ICANN83 | PF – ccNSO Council Meeting
Thursday, June 12, 2025 – 10:45 to 12:15 CEST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO Council Meeting. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I, along with my colleagues, Joke and Julie, are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior 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. 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 microphone disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you very much. And with that, I will now hand the floor over to Alejandra Reynoso, Chair of the ccNSO. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you very much, Claudia, and welcome everyone to our ccNSO Council Meeting #218. As a kind reminder to all councilors, please join the Zoom room and remember to put in your Zoom ID ccNSO Council or something similar. Also, if you're able to do so, please do turn on your cameras so our remote councilors can feel in the room as well.

With that, I will put in the Zoom chat the link to the wiki where we have all the documentation for today's meeting. We do have two important topics to review. One of them is the Review of Reviews, which is part of the update section, and the prioritization of our workload item. We also have a series of decisions we need to make and depending on how we will take with our discussion on the Review of Reviews, I suggest that we defer prioritization of workload to the next July meeting. We will need at least 10 minutes for that.

So, there's one additional item on the agenda following the adoption of the Review Mechanism Policy. So, there's the formal closure of the working group and update policy overview. With that, as they welcome, do we have anyone that would like to update their statements of interest by councilors? Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Hi, Ale. As I have mentioned in the past, in the recent past, my affiliation has changed and I am no longer affiliated with the registry .PR.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. This was noted last time and the process on consulting the North American region is still ongoing, but very welcome in the Council meeting. Anyone else? All right. Then we move to the meeting forum. Claudia, can you please let us know for apologies and if we are recorded?

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Yes, we are recorded, and we have not received any apologies. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you very much. So, next item is the Relevant Correspondence. We did receive a letter from ICANN Legal regarding the recommendation of the second CSC Effectiveness review. We'll be discussing it later in the agenda. Then we go to minutes and action items. The minutes were circulated on the 21st of May. No comments or questions were made online. Does anyone have any comments or questions now? Seeing no hands up and I'm looking at the Zoom because that's my reference, then the minutes are confirmed.

With that, let's move to action items. So, the action items are scheduled or have been completed. Please note that the Action Item 12 regarding the NPC review needs to be completed and the review needs to start. But it is scheduled. So, any questions regarding the action items? Seeing no hands up, let's move on.

Item 4 is Inter-meeting Council Decisions. There were two letters, the support for the ccNSO Council submission to IANA SLA change process and a reminder regarding the amendments of pilot and charter CSC. These will serve as background material for Item 20, but other than that, there were no other inter-meeting decisions. And moving to Item 5, it's the Triage Inter-meeting Decisions. There were no decisions then.

Regarding the updates, unless there are specific questions or comments, I suggest we take items six, seven, eight, nine, and 10 as read and no discussion needed. And those are the written updates for the several working groups and from the liaisons and the also from update from the website redesign and progress on Board consideration for ccPDP4-IDN. Any objections to moving forward?

Seeing none, then let's move already to Item 11. So, if we can go there, there we go. This is the introduction of the draft ccNSO portfolio for the fiscal year 26-27 and there is an overview of the work items, resources and need for prioritization. For this, may I ask Chris and Bart to talk about this item?

BART BOSWINKEL

Okay, let me kick it off. Claudia, can you go to the Gantt charts and don't try to read it, it's overwhelming what you will see. We circulated a series of four Gantt charts, one for each goal, so the three goals. One is the priority or the work items around policy-related matters. The second one is around the platform function of the ccNSO, includes all the activities like the internet governance, universal acceptance, DNS abuse, etc. The third one is ICANN-focused work items and the fourth one is foundational activities.

So, if you just scroll briefly through it and you see the different color codes. These color codes refer to what is planned and what is ongoing. So, can you stay on Gantt chart one, please? So, what you see with respect to the policy, and this is policy-related work, there is a lot in grey and these grey areas, they relate to the study groups, they relate to specifically the study groups and specifically to the IDN PDP.

What you see, what is colored is the implementation work from an ICANN perspective, although external, it has influence on the planning of the ccNSO activities, specifically on the policy assistance implementation group. And one of the resolutions today is on that group to create it and to assist ICANN in its clarification of the review mechanism to make it ready for full implementation.

If you scroll a little bit down, you will see some work items which have not even been defined. No, you can't see it, forget it. Some work items have not even been defined, no timeline included, and these are the four study groups which are still pending. Go to the next page, page two, yeah. There you see a lot of in purple, which is all planned. It's ICANN meetings and everything that is happening underneath. Underneath it, you will see some items that need to be detailed and also planned. So, this is the core of what we do at meetings and various working groups leading up to meetings and preparing statements, etc.

Next page, please. So, this is really the Goal 3, which is the input from the ccNSO into ICANN and ICANN-related matters. It ranges from the SOPC, but also, as you will see, and that is, and you're going to discuss it in a minute, is the Review of Reviews and or the Pilot Holistic Review, Continuous Improvement Framework, etc. You still see it, it is in gray, but it means it will have impact on the planning of the ccNSO. And at the next meeting, we will look at it in more detail, if so needed.

Can you scroll down, please, to the next page? And this is the foundational work for the ccNSO itself. This is all, for example, the activities of the guideline review committee, all the appointments, all the Council meetings and all the work items there. And again, you see there are some ongoing activities, but also work that is foreseen. For example, the planning or the FY27 operating plan and budget from ICANN, the SOPC needs to play a role there, and therefore it is captured in this overview. At a higher level, this is the work plan of known work items for the next two years.

Can we scroll down? I think that is it. So, this is the general overview. You can see it. I hope it captures, and underneath there are far more details to be dealt with.

CHRIS DISSPAIN It's a fairly detailed general overview, but it is a general overview, nonetheless.

BART BOSWINKEL

This is really what we do at a high level.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Absolutely. So, for those of you who are really interested in the detail, Bart will doubtless be able to take you through it. But here is the headline. The headline is that we have a lot to do and not enough people to do it. In order to plan, we are going to have to prioritize. It's the only way we can. We need to do two things. We need to prioritize and we need to get more people involved to prepare to actually do work. It's as simple as that.

Right now, at the moment, just as an example, my assessment is that we would struggle to do more than one of the gap things at the moment. We could do one study group, but I think, even that's a struggle. Okay. And it's also, the other thing we need to remember, this is really important, is not just us as volunteers, but it's also staff. And there's only so much that the team can actually take on and support us to do. So, we've got more work to do in the Triage Committee, looking at this and coming up with some thoughts and ideas. But that's the headline. And we'll be back to you soon with more.

And this, I just want to say thank you to Bart for actually doing the work to put this huge Gantt chart together. We should do our own Marbie and perhaps print it out on thousands of sheets of paper and put it up on the wall. We could all sign it. It's complicated to look at, but it does give us the feel. It's the most important thing is that you can look at it and you can say this isn't manageable. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO — Thank you very much, Chris. And evidently, there's a lot to do. So, I would like to ask if there are any questions or comments regarding this right now. Jordan

JORDAN CARTER — Jordan Carter, .au and Vice Chair of the Council. Thanks, Bart and Chris. The old click up is alive, which is nice. So, I'm interested in your point about only being able to do one or of the two proposed study groups. I guess part of the purpose of this tool and the work of the committee is to prioritize between the various pieces of work. So, I guess my question, I'd be looking keenly forward to the committee's guidance about whether it is more important to do both study groups and drop something else than it is to just do one of them. Assuming you haven't yet made a decision about that, when do you anticipate making some advice or decision about that?

CHRIS DISSPAIN — You are still on the committee, aren't you?

JORDAN CARTER — Oh, I'm on the email list of the committee, yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Not that you're supposed to, but obviously, I was assuming you would be participating in the discussion.

JORDAN CARTER Okay, I'll make sure I do that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN The answer is, I don't know when our next call is, but Bart probably does.

BART BOSWINKEL Oh, I don't, but the intention is, as you will see, is in one of the resolutions, is it is deferred until the next meeting. Hopefully, by the July meeting, the Triage Committee is able to come up with some recommendation based on this, and also taking into account the type of skills and everything else you need, knowing where we go with the Reviews of Reviews and the assistance group as well, because that cut across it, that makes it so difficult. And then the other thing is the availability of staff and the holiday season, which is upcoming to July and August. So, that's the reason for not including the date. It's a matter of resourcing.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO All right. So, with this information, it's evident that the Triage Committee will look into it, and hopefully, we will have something for our next Council meeting in July. Is that a fair thing to say? Okay. Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL

May I advise to put at least 15, 20 minutes, and then we can use the tool itself to run through. So, it's easier to read than this PDF. Unfortunately, you need to look at it in detail. Otherwise, you don't see the collision thing.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Well, we'll see when the discussion of the Triage goes. If we need more time, maybe we can think about even an extraordinary call just to go through that, if that's necessary. So, with that, let's go back to the agenda, please. And we are now in Item 12, which is the update Chair, Vice Chairs, councilors, regional organizations, and secretariat. And before going into each of those items that are listed there, are there any updates from anyone that I need to know about?

All right. So, with that kind of an introduction, we go to the meeting with ICANN Finance. So, as a follow-up of last Council call, the SOPC leadership and a few councilors had a meeting with Xavier and Kurtis to explain and discuss the concerns of the Council around the budget process. The major point was the communication. Only SOPC leadership noticed the changes in the budget. And after that meeting, SOPC had a meeting as well with ICANN planning where further details were provided regarding the changes in the budget. And as you may have noted, Xavier did send a note to the SO and Acs explaining the changes and committing to look at the process to improve lines of communication. So, in the end, it all had an explanation and procedure will be improved.

Any questions or comments regarding this? Seeing no hands, I'll move swiftly to the next one, which is the information session with the ICANN Board. Last Sunday, Jordan and I had a meeting with the Board to introduce the ccNSO and explain what we do, how we do it and our limitations. Some of you were also in the room and online. So maybe, do you want to say a few words on your views on that session, Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER

It was a little bit eye-opening and I think very useful to do. And I'll leave it to others to characterize the discussion. The questions were fascinatingly all over the place. So, it was really useful for us to understand what that revealed to us about the levels of knowledge in the Board and how variable it is, which is what you'd expect. But it made me think one reflection is that maybe we should organize, because there is an ICANN induction, is it called? Onboarding process.

I think we need a ccNSO onboarding hour with each new incoming director, because there was some stuff that was asked about that is quite foundational that we should make sure we do our part in guaranteeing that they know right from the beginning of their term. So, I think that might be something for us to consider after each

	ICANN AGM to organize some buttonholing of each incoming director to lift the average knowledge about some core elements of our model.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO	Yes, Chris, and then Nigel.
CHRIS DISSPAIN	So, I'm fine with that completely in principle. Logistically, I would recommend that we prepare a document, and we could even laminate it, that actually provides that foundational detail. Because actually getting people, it's much easier to just deliver. And then if you want more information, we'll happily have a session with you. So, give them a starting point and then do a session. But that's just because you'll guarantee to get them with the document. You won't guarantee to get them with the session. Thanks.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO	Thank you, Chris. That was also a suggestion made after we did the info session. So, you were spot on. So just to reaffirm what you're saying. Nigel?
NIGEL ROBERTS	Yes, thank you. I think I have to, first of all, underline exactly what Jordan said. And I think he was understating, if anything. As a former Board member, when I was on the Board with Chris here, I

think the knowledge of the other Board members was a bit higher. And we have been asleep at the wheel a little bit. In my second term, second year on the Board, I was tasked with briefing, onboarding the new NomCom appointed Board members. And in fact, I think GNSO ones as well. But they have less of a mountain to climb than the NomCom. It's the NomCom appointed Board members that they come in. They don't even know what ICANN is. And all of a sudden, they need to know the internals of what the ccNSO is.

I've got some material somewhere, if I can dig it out, which is the starting point of that. It does go back to the beginning of time and maybe even from before the dawn of time. But it's extremely important that we do this. The nature of the questions that we were asked, which was in particular one that-- Well, of course, all of the ccTLDs are owned by the governments, which was an assumption that I don't think any ICANN Board member should be allowed to hold for more than about 30 seconds. The other one is that maybe we should do a tidying up exercise and force everybody to have contracts. That's, again, going back 20 years. So, yeah, we have some work to do here. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO — Thank you, Nigel. Biyi?

BIYI OLADIPO

Thank you, Chair. Although I was not physically there, I joined the meeting remotely. And like everyone else, I was quite amazed at the level of knowledge gap of the ccNSO by the questions that some of the Board members, especially the new ones, asked. One of the suggestions that I was going to make was also the fact that we need to organize a session and look for a slot. While I agree with Chris that we should actually do like a document, however, I've actually discovered that a lot of those things don't get read.

So, what I will suggest is let's find a way of slotting into their calendar of onboarding, and then we could now, from then, if somebody needs more, then we can point them to where that document. We will provide that document. However, let's have a session first and see the possibility of having a session. And then we can, from there, go on and provide more insights. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Biyi. Super fair point. Most of the enrichment of the conversation comes from the questions they ask. So, I see a queue. I have Chris and then Olga, and then we need to move forward. So, Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Ale. So, yes, and Biyi's right. But I think you just basically you do both, but that's not why I put my hand up. I just want to caution us not to be concerned about-- It's good that they said those things, and it's good that they were corrected. The key is not what they thought, it's what they think. So, as long as we've actually managed to get that sorted, which I think we have, and then we've got a process for making sure that they are properly briefed next time around. And I'm only saying this in case anybody thinks we have a major problem, because I don't think we do, but I just wanted to say it. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Thank you, Chris. Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI Thank you, Alejandra. This is Olga Cavalli, NomCom appointee. I'm really curious about why the selected members of the Board from the NomCom are not aware of what the ccNSO does. I have never done that interview about the Board, but when you are interviewed about ccNSO, the detail of questions are very, very precise, and you have to know about it and you have to respond correctly. So perhaps some information sent to the NomCom about-- We did that when I was at the GAC. We sent some detailed information about how the GAC worked and the procedures. Maybe some information to the NomCom in order to make questions could be useful. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Thank you, Olga. And I think as Chris said, I don't think we have a major issue here of lack of knowledge. Maybe there were a few questions that were surprising for us because some were assumptions. Nigel, please. I have been enough unfair for today. So, it was more like some assumptions that could easily be made, let's say myths of CCs that happened. So, it's not a major issue either. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL

Although you closed the queue, two observations from my end. I know the Board members, new Board members are briefed, also around the ccNSO, but they are briefed and they will receive an overwhelming amount of briefing materials. And some of it is, in a way, it's a good thing that the ccNSO is not high on their priority list. There are other items which are far more important and directly. That's one.

Secondly, and I think that's what became these questions were asked after you presented the foundational elements of the ccNSO. And they noticed only when they see them and especially the way you presented them, they could start asking these more foundational questions and then that surfaced. I think that's something very important to keep in mind as well, if you prepare and if you want to prepare briefing material. And without the basic facts and everything else around resourcing and everything else, these foundational questions do not matter. They just skid over. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Bart. And with that, we need to move along. So, let's go to the next item, though I'm going to switch around the last two items because we need a little bit more time on the discussion Review of Reviews. So, regarding the informational meeting with the GNSO chair and the chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group on Monday, Bart and I had a meeting with them and also with the chair of the CSE. And the goal was to align the various actions with respect to the CSE, ranging from the selection of membership to the change of the bylaws to adjust the frequency of the CSE reviews. And we will discuss some of these matters under Item 20 of today's agenda. And as you can imagine, the conversation regarding the CSE will be continued.

With that, now moving to the SO/AC Roundtable and the review of reviews. First, as a heads up, we will spend some time on this topic. The last two weeks, the discussions around this topic have become very front and center of the broader community discussion. So, I'll bring you up to speed of what happened and the role we played. From my end, I want to use this part of the meeting to update you and agree on the direction of travel going forward.

So, as you recall, our involvement started in Seattle during the ICANN82, when the continuation of the Pilot Holistic Review and the Continuous Improvement Framework was on the table. As a reminder, the Continuous Improvement Framework is intended to replace the organizational reviews. In the context of continuation of the Pilot Holistic Review and the continuous improvement work, the question emerged whether or not ATRT4 should be launched.

Tripti and other members of the Board expressed their concern of launching the ATRT4, and then all the other reviews would completely bog down the community, ICANN org, and the Board. So, the question arose around the purpose and the need for all the reviews and the timing. And here is the review of reviews.

At the Council meeting, we agreed to send a letter to the Board in support of such review of reviews. And in case you don't have it at hand, I'm going to paste in the chat the link to that letter so you have it handy. And our main points were to continue with the Continuous Improvement Framework to replace the organizational reviews in time. And prior to starting a new cycle of reviews, to look at the purpose, scope, and frequency, and the efforts involved to conduct all the reviews. So, to achieve this goal, we suggested that the ICANN community should start a dialogue in Oman and close the dialogue in Mumbai. That's in two ICANN meetings.

So, moving forward in time, as you may have noted, the Board decided at its meeting in May to defer ATRT4 and other reviews until after the conclusion of the review of reviews and start that process. So, if also you would like to read the resolution of the Board, it is in the chat. So, with this in mind, I started to develop a roadmap on how to organize and manage such a process. I believe we need such a roadmap sooner rather than later, as ICANN84 and 85 are around the corner. And knowing that in July and August, a lot of people will be enjoying a well-deserved vacation time. So, in case you don't have it at hand, the roadmap, it's also in the Zoom chat now.

So, following the Board webinar that happened at the Prep Week on reviews of reviews, it felt necessary to share this roadmap with my fellow chair colleagues to maintain momentum of the review of reviews. And also, as you may know, some communities have expressed concern regarding deferring the ATRT4 and believe that an ATRT can do the job. All this based on the belief and the perception that breaching the bylaw of ATRT4 is a bad signal, especially in times of the WSIS+20. This was expressed by some of the attendees of the webinar. And you may have also seen some of the articles on this matter.

So, with this in mind, the SO/AC chairs had two meetings here in Prague. The first one on Sunday, when it became very clear that we as a ccNSO leadership are clearly in favor, and ALAC was opposed to the deferral of ATRT4. All others did not express a clear view other than, of course, doing a review of reviews was necessary. Yesterday morning, we had a second meeting where we discussed a path forward. The outcome of that meeting I shared with you and others at the end of the ccTLD news session. And for the update, I will stop here. And well, may I ask Jordan or Chris, if you would like to comment on this so far?

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Alejandra. Jordan Carter, Vice Chair. Just to try and really hone in on the disagreement there, I think everyone thinks the review system needs to be reviewed because it's complicated and clashing and timeframes, amount of work, and so on. And it hasn't been done in a substantive way to look at it for a decade or so. And even that was just a porting in of all the existing reviews. So, that's agreed. And what isn't agreed is whether that should be done through the ATRT vehicle or not. Our view is not. And some people think it can be done through the ATRT vehicle.

And the related thing that came up was there are breaches of the bylaws happening, both with the deferral of ATRT and apparently other aspects of various reviews. So, whether it's better to try and tidy up that breach by change the bylaws, or whether you just live with the fact that you're breaching them while you repair them, both can be argued to be facets of accountability. It's all been acknowledged in public, so no one's trying to sweep it under the carpet. But those are some of the factors to keep in mind as we work through the observations from Alejandra.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Exactly. And a couple of things that have happened since, and also just to go back a little bit and explain. So, the awakening that happened in the meeting on whenever it was, seems like weeks ago.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Yesterday morning.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yesterday. Was that some people in At-Large started to talk about, well, we could adjust the way that the ATRT is run so that it is very specifically just looking at reviews. And there was a kind of awakening that happened in that meeting because then we went through it and they realized that actually if they adjusted, it's not an ATRT. Unless you do the ATRT in accordance with the bylaws, which means that it has a choice of what it looks at and can set its own scope, it isn't an ATRT. So, what you would end up, what you've effectively done is created a bespoke review and called it an ATRT. So, there was an awakening and a movement away from the rigid position of we should use ATRT for, which is good.

Since then, I think the GNSO is generally, Council is generally feeling that the suggestion that's currently on the table is acceptable. And I understand that the leadership of the GAC feels the same way. And At-Large is kind of working through it, but is moving towards an understanding, I think that if it's going to happen, they're obviously going to participate and row in behind it. So, the fundamental question, I think, which Jordan effectively has just honed in on, is whether you do the second bit, which is actually in parallel, which is do you do the emergency bylaw change or do you just leave things the way they are?

My guess is the community's moved away from the ATRT thing, except that it's going to be a bespoke review. The roadmap is generally, timing is generally fine, I think with most people, whether it's the fast Jordan one or the slightly slower Ale one. The question is, do you do the emergency bylaw or not? And that is a function of whether you think, as Jordan has quite rightly said, there's accountability both ways, because this is not secret. The Board is not hiding any of this.

My understanding is the Board is prepared to just leave it. Happy is the wrong word. They have made the decision and they are prepared to accept that the deferral of the bylaws is public and they're leaning on their fiduciary responsibility as the way of doing that. And that's their legal advice, that they are entitled to do that, which I happen to agree with. And the idea of the emergency bylaw is also being looked at as another alternative. So, I think that's where we are at the moment.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO So, with that, yes, also some members of the community expressed that changing the bylaws and ending consistencies in the bylaw and the reality may be a worse solution than living with inconsistencies. But as far as I understand, either way we can move forward. So, I would like to ask for your comments and suggestions now, if you have any regarding preference of path. One at a time. Yes, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Can I make a suggestion? On the basis that we've all agreed that the review of reviews, this thing needs to happen and we're all comfortable with that. Maybe actually the bylaw thing can be left to the others that it matters to. If it matters so much to others to get them to agree to do this, then fine. And if it doesn't, then that's fine too. In other words, I don't think we necessarily need to have a position on that. We could, and we can if we need to, but I'm not sure that we do. If At-Large says you have satisfied us with this emergency bylaw, therefore we're happy to go ahead, then it would seem to me to be probably unnecessary to possibly saying that we don't like it unless in principle people really, really care. Yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO And yes, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER Yeah, I've heard arguments both ways, even inside my own organization's delegation here. The question of principle is whether you, when you're breaking your own rules, you should change them to fix that. Or if you're going to fix it a different way by doing the underlying work to fix the problem, you should just leave the breach while you do that. I don't think either way anyone is going to sue us. I don't think that there's massive legal risks for the organization or any part of it.

What I can't get my head around is the political salience of this in the context of the WSIS review. Does it look better when governments are looking to, some of them, to poke and prod at the multistakeholder model and ICANN's role? Is it better to acknowledge the fault and tweak the rules? Or is it better to acknowledge the fault and say we're going to fix them once and for all when we've worked out what to do differently? And I don't have a strong view either way on that question. And if the Council doesn't either. Chris is--

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Wait, wait, wait. I have a queue. Okay, so Peter, then Chris.

PETER KOCH Yeah, thank you. This is Peter for the record. First of all, I think this is a very, very quickly moving target apparently in terms of who has what position and why and what is an agreed upon position. And if we have a continuation of that discussion, I would explicitly want to hear from what the liaisons, the incoming liaisons would have to say. I've noted positions from the same group being voiced, but that's probably not group positions, but members of that group. And some of them happened to be in one previous team here and in one perspective there. So, it's not always clear what hat people wear.

On the bylaws change, that smells. I understand the idea, though, we shouldn't break the constitution, so let's change it. And depending on what type of government you are, you like that one or the other more. And I'm not sure which part we want to serve. I would agree that that's not necessarily-- Our first concern is the ccNSO, but obviously it looks like fixing the break by making it "legal" but not legitimate. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Yeah. Thanks, Ale. So, two things, Peter. You can characterize it that way if you wish. The point is that, and I'm going to speak in favor of the bylaw change for a minute. The point about it is that it's not changing the constitution because what it is is acknowledging that there is an issue and putting in place a constitutional hook that clears up any doubt about whether your deferral while you do this is actually a problem. And I get you can characterize it both ways, completely agree, but that is not why I put my hand up.

There's one key point to remember in response to Jordan's thing about how this will fly and that is this. The original suggestion for the emergency bylaw came from the GAC rep in the meeting. If the GAC accepts that this is a sensible way forward with the amendment, then politically the cover is there to say that the Governmental Advisory Committee within-- And I know they're not going to issue advice and say, do it this way. But if the general feeling in the GAC is that this is an acceptable way forward, then that provides, in my view, the answer because we would be going against what the GAC thinks by not doing so. And that seems to me to be a more dangerous course. Now, if they don't opine at all, then we're back to square one. But if they do, then I think that gives us the cover.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Yes, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER Thanks, Ale. Jordan Carter. I've heard different views from different GAC leaders about what they think about this. And the idea of a GAC consensus view on this emerging is not a thing. I just want to make the point about what the proposal was, which wasn't a tearing up at the rules. So, it's to say that there would be a bylaws amendment that said you need to do a specific review about the system of reviews, all in. So, to say we've got continuous improvement, we've got ATRT, we've got organizational reviews, we've got specific reviews, we've got the holistic review concept. Is that the system we need? Is it being implemented the way that we need it to be implemented?

So, the bylaw thing would say that. And it would say, while you're doing that, the timeline obligations for the existing reviews are suspended. So, it wouldn't delete those reviews. It wouldn't predetermine what came out of the review of reviews. It simply says that the timeline breaches that are going on wouldn't be breaches. And it would be a time limited bylaws amendment. The amount of time would be to be determined. But the point, what that means is this is a short-term fix. And if the community can't do the review to fix this review system within that fixed period of time, then the saving of this has to expire.

In other words, we come back to where we are today, breaching the bylaws' timeframes, and so on. So, it isn't quite changing the rules to sort yourself out. It's taking a timeline pause and a bylaws mandate to do this review of the reviews. So, what that does is it cures this "you're breaking the bylaws" concern, which was such a big part of the ALAC's rhetoric in the meeting, not rhetoric, argument. But on the other hand, it does do, you are changing the rules. It's not a fundamental bylaw. It's a standard bylaw. It's not the Holy Grail of the ICANN constitution, but it is a non-trivial step. And the fastest it could be done is four months. That's what they've told us. And perhaps six months, which could be half the time it takes to actually do the substantive review.

BART BOSWINKEL — But you do it in parallel.

JORDAN CARTER — You do them in parallel. You don't wait. So just a bit more detail, which I hope is helpful about what the idea is.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO — All right. Thank you, Jordan. I think we've heard everything that there was to say about this topic. As there are no more comments or hands raised in Zoom, may I propose that we go with what Chris was saying at first, as in we don't have a special standing regarding a bylaw change, but in case people need it, we won't object either, as in we will go with what works with everyone as long as we can move this forward and get this thing fixed. If that's the case, could you please raise your green ticks if you are in favor of this path forward, or your red crosses if you object. And if you will abstain, let me know. So going through the list, I'm seeing only green ticks, no red crosses. Thank you very much. So, this is how we'll go.

All right, moving along with the agenda, we are now on Item 13. It's the update and adoption of Council Selection Guideline and Timeline and appointment Selection Process Manager. So, the first item, it's the update and adoption of the Guideline. The GRC has updated the Council Selection Guideline at our request. Both Council and community were consulted. Community from May 27th until the 3rd of June. The GRC received comments from Peter and they were included with exception of his point around publishing the ccTLD that has voted, that is Section 7.1, which we will discuss in this point. I would like us to discuss first the guideline itself and then that particular point. As to Section 7.1, it is my understanding it is included following the test during the Board Seat 12 nomination and no issues emerged. But I will now ask Peter if you have any comments or any other, have any comments.

PETER KOCH

Thanks, Alessandra. This is Peter. Clarifying question, comments on 7.1 or on the rest?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

7.1.

PETER KOCH

Okay. On 7.1, this is about publishing the ccTLDs that have voted so far during the voting process. So just that everybody, including the observers understand what this is about. And indeed, we had discussed that before the Board election, Board seat elections. And my argument remains the same. It opens this to targeted campaigning, which I count as influencing or interfering with the election process. The fact that we did not observe any issues when this was applied to the Board seats has no meaning because just because it didn't happen there and then it would probably need a special constellation somewhere where that that did not apply to the Board seats.

I don't think that that addresses my concerns about the potential interference with the process. And that interference would look like, so I see that in a particular region, so-and-so many have not voted and either as a candidate or maybe as someone trying to be "helpful" and promote a candidate, they would go and specifically address those that haven't voted and remind them of voting. And by the way, you could also vote for this candidate because we think you didn't care and here's our helpful advice. And I don't think that's a useful thing to have no matter what happened or did not happen during the Board seat elections. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Peter. Regarding the idea behind having this list published is to, of course, know who have still not voted and then, well, reach out as has happened to let members know that this is an ongoing process and motivate participation and have more people in the process. Chris, did you have your--? Ah, yes, you have your hand up.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah. There's a negative side and a positive side, right? What Peter says makes sense to some extent. For me, the danger is not that people will encourage people to vote but that people will say don't vote for this person. And that concerns me where you have one country that is not friendly with another country in the same region and where you have circumstances where that country might try and influence other voters in the region. And I think that by publishing the voting, you facilitate the ability of countries to contact other countries and pressure them into not voting or voting.

And so, it's not just about, yes, it's good that there are people who-- Sorry. It's good that there is a process by which people can be encouraged to vote. But the danger is that by doing that, you end up allowing pressure one way or another. So maybe the answer is that we could have an internal process that was run, instead of it being published, there would be a way that the ICANN secretary, that our secretariat could be contacting people and saying, you haven't voted. If that's the purpose, then maybe there's a way of doing that without having to publish it. Because I am uncomfortable with the publishing thing. I think it's a challenge. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Thank you. Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS Yeah, thank you. There's a great deal of discomfort around some of this, and I'm uncomfortable with some of the comments that have been just made in some respects, not in a particularly bad way. But what concerns me is that elections, whether it's for the Board seats or whether it's for councilors, are fundamental to transparency and democracy within the ccNSO. And it seems to me that decisions are often made about how the guideline and the procedures are done on a fairly ad hoc basis. Somebody says something in a proposal like we've got now, Peter says something, and then we make a decision ad hoc.

What concerns me is that I've got some experience in how political campaigning works in the United Kingdom, and I realize how different it is in different countries, even one as close as France. But for example, what Peter has characterized as undue interference in the UK in a parliamentary election is regarded as not only acceptable but expected campaigning. The fact is that the way parliamentary elections work is that political parties make a record of who's voting when they're voting. It's a voluntary thing. They don't have to give the information. And they send people round to knock on the doors to get them out to the polling station. It's called the knock-up.

The other thing is, and this is sort of the thing that you don't see behind the scenes if you're an ordinary voter, is the provision by the electoral registration office, the formal government department responsible for the fair conduct of the election, of what's called a marked register. That's so that all party candidates can see who voted in order to address the campaigning to them in a targeted way next time. Now, what this is telling me is that we need to review this on a much more fundamental level and have all this out in public in a big discussion, maybe a session at a ccNSO meeting in the future, rather than just one person in a Council meeting says this is a good idea, or the other one says this isn't a good idea. I think we need a balanced look at this. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL

In this way, you mischaracterize the discussions in the GRC that came up with this proposal. I didn't know that it's--

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

And also, I see there's a queue. I see we have Peter, Stephen, and Chris, and we will leave it there. I just want to address the fact that campaigning will happen with or without the list in any case, as in people reaching out to other CCs to let them know their thoughts, and it's up to each emissary to make their own decision. And also, the guideline went to the community, and there was no comment back saying, hey, what's that, strike that, but just to put all the information in the table. With that, I'll go to Peter.

PETER KOCH

Yeah, thanks Alejandra. And I just wanted to shortly respond and then clarify two or three aspects of the position. So first of all, of course, we should appreciate that we all have different backgrounds where we come from, what the local or regional customs about elections are or looked like 40 years ago. And that needs to be taken into account. This is a very international setting, and then traditions and experiences are completely diverse actually, and that's good.

Let me clarify. I have no objection to the fact that some TLD voted after the fact, that's not the issue. I would also, since Chris suggested it, I would also completely agree with, okay, a trusted entity, and there is an election manager anyway that needs to be trusted and surely rightfully is, that entity having that information and then do some reminders or something, even though I know that I react very, very differently to these reminders as in go away.

But that's me. Anyway, the Internet Society does that for example, or others, but that's a different battle. Anyway.

But on the point of campaigning is going to happen anyway, that is probably true and that is fine. The point here is that the targeting of the campaigning is served on the silver plate. And I don't think that's the good part. And with that, I would like to let it stand and let others go. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Peter. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE

Thank you. Stephen Deerhake for the record. Nigel, we have a similar setup with our elections in the US, but I think you're comparing apples to oranges here because elections are one day affairs. This election is a multi-week affair. And yeah, people can run around in an election in your country or mine and see who's voting and who is not, but they really don't have the ability to pressure people one way or the other.

In our case, the ward manager will come around and bang on your door in some places and see do you need a ride and stuff like that. But Chris is correct in that what we're dealing with here at the end of the day, the ability of countries to apply pressure on other countries to bend their knee to their will. So, I'm kind of in Chris's camp on this. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Stephen. And Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah, I just wanted to say that as Peter has said, revealing what's happened after the event is not an issue at all. And I think that is accountability and transparency and bets and so on and so forth. My concern is much more to do with a running list that moves or is published and says so-and-so hasn't voted, so-and-so hasn't voted. That concerns me. I'm not comfortable with that at all. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

All right. So, since this bit it's still a little bit controversial, I would say, I suggest to move forward with the guideline, with the exception of this particular point. So, we will exclude it from the guideline. And with that, may I have a mover? Jennifer and seconder Olga. And we have a decision in front of us and we will do the exception there. We have a decision in front of us and we will do the exception there. Are there any questions regarding the decision? Yes Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL

Just for clarity. So, read the decision with exception of 7.1 on publication of voters, so that's included and it will be stricken after when the guideline is published. So, there is no reference in the guideline when published and effective to the list to be published.

That's the intention. So, that's the resolution you vote upon. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Okay. Seeing no hands, we will go to the vote, and I know Sean is abstaining as it's customary since he's chair of GRC. And everybody else, and this is for councilors only please, to vote in Zoom room using your green ticks if you're in favor or your red crosses if you object or let me know as Sean did if you abstain. Okay, Nigel abstains as well. Other than that, I am seeing only green ticks. So, this has been approved. Thank you very much. You may lower your green ticks because we will be using them later.

So now we are in the Adoption Timeline of 2026 Council Election and Appointment of Council Selection Process Manager. So, this will happen under the Guideline as adopted assuming it will be adopted because we have a timeline to wait there. Any questions regarding the timeline of the Council selection? Seeing no hands. May I have a mover? I see Jordan, seconder Stephen. So, if we can move down to the decision, please. Any comments regarding the decision? Seeing no hands then we move straight to voting. So please use your green ticks if you're in favor, red crosses if you object or let me know if you abstain. Seeing only greens, this has been approved. So, thank you.

Now we are moving to Item 14. It's the timeline of Board Seat 11 Nomination Process and Appointment of Nomination Process Manager. Although far out we have to take into account that the person has to be nominated by April and the potential member selection and the Q&A in Oman and the duration of the background check. So, that's why we start super early in this process. Are there any questions or comments regarding the timeline? Seeing no hands. May I have a mover? I see Olga. May I have a seconder? I see Everton.

So, with that can we move to the decision please? Get in there. All right. So, this is the decision to adopt the timeline. Any comments regarding the decision? Seeing no hands up. Let's go to vote. So, again, please, councilors only. Use your green ticks if you're in favor, red crosses if you object or let me know explicitly if you abstain. Nigel, are you voting? But let me know as in explicitly. Otherwise, it could get cut. So, Nigel is abstaining. And everyone else, I see only green ticks. So, this has been approved. Thank you very much. You may lower your green ticks.

And now we are in Item 15, Council 360 Review. So, the next round of reviews and according to the agreed upon schedule, the 360 reviews of the following councilors are scheduled for July 2025. And that is Molehe Wesi, Ai Chin Lu, Stephen Deerhake, Chris Disspain and myself, Alejandra Reynoso. This is a second round for the set of councilors. The first one was in the February, March 2024 time frame. So, we spoke a little bit about this on the prep call before coming here, but just to be certain, do we want to continue with the review, with this process? Are there any objections of continuing with this process or any comments regarding this? Yes, Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN Yes, I do want to continue. It's incredibly useful. Speaking entirely personally, it's incredibly useful way of getting feedback. And it's only valuable if councilors are prepared to actually take the time to fill it in. So just a reflection, the Board does this. And just so that everybody knows, it's just as hard to get the Board members to fill it in as it is to get councilors to fill it in. But please, it doesn't take all that long. And please, personally, I find it incredibly valuable to get the feedback. So, I would really appreciate it if people made the effort. And I shall, of course, be reviewing myself as well.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Thank you. Thank you, Chris. Anyone that had a recent review would like to speak to it? Olga?

OLGA CAVILLA Thank you, Alejandra. For me, the two reviews have been extremely useful as I was not acquainted to the way that ccNSO works. It's totally different from other experiences I had in the GAC and in the GNSO. So, for my first review, especially the talk that I had with Alejandra, for me, was very, very useful. So, I could adjust myself to the way of working of the ccNSO. And for me, as Chris said, I always like to be reviewed because it helps me, not only here, but usually. And every time I have a boss that does not want to do that, I talk to them and please review me because it helps me doing better my job. So, that was very useful. It doesn't take a long time. It's easy. So please do it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you very much. I don't hear any objections. So, I think we can move forward with this. So first, we have a decision to make. So, I need a mover. I see Sean and Peter seconds. So, the decision is in front of us. Are there any questions regarding the decision? Seeing none, let's move straight to voting. So please use your green ticks if you approve, red crosses if you object. And let me know explicitly if you're abstaining. Yes, and Nigel is twice in the-- That's why in the camera doesn't-- We're seeing double.

All right. So, with that, thank you. This has been approved. And now, please, please, please, please, please, when the survey comes into your inbox, fill it. It doesn't take too much time and it's super helpful for everyone. So, with that, we move now to the Adoption of Terms of Reference on this Study Group on Disaster Recovery. So, we agreed on the need for such a study group with the adoption of the final report of the Policy Gap Analysis Working Group. Jordan and the secretariat have developed the terms, and they were shared with you. Jordan, would you like to speak briefly to them?

JORDAN CARTER

Well, it might be actually better for Bart to speak to them in any detail. But what these do is set out just the two different topics that came to the top of the list of the policy gap analysis, which was the IANA records and the potential for any role for disaster recovery by IANA for ccTLDs. I think they're reasonably tight terms of reference. I guess the feedback is whether there was anything you thought was missing or anything in them you thought shouldn't be there. But hopefully, they've had time to look at them. And I think, is it fair to say that adopting the-- Sorry, I haven't read the decisions, Bart, so you might have to help me out there. But even if we adopt them, we can make the decision about when to kick them off at the next meeting.

BART BOSWINKEL

That's the intention. Maybe just to add to them, if you look into the terms of reference, the idea is that the working method will be more or less the same as the PGA. Because I think the PGA, in review, went very well both from a process management point of view and how it organized its work, etc. And we start to apply the method Jordan developed with the outline and rolling forward work plan with other groups as well.

And you can see they really, really focus the discussion. With the financial contributions working group, we're using that method as well. So, that's now embedded. And that was one of the suggestions coming out of the recommendations as well. Again, you will see it. And one of the requirements will be, if you want to participate, one of the first action items is really to detail the work plan. When do you want to deliver? Otherwise, such an outline doesn't make sense. It's just a few observations again. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Bart. And regarding decision on the timelines, the resolutions do not include a date to launch a call for volunteers right now. Because as we spoke earlier, there's a prioritization of work that needs to be done. So, this will come afterwards. Because there are two major projects we must do. It's the clarification of the review mechanism and the review of reviews. So, we need to be careful with our resourcing. And we will first have our discussion in July to set the priorities before adding dates to launch these study groups.

So, if I'm correct, we're going to do-- Okay. There are two resolutions, but let's move with the first one, which is now regarding the disaster recovery one. So, may I have a mover? Yes. Well, the draft resolution is there, but do you want to see the decision? Ah, okay. And well, there's the decision. So, I saw Wafa moving. Olga seconds. Thank you. So now we do have the decision in front of us. So, are there any questions regarding the decision? Bart, you have your hand up in Zoom.

BART BOSWINKEL

Sorry.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Okay, no problem. So, with that, let's go straight to voting. So, use your green ticks if you're in favor, red crosses if you object. Let me know explicitly if you abstain. I'm going quickly through the list. I am seeing only green ticks. So, this has been approved. Thank you very much.

Similar thing we are going to do now with the other study group that it's regarding the IANA Public Records Study group. I think we already have a summary regarding that, but are there any questions or comments regarding the study group? Seeing none. May I have a mover? I see Stephen. And Jordan seconds. Thank you. So, let's move to the part of the decision, please. There we go. So, any questions regarding the decision? Seeing none. Let's move to voting. So please, once more, your green ticks if you're in favor, red crosses if you object. And let me know if you abstain. All right. Seeing only green ticks. This has been approved.

Now, here we are at Item 18, which is the Closure of the ccPDP3 Review Mechanism Working Group and Call for Volunteers to the ccNSO Policy Implementation Assistant Group Review Mechanism. We have now reached the point of the additional item I told you at the beginning, which is the closure of this working group and closure of the overall ccPDP3. Any questions or comments regarding this item? No. Oh, I see Biyi.

BIYI OLADIPO

Thank you, Chair. Mine is not a question. It's a comment. And the comment is to thank everyone who is part of the working group and who works tirelessly to ensure that the PDP came through. And it took a long time, but things finally come to rest and we are at implementation time. This is just to say a big thank you to everyone.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Thank you, Biyi. Duly noted and definitely completely agree. Well, we do have a resolution. May I have a mover? I see Stephen. A seconder? I see Sean. So, can we go, please, to the decision? And if I may ask if there are any other comments on the decision here? Seeing no hands. May I ask that we decide this by acclamation? And we thank Stephen for his leadership on this endeavor. It was a great job and it's now officially done. Stephen, would you like to say something?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE Yeah, I have a few brief remarks. First of all, it was an incredible privilege to chair the working group and herd the cats for all those many, many, many months and many, many meetings. I think it was in the upper 70s or upper 60s, those 70s in terms of the number of meetings we had. I also want to thank the working group members because they were the ones that did the heavy lifting. As I said, I just kind of herded the cats. I want to thank my vice chair as well. I also want to thank our secretariat staff, which just did brilliant work. And we couldn't have done it without them. And lastly, I want to thank our contract wordsmith, Bernard Turcotte, for his extraordinary wordsmithing and his vast knowledge of all things ccTLDs.

Some of you know that I've had a cron job running on one of my servers, which would send me an email every day telling me how many days the Board has been considering the review mechanism since the Council kicked it up to them. And I can give you the results now because I turned it off the other day. It took the Board 25 months and specifically 714 days. I might note that the gestation period of an elephant is equivalent to how long it took the Board. I'm not going to do any editorial comment. I'm just pointing that out. So, thank everybody for your confidence in my management of the working group. And I have to tell you, I'm really glad it's done. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you. Thank you very much, Stephen. With that, now we move to the next item, which is the call for volunteers for the ccNSO Policy Implementation Assistant Group Review Mechanism. So, the Board directed ICANN org to first obtain clarification of all necessary parts of the policy recommendations, including from the ccNSO Policy Advice Implementation Group, which will result in a detailed implementation plan. So, there is an expectation that the ccNSO launches the first CCPAIG. I'm trying to make the acronym sound interesting. So, as you may recall, we have developed an outline on the role and the responsibilities of such a group some time ago, and this will be the first time we will use it. So, are there any questions? Yes, Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI Thank you, Chair. Is this open to NomCom appointees, I mean, the volunteering, or it's just for ccTLD representatives?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL In principle, there is a hope that former working group members will participate and some councilors, and in this case, probably councilors who have been involved in the clarification discussions with ICANN org and with the Board caucus. I don't know if there will be a lot of work. It's the first time, and it has to be, probably the goal is to have this completed and concluded before the Oman meeting, well before the Oman meeting. So, there is an expectation that you understand the discussions and the level of discussion, hence the limitation to the order, not limitation, but.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Thank you, Bart. And with that, may I have a mover? Ali. May I have a seconder? Stephen, thank you. So, can we move? Oh, we're already there. Oh, we're moving fast. So, we have the decision in front of us. Are there any questions regarding the decision itself? Seeing no hands, let's go to Zoom again and vote. So, use your green ticks in favor, red crosses if you object, or let me know explicitly if you abstain. Sorry, you abstain. Nigel abstains. All right. So, with that, only green. This has been approved. Thank you.

We move to the next item, and I am afraid about the time. So, let's see. We have the appointment of members of chairs and vice chairs to committees and working groups. Are there any questions on the appointments we have there? Well, we will not include it to be determined. But other than that, we have the Chair of Tech Working Group and the members of the ICANN's Universal Acceptance Expert Working Group.

Seeing no hands, may I have a mover? I see Olga and Everton Seconds. So, the decision is in front of us. Any questions regarding the decision? No. So let's go to the vote, please, in Zoom. So green ticks if you are in favor, red crosses if not, or abstentions. All right. I see only green ticks. This has been approved. Thank you very much.

Moving right along to what I hope is our last item. Let me just check on that. Yes. It's the CSC related topics. So, we have the selection of the ccNSO appointed member and alternate, and the coordination of the selection of Registry Stakeholder Group, and approval of full slate of the CSC membership. So, as part of the annual CSC membership selection process, the ccNSO Council is expected to coordinate its selection of members with the selection of the members appointed by the Registry Stakeholder Group as well.

The Council may task and mandate the CSC selection committee to coordinate the selection with the Registry Stakeholder Group and the GNSO Council. Further, the CSC needs to select a member and an alternate. The Council, right? So, the Council needs to select the member and the alternate.

So, are there any questions regarding this topic? I see none. Then may I have a mover? I see Wafa and Sean seconds. Thank you. So, let's go straight to the decision. We have a decision in front of us with the members of the selection, CSC selection committee. So, are there any questions regarding the decision? Seeing none, let's go straight to voting. So, if you're in favor, please use your green ticks. Or if you object, use your red crosses. Yes, I did say the mover and the seconder, but I don't remember now. I went too fast. Sean and Everton, right? Thank you. No, no problem. Better to get it straight in the record. So, I see only green ticks. So, this has been approved. Thank you very much.

Next one is the Deferral of the third CSC Effectiveness Review. In August 2024, the ccNSO and GNSO Councils deferred the third CSC effectiveness review pending the implementation of the recommendations of the second review. Recently, further steps regarding implementation of these recommendations were made, including a series of questions that reached the ccNSO Council. So, the suggestion is to defer the third effectiveness review for one year pending the implementation of all the recommendations.

Any questions regarding this topic? Seeing none. So, may I have a mover? I see Olga. May I have a seconder? Wafa. Thank you very much. Let's move quickly, swiftly to the decision. Any questions regarding the decision itself? Seeing no hands, let's go to the voting. So please use your green ticks again for approval, red crosses if you object or let me know if you're abstaining. I see only green ticks. This has been approved. Thank you very much.

Regarding the next item, we are already over time, so I propose to have this item in our next agenda in July. So, we will go through the ICANN83 then and our observations. Does anyone have any other business? If not, then we will move to the next point. We will meet on the 17th of July at 18:00 UTC. And we go now swiftly to the last item, is the thank you and adjourn.

So, on behalf of the ccNSO, I want to thank Yurid and Nick Zizet for a wonderful and heartwarming ccNSO cocktail and for being such a great host. In addition, I want to thank Nick Zizet as local host and for setting such a high standard. So, I also want to thank all the people involved in preparations for the sessions, all the volunteers, ICANN staff, tech staff, interpreters and everyone for attending and participating so actively. And with that, let's give a big round of applause. And this meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Alejandra, before everybody logs off, the councilors, we're going to take a group photo. I'm not sure if the councilors that are online wish to--

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]