
ICANN82 | CF – ccNSO: Guidelines Review Committee Session
Saturday, March 08, 2025 – 16:30 to 17:30 PST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to ccNSO Guidelines Review Committee Session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I am the Remote 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 or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their microphone in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. With that, I will now hand the floor over to Sean Copeland, Chair of the GRC. Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND

Can you hear me now? All right. So good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to the Pacific Northwest. It's wonderful to be hosting this in my own backyard. For those of you joining us in person, Seattle offers plenty to explore. You have Pike Place Market just down the road, which happens to be the place where the first Starbucks was.

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.

You can get on a monorail and head to the Space Needle and Science Center. And if you brought your family with you, the Woodland Zoo is nice to see. For everyone here in the room, thank you for attending. And for everyone online as well. And if there are any of our new members that are here, I welcome you very much to the GRC. Before we dive into the agenda, let me briefly cover some administrative items. As always, if anyone has an update to their statement of interest, please let us know now or let the Secretariat know at your leisure. On today's agenda, Joke will be guiding us through the analysis of recent voting results, after which we'll revisit and aim to finalize our review of the ccNSO selection guideline. I know a lot of you have provided input in that, so hopefully we'll finish that today. And if we manage to have enough time, we will actually get to the proposed updates to operating standards, though I believe we will end up having to table that to another session.

Additionally, although not officially on today's agenda, last month Pablo took the time to do a test case for interaction with local ccTLDs as an effort to drive membership. This was supported by the Secretariat and by AJ, and we got a lot of valuable insights from that, and I would suggest that we will want to have council add that as a functional duty of every single councilor. It was a good result, and thank you for that, Pablo.

Finally, a couple of things. A quick reminder that on Wednesday at 10:30, we're having a joint session with GAC, and this will be a two-part session, and the second part will be kind of along the lines of what we've been doing here in the GRC with continuous

improvement, so I hope to see you all there. As usual, we have AOB at the end of the agenda, and I'm looking forward to productive discussion today and encourage your active participation. And finally, for everybody here that's traveled, please remember that it is daylight savings time tonight. That means you all are going to lose an hour of sleep, so keep that in mind, and maybe head to bed an hour earlier. So with that, we can get started. Over to you, Joke.

JOKE BRAEKEN

What you see here is a slide deck. Most of it you already saw, actually, because the beginning of the slide deck are those numbers that were presented also during the World Cafe at ICANN 80 in Kigali. And at the time, the ccPDP4 vote was the most recent vote, so you can see some slides with numbers regarding voting per region, number of emissaries that voted. But I think we can skip those, if you agree, Sean, and we can go directly to the more recent ones that were added just now. And that is slide number 13, regarding the, this one, exactly. No, the next one. One more. Yeah. So this is a slide that was added regarding the recent voting for the election for ICANN board seat number 12. And that voting ran from the 4th of February to the 18th. You can see the ballots that were counted were 107. There were 70 voters that haven't voted, and you can see the regional distribution. The bar, the blue bar, is the number of votes received per region, each of the five regions listed there. And the orange bar is the number of emissaries per region.

On the next slide, you can see an overview of the number of votes per region per day. And I know that the colors are a little bit hard to

see, maybe, the dark blue is the African region, then you have orange for the AP region, followed by green for the European region, light blue for the LAC region, and purple for the North American region. And the idea is to add also in this slide when the reminders via tally were sent out, when were there, for instance, outreach efforts by the regional organizations, and see if these impact the number of incoming votes. On the next slide, you can see one of the novelties that you just referred to, Sean, for this voting round was to have a live tracker for the list of voting territories. So per region, per country and territory, the ccTLDs were listed there as well. You can see a screenshot with a quick at-a-glance overview whether the territory voted or whether the vote was still pending. And then the regional distribution again. That was one of the few, of the two items that GRC introduced as new items for this voting round. The second one is on the next slide, and that's the webinar for the Caribbean ccTLDs. And here you can see the participation by the Caribbean ccNSO members in the current round. So for board seat 12, and you can see all of the Caribbean ccTLDs that are a member of the ccNSO listed there and whether they voted or not. So there's a small epsilon next to them, their names, if they participated in this voting round.

And then the final slide is an at-a-glance overview of the recent voting rounds, starting with ccPDP3 retirement on the left and ending with board seat 12, the latest voting round, and how the various regions participated in each of these rounds. Happy to answer any questions.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ This is Pablo Rodriguez from the NIC.PR for the record. I believe there were, what, 18, we have 18 members from the Caribbean region who are members of the LAC region, and of it, eight of them voted. Is that correct?

JOKE BRAEKEN I count three votes, three votes from the members from the Caribbean region.

BART BOSWINKEL Pablo, what you call the LAC region is the Caribbean region, so as you can see, they're counted differently, yeah.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ Right.

JOKE BRAEKEN So the ccTLDs that are part of the Caribbean region are spread over the various ... Two of them are North America, four, Europe, and the others are part of the Latin American Caribbean region.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ Right, so we have two. From LAC three, from North America two, from Europe three. And then we have a number of them from the LAC region that can vote.

JOKE BRAEKEN

Exactly.

BART BOSWINKEL

Joke, if you look at these numbers, based on yourself, what you've seen in the past, do you think that the number of ccTLDs from that region that voted has increased?

JOKE BRAEKEN

Without having the concrete numbers, I think a slight increase.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Statistically, one or two is actually a good outcome for us.

BART BOSWINKEL

It might be interesting to go back, especially if you can just go back, I think it's the next slide. Okay, so from the actions, I think what is, at least from my perspective, and just as an observation is interesting, is that, first of all, that you see the trend of voting with respect to the PDPs is higher than with respect to the board seats. This is where you have a general vote. So that's one observation. Secondly is what you see this time around with board seat 12, we almost surpassed the level of voting of PDP 4. And I think that's a very good outcome of where you are in that sense. And you talk about two or four more and etc., but in that sense, it is positive.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

I am glad to hear that. Next Wednesday at 4:30 in Block 5, I'm going to be speaking in the LAC space. And I will bring this information and I will share also the importance of participation in these different meetings. So, there's different types of events. We definitely need to do, we, those of us who are in the Caribbean region, of the different members of the different ICANN regions, need to do better. So, we'll continue to push forward. Thanks.

JOKE BRAEKEN

Anything else to add to these numbers? No? Go ahead, Sean.

SEAN COPELAND

Yeah, I just want to make the comment, if you extrapolate that one or two that has come out from there across the board, we might be looking at 15, maybe even 20 more active members across the ccNSO. And I think that would be very good for us, you know, just to see that. So, I'm really hoping that we're able to take this and nurture it and make it grow.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

One of the things that we are considering is to, not just to wait for the regional or the local IGF forums, but also to develop other spaces in which we can gather, excuse me, this similar group of people and explore other, explore the necessities, explore possible solutions, and also explore other interests that they have. And I think this would provide them an opportunity to become

familiarized with the ccNSO and perhaps feel enticed to become members and or to participate more actively.

BART BOSWINKEL

Do you see any, say, first of all, for the Caribbean region, because that's the one you probably were really involved in, do you see any future events like the ones in January? And how do you think, say, the council and others could help you, because that's what happened actually in that webinar session. Do you see it, how could they help you for that?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thank you for the question. And I want to officially, for the record, state that your, that the support of staff was instrumental in the success of what we did. And I definitely see, as a result of that participation, the warming of many of the participants and/or the coordinators of that event asking me to participate in LAC Space on behalf of the ccNSO to explore how we can continue to collaborate together. So to answer the question, I do expect that out of this meeting in LAC Space, we will at least begin to identify a number of opportunities that we should, opportunities to develop events in which we will touch several topics and in which the ccNSO will be an important participant of that conversation.

BART BOSWINKEL

Another question for you, and I think that's important also, because going back to why are we discussing this is because you are driving the Continuous Improvement Program of the ccNSO. If

you think about it, do you think this model can be used for other regions as well?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

There are a number of things that, usually I tell people that business models and revolutions are unexportable, right? But since this is neither, I strongly believe that this model could be used to get other regions to participate more. I know that language plays a very important role. In the case of the Caribbean region, English is a major language there. Perhaps in the AP region or in Africa, we may find that, well, in Africa it's either English or French, but in the AP region may be a little bit more challenging. Nevertheless, I believe that we could use this model. So the answer is yes, I believe that we can use this model. Perhaps we may have to use variations of it in the AP region, because of segmenting the events per language would make the difference. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL

Maybe Abdalmonem. If you think about the Arabic region, because that's a very specific one, almost like the Caribbean in that sense, with all the differences, do you think it's worthwhile to organize sessions to engage with, say, the Arabic ccTLDs to get them more involved?

ABDALMONEM GALILA

Actually, the number of Arabic speakers worldwide is somehow comparable. I think Arabic language is the sixth or seventh language used worldwide. So it's very important. Even not in the

Arab region, you know that Uzbekistan is one of the examples. They are Muslims, they could speak Arabic, they are keen to learn Arabic, so Arabic language is very, very important. And I am wondering why at this moment we don't have any translation for Arabic language. I don't know. Arabic language is very important, and it's one of the six UN languages used by UNESCO, by UN.

BART BOSWINKEL

I appreciate that, and I understand. But going back, say, what we did, what the ccTLD did, or the Council members did, Pablo did, is attend a regional event to explain what the ccTLD is doing, to engage. Because if you look at the Arabic, say, the Middle Eastern region, there are a lot of members, but these members don't show up. It's – I don't know why they're – and engaging them actively and sharing them what we do, or what the ccNSO is doing, would that help, in your opinion?

ABDALMONEM GALILA

Yeah, it's very important to have something like this. But not only this, it is a must. We need also to have GSE team involved. He will make his job, his mission, to involve Arab guys from these national events to be engaged with the work for Pablo, or for the work groups that Pablo is involved in. It's very important to go for that. For example, for Middle East DNS Forum, it's very important. APTLD, FTLD, something like that. I don't know what other region is doing for that.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

So one of the things that we did is that we identified an event that was taking place in Trinidad and Tobago, and that is inviting a number of different players from different areas, from social movements as well as professional communities, different ones. But we took advantage of that opportunity to ask if we could invite ccTLD operators that we normally don't see them in this type of events, in this type of meetings, and if they would be keen to come to the event, and they did. And so we were able to speak to them, ccTLD operators. So, the big question here is, do you think that there is an event that takes place on a yearly basis or something like that, or a special event in which we could invite a number of people, of ccTLD operators from the region, who would participate there, and then, for example, you, with the support of the staff, would reach out to them to explain the importance of the type of work that the ccNSO does, and how can they participate, become members if they're not members already, and if they are members, how can they get more involved, that type of thing.

ABDALMONEM GALILA

Actually, similar for this, why Universal Accessibility Group and I can select the event for Global Universal Accessibility to be at Vietnam, we select one of the big event, [ABAC,] that have a lot of providers, software providers, a lot of players there, in order to hold the Global Day there, Global UA Day there, it's the same example. For the most common forum for the Middle East, what I know is the Middle East DNS Forum, it's very important, and also the School of

Internet Governance, Middle East School of Internet Governance, second event for that.

PETER KOCH

Okay, when we're counting the votes cast, and we're talking about increasing participation in the voting, would it be helpful to also weigh in, or count the number of abstentions, because people can, I assume that the voting allows to abstain, like vote abstain, rather than not, only abstain by voting, by, I'm sorry, there's a voting option to say abstain rather than only to be able to abstain by not voting, right? So then, by increasing the number of participants, it might be helpful to look at the abstentions and whether they grow or shrink, thank you.

JOKE BRAEKEN

So for instance, for the latest round, for board seat 12, there were three options, you could vote for one of the two candidates, and the third option was none of the above, and if I remember well, there were four votes that selected none of the above, but there was nobody that casted a vote without selecting any of those three options.

PETER KOCH

Yeah, thanks, Joke, this is Peter again. None of the above would then, would be what I phrased an abstention, right? Okay. And of course, that makes only sense if we watch that over time, right? Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL

Peter, what is more important, I think, and that's why the trend is there, so, and that's why the GRC is involved, it is testing whether you can, through these actions, and that's why we say that you could see it from the Caribbean region, is because that's a hard one. It has always been very low in participation, in general participation in the ccNSO, whether it's a good thing or not, and this is, in that sense, it was an indicator, if you recall from, I think it was from the Istanbul meeting, when we discussed it. This was one of the two measures, and to check whether it's, first of all, whether it's a success, and to continue this, and based on the, say, the anecdotal evidence, you could say it is because also of the interaction with the others, and how the webinar was, and then check if you want to promote this going forward, for example, for the Asian Pacific region, and for the Middle East region, and maybe even for the African region. And it's not about getting votes, at the end of the day, that's the test, is getting more votes at this stage, but it's also getting more involvement in that sense. That's why we're driving this agenda, not the end results, et cetera. I hope that's clear.

PETER KOCH

Yeah, sure it is, but still, it's the question of what is the measure for success, or not necessarily failure, but no change, and you can, of course, say if there's 10 more who vote, and at the same time, you have 10 more abstentions, could argue that, okay, that's an active abstention, rather than a passive abstention.

BART BOSWINKEL

It doesn't matter how they vote, as long as they vote, even if they vote abstain. That's at least an active participation, instead of just, yeah, don't do anything.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

If I may, I believe what I understood from what you were saying, if I understood correctly, if, for example, from the ICANN regions that we were looking at, if we would have seen from those countries that we had there, that they had voted none of the above, or whatever, I would have been really happy, because at least they voted, they were there. So, if that's what you were saying, I think it's really important, one way of saying, if they're saying, no, I don't want any of these, but at least they're there, they participated, and that is encouraging. So, yeah, I think it is a good idea of continue to watch the abstentions or the abstentions-like type of votes, to give us an idea of who's participating and who's not. Thanks.

SEAN COPELAND

Just, sorry, I want to make an observation that the Asia-Pacific region, their vote tally actually was really good, but having been there, and trying to attend my own meeting while there, it's brutal. I've got a lot of respect for everybody in the Asia-Pacific, for those that are able to get on the calls, they are really, really hard, and that's something that we do have to look at, slightly different than middle of the night, like right in the middle of the night, like 03:00 AM, right? So, I have a lot of respect for you, Jordan, for some of the

calls that you're getting. Uncle, I know you're a little out of it, but it's still pretty intense.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, but also, I don't go to the 03:00 AM meetings. I refuse.

SEAN COPELAND

Therein lies the rub, right? I mean, how many people get up in the Asia-Pacific for a 03:00 AM meeting? Not very many. Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL

Just to conclude this part, may I suggest that, say, based on this conversation, and that's, at least, say, that you suggest to Council to continue this and broaden it, because in that sense, say, it's only one case, but it did indicate, and at least from the attendance at the session itself, it did indicate it's worth pursuing in testing, say, as a way to improve engagement. So, that's, in that sense, a positive. So, maybe the other one, and I'm looking at you, Joke, again. Did you have any feedback on, and maybe the others as well, on the list that we produced or that was included on the website on, maybe you can show it to, again, the, which slide is it, the, no, the other one, yeah, this one, where people, the vote tracker, because one of the concerns, if you recall from the Council meeting, and that's why people abstained, was this could be used and maybe misused, abused by people approaching others to vote in a particular way. And, at least, based on the first use, there is no indication this happened.

JOKE BRAEKEN

There were no questions regarding the publication of this list. During one of the Council meetings, I recall that some Councilors had a more detailed look at the list and reached out to ccTLDs from their region, saying, I notice you haven't voted yet. This is a reminder. Please, please vote. So, more like an encouraging type of approach. Like, the list is public. Make sure you join.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

It occurs to me that we should identify where is the next step? Where is the next region that we should do something about it? And, Muscat is coming in. ICANN 84, right? So the Middle East, it's easier and more familiar to them to move there, to participate in that event. But then, where within that event can we have that conversation with the particular ccTLDs of the region? And so similar to what we're doing here, where we have black space, then we can have Middle East space, and Abdalmonem is a co-chair there. And that would be an opportunity to reach out to them and do something similar to what we did, and bring, for example, the UA topics and other topics of interest to them.

BART BOSWINKEL

But why would you do it at an ICANN meeting? I think that's the strength that you can do it, build upon, say, that's the next step. What you do is, but you can engage with them, I would say, intersessionally as well. Start as soon as possible.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ Absolutely. Absolutely. We just need to identify what are those events that are taking place there.

BART BOSWINKEL Organize one yourself, together with Baher and [inaudible]

ABDALMONEM GALILA Yeah, as a co-chair of the Middle East space, actually, during the ICANN meeting, this ICANN meeting, we have a session for Middle East space. And maybe the three times of ICANN meetings per year, we have a statement or have topics to be discussed. At this time, while we are in ICANN 82, we'll discuss ASP program. Applicant Support Program. What are the challenges for the Middle East in order to apply for this kind of program? So maybe one of the topics that could be as a joint session between ccNSO and Middle East space to discuss something related to the challenges. Why you are not joining ccNSO? Why you have no participation from there for different kind of workgroup? And display all the activities for the workgroup that they maybe involve, maybe could involve in, and you don't know anything about that. Thank you.

IRINA DANIELIA Thank you. Since we have this great vote tracker, before deciding on what is the next step, maybe we should look on those who did not vote and identify how they are grouped, can be grouped together, and then discuss how we can reach them.

JORDAN CARTER

That's reasonable. Can we do that, Joke? Thank you. Are we ready to move on to the next item in the agenda? Okay. All right. Let's go on to the review of the selection guideline. If you want to bring it up on the screen, it'd be fantastic. And Bart, I will turn this over to you. So going through here, nobody had any issues with the very first part. Do you want me to read everything, or do you just want me to go to the notes?

BART BOSWINKEL

To the notes, because this is ...

SEAN COPELAND

Okay, so let me bring this up on my screen so I can read it. So we're looking at the selection process and the election process entries. And there was a fair number of comments here. I liked Irina's comment. And I don't know if I have necessarily hit what you wanted here or not in how I put stuff in the commentary. So I don't know if you've seen it yet, in fairness. So I redid the selection process to read the full sequence of events managed by the ccNSO council, beginning with the adoption of the selection process timeline and ending with the adoption of the selection report, which confirms the result of the nominations and election. That's how I reworded the selection process. And then from the election process, then I'm suggesting that we actually go into clarity of the steps in the election process, so the steps that Joke actually does to break out the tool. Go ahead, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA

Actually, my comment was [not] to get rid of the term election process. At all. Just don't have it.

SEAN COPELAND

Does anybody else want to weigh in on that? Do you want them kept separate, taken out? Does anyone have an opinion? Pablo? If we take it out, you're OK with that, then, Irina?

IRINA DANELIA

That means that we will need to go through the text to make adjustment in the text. But my point was that it's just confusing to have selection and election, and it's too confusing.

SEAN COPELAND

No, totally fair enough. Fair enough. All right. We will adjust that to make it a little bit more clear. So we will do the process and the steps into one definition. Do you guys prefer the election process or the selection process as the one that stays?

UNIDENTIFIED

Selection comes from the bylaws.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

And besides the possible confusion, sometimes election requires, by definition, an action to happen, like voting. And it's not always

the case. So selection, it's the broader term that groups everything. So that's why selection makes more sense than election.

SEAN COPELAND

Fair enough. So we make those changes, Joke, please, if possible. Moving down, the next item is the self-seconding. And the conversation here was between Katrina and AJ. And it had to do with the use of a representative versus a nominee. And AJ, you provided a nice logic algorithm on the reopening. Are we content leaving it as a representative? Or do we want to take Katrina's suggestion and make it a nominee?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

I feel that representative makes more sense regarding the examples I provided. Because a nominee, it's a specific person that has already, like, it's the first case. It's the nomination of oneself. And I think it overcomplicates the language if we go using nominee. Because then people should be, like, super careful to know exactly what we're talking about. And I think we should strive for clarity rather than specificity, if that makes sense.

SEAN COPELAND

Thank you. And by the way, the diagram that you added was very helpful for those who have seen it. Going down now to section 6. There's a lot of commentary in there. So this one, again, I've taken what people have said. And I came up with language. I'm hoping is helpful here, or it may not be. So under what I would propose, actually, is those six bullet points be adjusted to four. And what I'm

suggesting is they be the first bullet point be representatives may nominate themselves. Self-nominations require seconding by at least two other representatives from the same ICANN geographic region. A bullet would then become to be valid each nomination except self-nominations, as noted above, must be seconded by at least one other representative from the same ICANN geographic region. To lead the third bullet point, a representative may second the nominee of only one candidate. If a representative submits multiple secondings, only the first seconding received will be considered valid. And representatives cannot second their nominations. Self-seconding is invalid. Now, I know later on in the conversation, it was discussed about what happens if a nomination is considered invalid, and if there's a seconding that happens with one or the other. From a logic point of view, when a nomination is considered invalid, but has had a person that is seconded on two different ones, if the first one was the one that was invalid, it drops off anyways at the point of nomination, closing. Therefore, the second one would actually be valid from a pure logic point of view. And I just want to make—this is complex. Go ahead, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

I'm not sure I'm following everything what you said, John, but one comment regarding self-nomination or self-seconding, it's not just the representative self-nominating himself, but it could also be a colleague from the same ccTLD. So that is not covered, I believe, in the suggested new wording. Thank you.

-
- PETER KOCH This was exactly the point I was going to make. The self-nomination makes sense, but the self-seconding is unclear whether that refers to the representative or to any, whatever the term is, any employee of that same ccTLD.
- ALEJANDRA REYNOSO I have another comment. So now that I'm reading it again, it says each representative may nominate or second one or more persons. But then if a representative nominates more than one nominee, only the first nomination will be considered valid and processed. So what's the definition of nominee again?
- SEAN COPELAND So the nominee is a person that has a valid nomination.
- ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Yeah, that's it. No second.
- SEAN COPELAND But at this moment in time, until the election process says these are the nominees, a moment before that happens, essentially, or a period of time before that, Joke is going to, presuming Joke is the election manager, Joke is going to probably notify the nominee that they have an invalid nomination, right? And they will or will not correct it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

That's where my comment comes. As in, why are we allowing for a representative to nominate more than one person? Because it overcomplicates everything. If we are taking the first nomination. Right?

SEAN COPELAND

I'm not disagreeing with you. That's just the way that things are.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

I know, but that's when I'm reading it, it makes no sense.

BART BOSWINKEL

It is a change. In the past, it is why we allowed, if I recall, people to nominate more than one person, which happened. So the only thing, either you say, because this is complete, if you look at it, it's completely illogical. So either, the real choice is, do you allow a person to nominate more than one person? How many, even three or four, it doesn't matter? Or just one? And whether then the first one is valid, it doesn't really matter anymore. If a representative can only nominate one, including self-nomination, full stop. If they can nominate two or more person, full stop. So they can even nominate seven if they want to. So I think that's the fundamental choice. And then we add to the, say we adjust the language accordingly. But this goes round in circles.

SEAN COPELAND

Not disagreeing.

PETER KOCH I would just like to, Peter again, I would just like to suggest that the self-nomination has the same issue that the self-seconding has. Is it about the person or about the ccTLD? That should be clarified.

SEAN COPELAND Fair, yeah, understood. Irina?

IRINA DANELIA Yeah, thank you, Irina, for the record. By the way, I'm just wondering why cannot nominate two or three or even seven people and second? What's wrong about that?

SEAN COPELAND Technically, nothing. It just depends on what type of rules we generally want to follow within the ccNSO. And we kind of seem to go back and forth a bit.

IRINA DANELIA That's exactly my question. I don't know why I would try to introduce this limitation. Maybe I don't understand, but what is wrong with that? It's having like two or three, being able to nominate three candidates.

SEAN COPELAND To be honest, I really don't know why, to be honest. It is not an issue to me one way or the other. If I look at it from Robert's rules

perspective, it's one way. If I look at it from Chatham House, it's another way. We seem to be trying to divide between two different rules and we somehow end up picking a route that kind of not workable. Go ahead, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER

Yeah, I'm not a member of the committee, just an observer, maybe annoying intervention. But if we have to make a choice, shouldn't we make a choice that maximizes the flexibility of ccNSO members? So shouldn't the choice be to allow multiple nominations? In which case you just delete that first bullet point after the yellow text and you keep the bright yellow bit. Go ahead.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Just to clarify for Peter, yes, we do have the concept self-nomination and self-seconding at the beginning. And it says when a representative either nominates oneself or nominates another person from the same entity. So it's when self-nomination or self-seconding means everyone in the ccTLD, so for that. And regarding the other, yes, I agree. It should be one or the other and give even more flexibility. I don't see an issue with that in particular, but allowing it and then restricting it, it's the one that bothers me because then we are over-complicating things.

SEAN COPELAND

Can we strike that out on that one then? Just to make it easier?

BART BOSWINKEL

This was the result of some of your observations in the sense of, I think from the formal language that you suggested clarification. Do you foresee any issues if you would receive multiple nominations by one person?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER

Can you elaborate, Peter?

PETER KOCH

Yeah, just let me remind you I'm not on the committee. I'm actively observing. So the question is what problem are we trying to solve here? And the reason to limit the nominations and the secondment is of course that not two can, I'm not going to say conspire, but agree to nominate a large slate just on their own and then maybe confuse the election. So the support for the candidates should be distributed among the electorate. And nomination is not a guarantee for voting, but two registries could then go and whatever. Nominate and second 15 people. The question is, is that happening in practice or not? But then you have these rules to prevent crazy things. Has the status quo been a problem? That's the question to ask.

JOKE BRAEKEN

I'm a bit too tired, but I think if I remember well, there was a discrepancy between the board nomination guideline and the council selection guideline. And there was a different approach in each of them. There was a limitation in one of them. And my observation was not giving a recommendation in either one

direction, but if possible to have a streamlined approach for both procedures. And the situation which you just described, Peter, I think there's still one step in between all those candidates that have been nominated and seconded, all those 15 people, they still need to agree to run as a candidate. They need to accept their nomination. Happen, but perhaps unlikely.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

So, I would like to suggest if maybe for the next call, we could have both text from the Board election process and this one and compare them to see which one fits best, instead of deciding now and making maybe a decision that it's farther away from the Board election process. So if we want to actually do them more homogenously ...

BART BOSWINKEL

I think we copied it. The fundamental choice is whether you allow one nomination or you allow multiple nominations. The board nomination procedure needs to be revisited anyway as a result of the last election. But harmonizing is one, but make it as simple as possible and not getting into these complex rules which at the end of the day don't add anything, they're circular. So it has to be one of the two, either you allow one nomination or you allow multiple nominations or two, whatever number you want, but don't make it too complex and then you insert it in both.

-
- ALEJANDRA REYNOSO But we don't have to decide right now, that's my point. So maybe give time to thinking, it's a suggestion, sure.
- SEAN COPELAND Actually then maybe what we should do is we should take that out of both what's existing now and do that entirely in isolation to...
- BART BOSWINKEL Or you adjust it in one and then you do it in the other one as well, you need to make that choice.
- SEAN COPELAND Yeah, no, I agree, I'm just saying from a workflow point of view Bart, if we deal with this issue and we decide on what it's going to be in one, it's automatically in the other, but we've done it apart from, is where I'm going. So if we can take that up on the next call, this brings us down to...
- UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER Just one thing, that in the board seat nomination guideline, there's also a bit of confusion in the way that this is described, so if you look at them both together, you might need to make some tweaks to both of them.
- SEAN COPELAND Yeah, that's a very good reason for us to literally do it isolated from everything else just so that we can arrive at a consensus. So I'm cognizant that we're running out of time and I don't think we're

going to get through this document much more in five minutes and I know some of you guys are tired, which is fine. I know we had anticipated getting this to council this week, we'll fail, but nevertheless, if we can take and adjust what has been done, at least at that point, it would be appreciated. Again, don't worry about it this week, wait till you're home. With that, if you're okay, then go ahead, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA

We will not finish this document today, I understand, but in the next part, there is also a piece to which I have really questions, it's about change of affiliation and I'm wondering why we are so strict about that, but this is probably the item for further discussion, but I hope it will happen. At the moment, it's very strict text, but there might be a reason which I'm not aware of.

SEAN COPELAND

Totally fair. Let's go back to the list of things for us to specifically discuss. You're all good? Okay. One of the things I will mention in this document, there's a couple of components of text in here that I do want to bring up. As said it previously, we need to have a style guide within the ccNSO and the ICANN geographic regions is a terminology that I think we need to do as a style guide item for all of the working groups. The same to, Joke mentioned item number 10 in this particular list of items as being, I'll call it boilerplate, it's a language I will use, but it's consistent across, it's supposed to be consistent across, this is also a style guide type thing and it's something that I think we really need to encourage within the

various working groups for consistency across the board. Saying that, is there any other business? All right, then I will yield the rest of the three minutes to you guys. Thank you to Bart, Joke, and Claudia and the people behind the screens. Thank you for the lively conversation on the Middle East. Any help that we can do, feel free to ask. We're here for that. And thank you so much. Enjoy your visit to Seattle and remember that the clocks go ahead, you lose an hour's sleep so if you're on council tomorrow and you don't set your clocks, you're going to miss the first session. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]