ask a stupid question? Do we need a majority or do we need anonymity?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: A majority is enough, but I see that there's some conversation, so maybe people are now thinking of having more time. Again, green tick to decide now what to do with this, or red cross to say let's defer it to the December Council meeting.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I can't get into the Zoom room, so I have a red cross physically.

MOLEHE WESI: My apologies, Alejandra. I'm following the conversation. My apologies. I'm Molehe Wesi for the record. I'm trying to rationalise now the decision to defer this. And I'm asking this because we were already voting on something that has been subjected to a due process, I believe. And we were at a stage where there was a motion that was seconded, and then we moved to approval. And I don't think the discussion that ensued after that was to defer, but to rather understand where the objection came from. And this comes from a position whereby I think

Sean and everyone else that has been involved in the World Cafes, they applied their minds to this thing, and it opened up discussions then. So, my view is we continue with the voting as is, and we move on and we take majority. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Molehe. And I almost was reaching the conclusion with the question I asked because I do see some red marks now, but not enough to defer it. So, thank you, Molehe. I agree. We now should move to the voting then. So please clear your green ticks or your red crosses. Noting again that Sean and Nick are abstaining. So, again, green ticks if you approve this decision or red crosses if you object. Okay. I counted three objections and the rest are green ticks. So, majority approved. So, this has passed. Thank you.

And moving along to the agenda, now we will need to, well, we don't need it, but we would like to have an update on the progress so far of the Board election. And for this, Joke?

JOKE BRAEKEN: This is Joke speaking. So, indeed the call for nominations for the seat on the Board Seat12 has closed recently. Two candidates stepped forward and in line with the relevant guidelines and the timeline agreed by the ccNSO Council, they accepted their nominations. Due diligence verifications are currently ongoing and an election will be held starting on the 4th of February. Prior to that, the ccNSO membership had an opportunity earlier this week at ICAN81 to interact with the candidates.

And there will also be a virtual follow-up of this Q&A opportunity in the new year. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Joke. Are there any questions or comments for Joke? Okay. Seeing none, let me just double check. Okay. Now we move on to the next sub-item. It's C, the update on the timeline. So, at the request of one of the candidates, the Q&A, it's proposed to be rescheduled to-- Sorry, let me put my thoughts together. So, one candidate requested if we could move the potential date already planned for the virtual Q&A. And after consulting with both of them, it was suggested that the new date for the February is the one that fits both of their respective schedules. So, this is the proposal here to approve the new timeline for the virtual Q&A.

Are there any questions regarding the topic? Okay. Seeing none, we do have the resolution in front of us. May I have a mover and a seconder? In Zoom, please. I see Ali moves and Biyi seconds. Thank you. So, the decision is there. Do we have any questions regarding the resolution itself? I see Ali, you still have your hand up, but-- Okay. It's an old one. Good.

So, if no questions or comments, please let's go to the voting. And now we have green ticks for approval and red crosses for objections. And it is noted that already that Nick is not participating in this one at all. Going through the Zoom list, I see only green ticks. So, this has been approved. Thank you very much.

And now we move forward to the next item. Being mindful of the time. Okay. We still have 18 minutes. So, Item 19, it's the next steps in the review of the ccNSO financial contributions guideline. You all will recall the session from last Tuesday when Byron, Roelof and Xavier introduced the topic. You may have also noted that we discussed our portfolio of activities. This topic was already mentioned and included in the list as work item on which we have to decide at this meeting. So, in front of you, there is a resolution with an extensive background paragraph, which intends to capture how we got where we are and some main areas that will need to be addressed going forward.

So, are there any comments or questions regarding this topic? Jordan, you have your green tick still, but I don't think you-- No? Okay. If not, let's move the agenda to the decision. And may I have a mover and a seconder? I see Olga moves in Zoom. And Sean seconds. Thank you. So, let's bring the decision to the screen. There we go. Thank you.

All right. Are there any questions regarding the resolution? Seeing no hands, then we can go straight to voting. So please green ticks for approval or red crosses for objection. And of course, if you abstain, let me know. I see in the list. Yes, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just one point. Please note the timeline. The goal is that we hope, or when drafting this resolution, the intent was that the first meeting of this group would take place before the seasonal break. That means your role, and you're expected to look at the draft data at the end of next week. So, otherwise, yeah, well, this, I would say timeline will not fly. So, that's one. The second point is, if you're interested, please consider whether or not you want to participate in this working group. So, thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. With that in mind, I know some Zooms tend to bring their green ticks down. So, if you could put them up again, so I can see the voting, that would be really nice. Okay. I see only green ticks. So, this has passed. Thank you. And well, be mindful of the timeline, as Bart mentioned, we do have to be, let's say efficient about it.

Item 20. Now we have outcomes and observations from the Council workshop. Does anyone have any comments or observations they would like to share? If not, I do have a very brief notes of my own. It's evident that it was surfaced that the balance of the workload and capacity is necessary with active participation. Also planning and KPIs definition plus succession planning was also high there and dividing the work in a tangible and with timeframe tasks. It could be a potential way of having more people commit to a short time period instead of a longer commitment. But if there are no hands up. I see Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. This is Pablo Rodriguez from the registry .pr for the record. I absolutely believe that the Council workshop was productive and that while we continue to say that we need to bring more people, it is important to point out that we need to establish a clear criteria of skill sets at this individuals that we aspire to bring into the group should have in order to accomplish the objectives that we are trying to accomplish. So, that is something that I took away from this workshop. And that is something that I will continue to push in order to bring in people that can help us achieve our objectives. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. It's worth noting that in December, we are going to do a follow-up using the same method and using the outcomes of the workshop. So do keep your notes handy for that time. So, with that, seeing no more hands, only Pablo's, but I guess it's a previous hand. Okay, we move on to Item 21. So, what have we heard from the meetings? As you remember, we did assign councilors to several sessions. So, if there was anything substantive that you think we should know right away, please, this is your moment. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: On the topic of the community plenary, I wish we'd won the coin toss. The coin toss about the topic. I found the topic quite difficult to follow and the topic material felt a little bit on the edge of the scope of ICANN's remit. I loved your speaking, though, Olga, to be clear. No one has any idea what I'm talking about, do they?

On Wednesday morning, there was a plenary, a community plenary, which was called Shifting Paradigms, Multistakeholder Model, Geopolitics, Law, and Infrastructure. And I felt like it was a little bit on the edge of the ICANN remit, but it was saved by the structuring questions and some good interventions, like Olga's one, and some of the discussants from the floor.

There was 45 minutes of context setting and a 90-minute window. So, I think the balance there. And there was an alternative proposal for that plenary slot that the ccNSO developed. And in the end, the SO/AC leaders group tied on which one should be done. And so, there was a coin toss. And all I'm saying, sorry to take up so much time with this story, is I wish the coin had tossed the other way.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan, for bringing us to speed on that one. I agree. I do have a queue. Nick, and then Peter.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, thank you. Just in relation to the topic of DNS abuse, which I was the assigned follower of since I was going to be in those sessions. We had a good session with the GAC yesterday morning. And I didn't appreciate this, but I heard it in the session. The topic is one of their priority topics for discussion. And I feel that it was a very positive engagement session. And I suspect that our respective liaisons are going to raise that up the agenda again and that we should do some thinking and preparation ahead of that to make sure that we reinforce our positive messages and we get the most out of those opportunities for engagement with our GAC representatives. Thanks.

SEAN COPELAND: I just want to echo back to Nick in talking with our liaison that's coming in from GAC. There is actually the potential for us to do a World Cafe type of event on DASC. It's something that we're talking about very lightly right now. So have that in the back of your mind.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, this is Peter again for the records. And to shock you all, I actually have two points. One is in response to Jordan. I was the volunteer appointed to the planning from the ccNSO site, and I missed the meeting after that because I had ccNSO related work to do. But I'm happy to talk about this, especially about the point how we can probably better contribute to the planning of that session because I also wasn't completely happy with how that went, not only the outcome. So, that said, that's something for us maybe to take offline or assemble an informal group or something.

On observations during the meeting. When I socialized this in the hallways, I used a much stronger term, but let's say after getting into a couple of community sessions and also the GAC, I developed a scenario, and that's not necessarily positive. So, bear with me if this is too dystopic. So, we're having very fundamental discussions in parts of the community that are similar to what we did probably when we worked on the FOI.

The Root Service System Governance Working Group, which we have two seats in, one of them I take, is trying to set up a governance structure, and it is not clear that this is leading to a success anytime soon or even later. The numbers people are touching their fundamental document ICP-2, and that also has some edges. Both of these questions have appeared in the GAC with interesting questions being asked, and we should definitely watch the communique that comes out of this.

And thirdly, we are working on this policy gap analysis where the term gap actually also triggers interesting questions from governments. And then we have WSIS+20 at the end of next year. So, stretching this across the year in front of us, we have a couple of issues that could have, say, undesired results or that ask for interpretation as having undesired results by interested other parties, break nation states.

So, maybe we should, A, have a discussion about this in some circle, but also, and to be a bit more forward looking at, okay, the world is burning, what are we going to do about that? Maybe we find a way to share our experiences with that situation of, okay, we need to change or interpret some very important foundational document. Maybe we find a way without interfering with other SOs' work, because we have this noninterference principle, but to share our experience in a more informal way with those organizations. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Peter. So, you're suggesting that we should have a more formal way of communication with the ASO in particular, for example, or?

PETER KOCH: There might be bilats that we want to set up and think about doing that intersessional, for example, or reserve session time in Council sessions where we can look at this from a strategic angle, because we already committed to deal with WSIS+20, but these are things that could "explode" in our own circles, and maybe we want to make sure that everybody knows about what's at stake. That's the message. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Noted. And I see Olga has her hand up.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Alejandra. This is Olga Cavalli. I'm a NomCom appointee to the ccNSO. Jordan, I don't know if I could hear you very well what you said, but about the session yesterday, I was invited as a member of the community, but I did mention I'm a ccNSO Council member. I think it was an interesting session. My proposal when they asked me to participate was to bring some perspectives from developing economies from my region, but I couldn't hear you very well what you just mentioned, because the sound in the room is-- Maybe you can repeat. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Look, I mean, everyone has different views on a session, right? I liked your intervention. I found some of the other panelists almost impossible to follow the logic of their thinking. And I thought it would have been more practical for us to focus on the more immediate challenge that the ccNSO had proposed. I don't want to be too mean about the ccNSO session.

Everyone ends up in sessions, and they might not be what you hoped for, and I did have some positive feedback from other ccNSO members about how they found it. So, it's I just think we could have used that time more constructively if we'd tackled a different topic. That's all. And it's interesting to hear Peter's points about that preparation process as well. So, yeah, that's all.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, thank you all. Olga, you still have your hand up in the Zoom, so you know. And in interest of time, we need to move forward because we have less than two minutes. So, are there any other business? No? If not, then, well, next item is next Council meeting will be December 12th at 12:00 UTC. And now we move to the thank yous and welcome.

So, thank you to Olga and Nominet for a wonderful ccNSO cocktail. It was a very lovely evening. Thank you, Rosemary Sinclair, Jacques Latour, and Leonid Todorov for your immense and invaluable contributions and support throughout the years. While we hope to meet you in the future in other circumstances, in the meantime, you will be greatly missed. Welcome Jaijit Bhattacharya, ccNSO NomCom appointed councilor. For organizing the sessions at ICANN81, thank you to the MPC, tech working group, IGLC, DASC, and Policy Gap Analysis Working Group.

And for the outstanding efforts and support before and during this meeting, thank you to the ccNSO secretary, to Bart, Joke, Claudia, Susie, Kathy, and everyone else who chimed in and helped us. Without you, none of this would be possible. And for the hard work and patience in allowing more participants to engage in the ccNSO activities, thank you to the interpreters and the technical team in the room and remotely. Finally, for participating either in person or remotely, thank you all. This meeting is adjourned and we may stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]