ICANN81 | AGM – ccNSO: Guidelines Review Committee
Sunday, November 10, 2024 – 9:00 to 10:00 TRT

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello, and welcome to ccNSO Guideline Review Committee. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I am 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 the session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. If you would like to speak during the 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 speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you and with that, I will now hand the floor over to Sean Copeland, chair of the GRC. Thank you.

SEAN ANDREW COPELAND: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the 81st edition of the ICANN GRC meeting. [inaudible] giving moments of silence to Atatürk. It's always nice when we are in the country to recognize their traditions and respectfully acknowledge them.

Onto our stuff, off the bat for everybody that's in the room and online, does anyone have any updates to their statement of interest at all? No? Great. Moving ahead.

You guys will recall that we were working on various issues in terms of continuous improvement in the voting process. And Bart has put together a rather nice presentation for us that we will start looking at and if you can bring up the Mentimeter, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Okay, thanks. Sorry, I was busy. Next slide is the agenda. Can you go to the agenda? Okay. Today, I think Joke circulated the agenda about a week ago to the GRC. I'm just sharing it now, or we're sharing it now again, so you can see what we'll discuss today. First of all, I think, given there are other people in the room, there's no need for updating the SOIs. Today, this is an open session, so that makes it easy. So, we can go to the finalized proposals, improvement of decisions or voting process.

For those of you who have not been involved in the work of the GRC, just a brief update, the GRC was tasked to review or to use the continuous improvement framework that was adopted in—I think it was San Juan on continuous improvement for the ccNSO and to test the continuous improvement framework on a voting process. Due to the fact that Katrina Sataki stepped down, it became a matter of urgency to really start developing some recommendations in order to test it in the upcoming voting process already.

So, the working group has started and did a World Cafe in Kigali and then a Virtual World Cafe to come up with some suggestions from the community and review these suggestions. And the result was effectively a list of potential areas of improvement. And that's, I think, one of the strengths of the framework is you have to limit it and you have to include some measurements in order to check whether the proposed improvements really make a difference or not. So, they have to be fairly concrete and able to measure.

So, the working group or the committee came up with two suggestions. One is the improvement of the voting process by publishing a list of ccTLDs who have voted. Specifically, who have voted. I'll go into the details. And the next one—can you go to the next page, please?

The next one is engagement of the Caribbean ccTLDs, and we'll talk to it later. I hope Pablo will be able to join us. Can you go back one slide.

So, publishing the list of ccTLD. To date, we haven't done so. It's a change to the process itself, to the voting process as included in the guidelines. And therefore, there will be a council decision needed and I’ve looked at the council agenda, it's not included. So, there will be an update circulated tomorrow. But that's the good thing, that we have the meeting. What we intend to do, and we looked at it, and that was one of our action items from the staff side, is how do we want to do it?

Given the nature, we can do this almost on a day-by-day basis and update it once a day and then publish it on the wiki space with a link to the main page under highlights, and even alert people, say there has been an update, if necessary, to the members. So, people can check and see which ccTLD has voted. And one of the advantages—there are several advantages, but one of the advantages we've noticed in the course of the discussions is that some operators, the mystery is not directly associated or in the realm of the operator or the operated people who are involved in the ccNSO have no way to see whether their ccTLD has voted yes or no, because it's one person, and it could be outside with the ccTLD manager. It could be another organization. So, this way, people can really check whether their own ccTLD has voted yes or no.

But also, say, a little bit of peer pressure, and there is Pablo as well and [inaudible]. So that's the reason and the rough measure that was—it's a rough measure, is that the number of votes on Board Seat 12 will increase. And so, that's a nice test that you can do some digressions if you want to check against the second measure. But at least, this measure meets all the criteria of continuous improvement. It's timely. You can test it very easily, and you can express your expectations. So that's measure number one. Can you go to the next?

Improvement of voting process, and this is a very specific suggestion that is the engagement with the Caribbean ccTLDs. And Pablo, you're here right on time. So maybe, for a moment. Pablo has been working on this, and one of the reasons for focusing on the Caribbean is not because they're more important or less important, but it's a nice, secluded, and a bit of a complicated area. The reason why it's complicated is not because of the socioeconomic differences, language differences, but more from an ICANN perspective.

A few of the territories in the Caribbean do not belong to the Latin American Caribbean region, the European region. So that makes it fairly interesting, and that's why it's a nice combination with the first measure, where you can really check whether an individual ccTLD, and specifically—for example, I have the Cayman Islands in the back of my mind. Reason is they allowed the ccNSO to existence. They were from the European region, and they were the fourth one to support the ccNSO from Europe at the time. So that was, yeah, anecdotal evidence why it was so important to have.

The Caribbean—and this is a nice way to test whether something like reaching out directly prior to the voting with a more general approach may help increasing the voting in a specific region. And again, this is not easy to measure, but there are [inaudible]. We can check whether there is an increase in voting. And then, yeah, there is an assumption of a correlation between the outreach effort and the increase in voting.

If it works, it might be a model to reach out to other regions as well. Again, it meets all the criteria of continuous improvement. So, I've included an example from the—say the bit about the European region. In this case, it was fairly straightforward for me, at least being Dutch. It's Curaçao, which is part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and because of that reason, it's EU region and not LAC region.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] Aruba.

BART BOSWINKEL: Aruba, [inaudible], Bonaire, and the ABC Islands, and St. Maarten as well. And what's [inaudible] other islands, but they are municipalities. They don't have their own country code. Okay. With this, Pablo, maybe you want to, yeah, inform what you've been discussing. What will happen.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. Good morning to all. This is Pablo Rodriguez for .pr for the record. We have been in conversations with Rodney Taylor, who is a COO and Secretary Director for the CTU, the Caribbean Telecommunications Union. And they have been eagerly interested in celebrating something with the ccNSO in order to involve those ccTLD operators and others with decision-making power to participate within the events of the ccNSO such that their voices can be heard.

One of the interesting things that we need to keep in mind is that many ccTLDs from the Caribbean region are government-run. So, knowing who is our audience, and how are we going to work with them is going to make a big difference. And so, just recently, we talked about—it coincides that towards the end of January 30 and 31st of January, Trinidad and Tobago is going to be celebrating what they call the TTIGF, the Trinidad and Tobago Internet Governance Forum. And it's going to be celebrated—it’s going to be in a hybrid fashion, but it's going to be celebrated in the facilities of the CTU.

Consequently, I asked if we could have a one-hour webinar embedded into their agenda, and it just happens that they are still in the process of creating that agenda. Before I arrived to Istanbul, I had the opportunity to chat with Rodney and he told me that they agreed that we are going to get that one hour in their agenda. I just don't know when, if it's on the 30th or the 31st but one of those two days, we will have a one hour where we can have this conversation with all the ccTLD operators and other government individuals.

It is a good opportunity because it is better if they [inaudible] these individuals, because they know them as members of the Caribbean community. What they call the CARICOM, and we can get them all in one place. So, this is a fantastic opportunity to reach out to them and catch them all in one place. So far, this is the information that I have, and I will keep you all posted. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Any questions about these two proposals to start implementing an analysis test for the voting process and to check if this way, we can improve participation in the voting. No questions so much, but Pablo, do you have any ideas where we can help you directly?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Pablo Rodriguez for the record. I've been coordinating with Bart, and so far, I understand that what we will need is a presentation of the many that we have. I think that shouldn't be too difficult. Perhaps a little bit of massaging on one or two slides, but no more than that, and the support of staff. At this point, I don't see much more, but if there were, I will definitely reach out to you, of course.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe, and this is not so much GRC or a bit related, as you will see because we said monitor potential increase votes from the region, and that's why I was stressing this point, will probably, and one of the things we need to test from a staff perspective is, which ccTLDs are really in the Caribbean region, and to which ICANN region they belong, because as I said, it's a different matching in order to measure properly if there is an increase. That's the type of detail you run into, and that's that way you can really start to measure the impact of what we're proposing. So, question, yeah, Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you. This is Alejandra. Just to say that if you—well, as Sean when he helped, just if we can connect and be there, in case there are any questions, or if you want to say here's the people joining as well because they're interested. Anything that could support or make this more robust. The thing is that we are available.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Alej. Once again, Pablo, for the record. Of course, Sean, Alej, and those who may be interested in participating, of course, more than welcome. The more the merrier. Absolutely. And it gives more—your participation will provide more seriousness to the event, and it'll make it more official as well, of course.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay. Any other questions? Maybe from the audience? Go to the next item. Next slide, please.

Work plan, okay. With the proposals made, say the bit about the review of and testing of the Continuous Improvement Framework is a bit on hold. It's now implementing these measures and awaits until the results come back and then start the review of what we've done to date. So that's, say, part of the work plan, and that was the main priority.

We do have other work items as a GRC and support staff. One is the update of the Board Nomination Guideline, which was a little bit overtaken by time, unfortunately. Because there is a new board election forthcoming, I think this summer, I'm not sure, otherwise the next year, but by then, the Board Nomination Guideline needs to be adjusted. Maybe we can take into account the results from the last board nomination process as well. So that's another work item.

A third work item, which has been on the GRC's plate for quite some time now is the board recall and director removal guideline. It's still one of those guidelines, which is an implementation [inaudible] relevant for the ccNSO as a decisional participant. What I've included, and this is more as a background, is that we don't need to go there because this is more for the GRC.

An example, say the ccNSO has completed its work in this area as well. And one of the interesting parts of it, they've produced some templates in the guidelines on how to submit an approval action or a rejection action, etc. So that might be worth looking at from a GRC perspective, so I just want to do it. But this is still—and you can do it as well with the rejection and approval action guideline. Include templates to make life easier for everybody to submit a rejection.

Then the fourth one would be to harmonize, simplify and consolidate guidelines as much as possible. If you look at the list of ccNSO guidelines, it is becoming a little bit unwieldy. I think there are about 10 or 12 guide [inaudible] clustered nowadays, but it might be more useful to revisit them and rethink how we structure them. I think we've done one effort with the election, various positions, which is now a consolidated part with the exception of the council election and the board nomination. But there are other positions where there is elections, etc., so official positions where election is necessary, we've got a consolidated guideline.

The other thing is, and if you recall, the GRC had an extensive discussion about what is a participant, what is an observer, what is a member of working groups, and if you go back over and look at the various charters and various terms of references and look at the various guidelines, the terminology has been, it is time to have a look at all these charters, guidelines, etc. And to start to harmonize the terminology as well, and maybe simplify some of the probably the over legal, and that's not necessary. So that is a work item.

Finally, the two other simplification and rejection and approval action guidelines, they are very complicated due to the nature of the processes themselves. At the same time, if you look at, and again, as I said, I looked at the GNSO ones. They found a way to probably to present the material in a different way that makes it easier, and they do it along a timeline, which we haven't done. So, make it a little bit more either graphical or include tables, etc., or days, what is expected, when. That would make it already a little bit more readable and understandable for people who are not very versed into the rejection and approval actions.

And then the final one is the self-evaluation framework. That's something that came up after the closure of the retirement PDP, and it was a question from the Council that this GRC would develop such a framework, so working groups and committees could evaluate what they do themselves. At the same time, what we started. And that's something to take into account there as well as a new work item and combine it, is the review of committees. Say the first one was the OISC review. Pending and started is the DNS Abuse Committee Review, and the IGLC will need to be reviewed at one point. The GRC itself will need to be reviewed as well at one point. Check if there are areas for improvement, and if it still adds value to the community. So that's something that may be included to maybe expand the self-evaluation framework to do this.

So, that's your current work list. So, any questions around the open items in order of priority? This is your current order of priority, by the way. Any questions, comments? Everybody's happy with that order? This is your current. Can we go to the next slide, please?

So now this is the reason why we use Mentimeter. Any new items for the GRC or the governance committee, however you want to go that you can come up with? So please log in. If you look at it, I think the glossary is and the simplification is probably part of the harmonization included. So, it's more detailing of that specific work item. Overall, ICANN continues improvement program. Is there a role for the GRC? The person who inserted this maybe can speak to this in a moment. Let me clarify. Yeah, Irina and Sean are both members of the CIP, so ICANN's program. So please go ahead.

IRINA DANELIA: Hi, everyone. This is Irina for the record. Yeah, as mentioned, Sean is the main representative from the ccNSO, and I'm the alternate in the cross-community working group on our Continuous Improvement Program.

Shortly after this ICANN meeting, first draft document will be put up for the public comments, and it describes how the Continuous Improvement Program run by each supporting organization or advisory committee will substitute their organizational reviews, which happened before.

And this Continuous Improvement Frameworks suggest that there will be five principles, which are almost agreed after a few months of discussion, and will be part of the document, which will be [inaudible]. But also, it suggests that each supporting organization or advisory committee develops its own metrics to measure how they are doing according to these main principles.

For each principle, there should be several criteria. Probably three to five, and indicators that help to measure the progress. And this is the work that needs to happen within ccNSO. Some supporting organizations or advisory committee have already done this. So actually, the examples are available and the ccNSO is expected also to do this exercise, and this might be a GRC job. This might be another group of people. This might be, I don't know, GRC plus council, whatever.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. So, what you suggest is maybe as a result of—if I understand, let me take a step back. So, we know a little bit of the roadmap. The CIP will produce a public document for public comment, so that is the first step, and there is an expectation that the ccNSO will comment. Yeah, that's the first step, and the question is, who's going to do this? Either the GRC or the council or a [inaudible], but that's a council decision, probably, together with triage, and then they can assign this to the GRC. That's the first one.

Once this has been completed, then there is the expectation that after adoption of that framework, the matrix, or there will be, say, the framework will be used to evaluate the Continuous Improvement Programs of the ccNSO, including, say, using these criteria. Is that correct as well? Yeah, so that's the second step. And what you're saying is, if I understand you correctly, Irina, some SOs and ACs have already started measuring according to these criteria.

SEAN ANDREW COPELAND: They have.

IRINA DANELIA: No. Sorry.

SEAN ANDREW COPELAND: Go ahead.

BART BOSWINKEL: Go ahead, go ahead.

IRINA DANELIA: I'm not sure they have started, but they at least developed the criteria and indicators, because these criteria and indicators are individual for each SO/AC. And SO/AC is supposed to develop these criteria itself.

BART BOSWINKEL: If that's the case, would it be wise, and then reframing it a little bit, to check, and that's something to maybe to raise with the council. Not this meeting, but as soon as it's open for public comment that the GRC would test its framework against these criteria.

SEAN ANDREW COPELAND: That would be fair. I mean, part of the problem that we're having here is this discussion, as Irina noted, on the principles. I'm surprised that people put forward something when we're still discussing the principles. Nevertheless, one will hope that when it gets published, we will build to expedite, because we have actually created, without necessarily seeing it. That process with the things and activities that we've been doing over the last 18 months. We just haven't put it in form of a workflow metric to submit into the CIP.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe that's as a test. That's something to discuss with the council, of course, as well, but as a test, as a work item, that you test the current framework against the—or use the criteria, match it with the framework or the program.

SEAN ANDREW COPELAND: True. I do want to point out that we have put some stuff to the council, and to date, only one council member, Pablo, has actually given input back, so it's always helpful for council to give us input back.

BART BOSWINKEL: Is this something that you want this week, or at the next council meeting?

SEAN ANDREW COPELAND: How about the agenda now? If it’s busy, then we can do it the next council.

BART BOSWINKEL: But then, it will come one way or the other, part of the work item. Maybe related to the test and review of the ccNSO, Continuous Improvement Framework work as well, so as a separate, I would say, sub-work item. Would that work, or do you want it as a separate one? Okay.

Then we got ASP. Is there a role for ccNSO? I don't know who submitted this one.

IRINA DANELIA: Yeah, I wanted to raise some issue with the ASP. I don't know if ccNSO can have contribution on that, because when I went and read the handbook, I saw that this program is intended to help support the [inaudible] region at the first level, but when we go through the handbook, we can see that at the regional level, the underserved regions can be leased with this program. I don't know if the ccNSO is somehow related to work, I want to have a look at the work of the GNSO.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, probably it's—I think, if you say to work with underserved regions, whether this is a work item for the GRC is another question, but I think it would be worth for the council to have a look at that work, maybe even the triage committee. Yeah, we see have a few members of the triage committee in here as well. That they check whether there is a work item for the ccNSO in that area.

SEAN ANDREW COPELAND: Yeah, go ahead.

IRINA DANELIA: Apologies if I missed. Irina for the record. ASP stands for... Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Running lists of potential recommendations for the ICANN bylaws.

DAVID MACAULAY: Bart, David Macaulay of Verisign speaking for the record. One preliminary comment, I just want to say how nice it is to be back here at the GRC table. I'm a former member whose attention was taken elsewhere by a modest reorganization of the Verisign policy team about a year ago, but it's great to be back amongst friends.

What I did here with this, just wanted to draw from work I'm doing on the Independent Review Process Implementation Oversight Team of which I'm a part. And we are just about done with creating rules for how IRPs are conducted, but it's very intensive and bylaw intensive work.

And as we do it, it gets very deep into bylaw 4.3. Deals with the Independent Review Process.

And we have developed the practice of keeping a running tab of suggestions to ICANN for bylaw amendments that we will submit when we finish our rules work. We haven't yet. But as we get so deep into the bylaws, and what you do, for instance, when you get to board recall or those kinds of things, and as you get deeply into it and try and apply it in practice, it's almost inevitable that you'll come across little things that may or may not merit a suggestion.

In our case, in the IRP, we will have a list that we keep so that we don't forget them, and at the end when we curate the list, we'll say yes, this is one where we should, and maybe a bunch we'll say no, forget it. It's just not that important. But it's a good idea, I think, to help enhance the bylaws and make them better over time as people who are engaged in practice and grapple with some of the difficulties in the bylaws. And there are some ambiguities just to keep a list. And so, it's not direct work for the GRC, but it's like keeping a background document going just so you don't lose sight of these things, and that's my suggestion.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks, David. Just for your information, on the council agenda for Thursday, is an update on the list of bylaw changes suggested by the ccNSO. I think there are about 11, and that's one. But not at the level that you are saying. So, I think, Sean, it's something—as the IRP is doing it, is to come up with concrete suggestions. I know from other areas, for example, with the PDPs, there were bylaw suggestions, and yeah, the council keeps up all these changes as well. I think with version 9 or something, but detailing it for the GRC makes sense, especially we review all these guidelines again.

SEAN ANDREW COPELAND: Okay. Can we go to the next slide? I don't see any. It's good to have this. So new items, no need for voting, I guess. We can go to the next one. Next slide please. Priority or work items, this is an interesting one as well, next slide, I hope it works.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, here you go,

SEAN ANDREW COPELAND: I've listed, and this is for you to set the priority again, from a GRC perspective and broader perspective. Go back to your Mentimeter and you will see two axes, one is the importance of the issue, the other one urgency, so not the effort, but the urgency, because this is all your work. If you combine them, you end up somewhere in that quadrant, and this is a bit of a test.

BART BOSWINKEL: Rate all six of them.

SEAN ANDREW COPELAND: Thank you. I think this is an interesting—it's really interesting, so yeah, they combine now. Jordan, this is the one I wanted to use.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just a comment. I think this tool is super cool, honestly. We were discussing with Irina about the scale, because in my very math-oriented axis crossing, to me the center is zero. So, I was thinking about that while evaluating. So, the middle must be five, I guess, then if it's from zero to ten. So, I didn't take that into consideration, so for the instructions it would have been better, but I think it works on its own, but since we're testing it, this is a little bit of feedback, because in my head it was from zero on, and okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: I was thinking about using another grid, but then again, I have a priority of minus five is something that's if.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But maybe more representative, because then you're saying this is really less important.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, let's see it next time. Sorry, we'll see how it works next time. Can we go to the next slide. Sean, I'm looking at you, this gives you a rough indication for going forward and for the GRC as well, for the priorities, so thank you. Final one, GRC capacity and working methods, that was the final topic for today. Again, pre-empting on other work. Can we go to the next slide, please. Over time what you see is the GRC workload, and what we're doing right now, where we are, is there is a certain capacity of the GRC to do and complete its work.

There is a workload of GRC, the work items, and what we just completed was prioritization. What will happen is there will be additional work items, and yeah, we have to prioritize even more. And some of them probably will evolve because they're no longer necessary. It's also the art of prioritization. But I think the other side is the capacity of the GRC to complete its work. Go to the next one.

So, one of the questions is really to balancing the workload and capacity is to increase the capacity of the GRC itself, because in this way you'll be able to get more and faster. And so, there’s less pressure say on the GRC itself, and it makes it probably more interesting as well. Can we go to the next slide?

Now, this is an interesting one after – think about capacity. There are probably two major components to it. One is the efficiency and effectiveness of working methods. So, this is the way how the GRC conducts its business. How we organize our work. The other side is the quality and quantity of the resources, the volunteers and staff, you have to work on both sides, just one isn't enough, if there are no efficient and effective working methods and you have 100 volunteers and 100 people or staff, it will be fairly unproductive. You have very efficient work methods including AI, but no people, probably nothing gets done either.

You need to strike a right balance between the two of them, so just as a brief exercise, and we have a few minutes, can we go to the next slide.

And we're going to use Mentimeter again. What changes do you suggest so the GRC can make to increase its capacity or our capacity? So just type in any suggestions you have, knowing the working methods, knowing what the GRC is doing, where you think and capacity and quality of staff and resources, etc. This is a real blue sky effort. I'll give you two more minutes.

Interesting suggestion. One more minute. Okay, thank you. Can we go to the next slide, which is again, not a Mentimeter. I think we're almost done. I think they should be taken on board by the GRC, so thank you very much. I'd just like to hand it back to you, Sean, to wrap it up and then, we [inaudible].

SEAN ANDREW COPELAND: Thank you so much for coming out today, you guys. The comments are very interesting, I personally like whoever suggested the marathon. I actually do like that. It does get a lot of stuff done, we have tried the subgroups in the past and they have been effective. Usually, requires a little bit more in our membership, our membership in the GRC is low right now, we need to entice members. I do know that our World Cafe type events and open space events have caused people to be interested in what we're doing. But we haven't figured out a way to convert that into membership. The fun stuff is always fun. Doing the work, maybe not as much.

Something for us to work on within the GRC. Saying that, I would like to thank, Claudia, Joke and Bart for the work today for this. I'd like to thank all of you guys for coming out, and I would like to thank the gentlemen behind that are running the audio visual for us. And with that, I will give you back the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]