ICANN75 | AGM – ccNSO: Council Preparatory Meeting
Sunday, September 18, 2022 – 10:30 to 12:00 KUL

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Council Prep Session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

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 in Zoom. On-site participants will use their 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. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar.

Thank you. And with that, I will hand the floor over to Alejandra Reynoso.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Claudia. And welcome, everyone. So good to see you here. And so good to see our participants online. Here

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.

we are in our ccNSO Council Prep Meeting for ICANN75. So we have the agenda in front of us, and the first topic that we have is the preparation meeting with the Board. So you received in your e-mail … No problem [inaudible]. Just remember to—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This is [bizarre].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: —turn the volume down on your devices.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It won't shut up.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No worries.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, so in preparation to the meeting with the Board, we had a small group that discussed the way forward to address the question that we got from the Board. And now we need to, well,

let you know what we discussed and to see who would like to address the specific topic during the meeting with the Board.

So the main things that were still a question when we talked about these were what was meant by strategic priorities. And it was clarified that they were referring to the Strategic Objectives. And when speaking about ["our,"] it was meant in the context of the Strategic Plan.

With that, the idea would be to address the whole hour with the Board on the question that they brought to us and to have a dialogue with them. Not trying to seek any particular outcome or answer, as in a straight answer, but to have more of a food for thought and to explore several topics.

For example, since we're talking about priorities, it would be good to get in depth with prioritization. So we could start by saying what we are doing specifically in the ccNSO regarding prioritization. And this could be a nice topic for the Triage Committee. So I was wondering maybe if Jordan or Irina are available. Or anyone from the Triage to talk about how prioritization is done in the ccNSO.

JORDAN CARTER: This is probably as good a moment as any, Alejandra, for me to say or remind people that I'm actually leaving the conference tonight because I've got to be in the UN next week instead of at

ICANN. It's a very inconvenient clash between the UN General Assembly Leader's Week and ICANN. And I can't be in two at once, so I can't do it. So, Irina, if you can do it. Or Chris, you can do it. Or someone else on the Triage Committee, that would be fabulous.

IRINA DANELIA: I can try, but you're going to help me to get prepared.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Excellent. Thank you. Thank you both. And then we were going to address, as well, some SOPC comments and takeaways on the plenary session on who sets ICANN's priorities since that's where we left in The Hague. So the SOPC has made comments regarding this and how having too many big things in parallel can be complicated.

So I was wondering as well if someone from the SOPC could address this particular part. I'm not sure if Irina or maybe Chris or … The bit regarding the comments on the of the SOPC and prioritization of ICANN's [activities].

IRINA DANELIA: Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes?

IRINA DANELIA: I'm not sure SOPC really dealt with the prioritization?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, there was a comment submitted by SOPC. Maybe it was a long time ago. But if not, I can do that. No problem.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I don't remember making a … Did we make a call?

JORDAN CARTER: Is this the participation in the ICANN Prioritization pilots that was—

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No.

JORDAN CARTER: No?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, okay. It's not.

JORDAN CARTER: It's something else?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, it's not. It's another ... Let me see if I can find it here so I can refer to you. Or maybe Bart can help me put it in the chat.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, I'm looking.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. But let me get the document up. Or maybe, well, I'll let Bart find it for me.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Let me look for it. I'll pass it and I'll circulate it. It's part of the comments. It's part of the discussion the SOPC will have later today as well. So I'll find it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you. So while that's happening, the reason why I'm trying to speed things up is because at 11:00, we're going to have some people from the Holistic Review to come here and talk to us about it. It's at 11:30, or is it at 11:00?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's 11:30.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: 11:30. So we have time. I was rushing. Okay, no problem. So the other topic there is regarding prioritization. It's about efficiency. And because the question from the Board came to us as a "how can we do things better" kind of question. So here, one of the things that we discussed was that we could suggest to the Board that maybe ICANN could prepare some work in advance and suggest it to the community instead of just asking every time for the community to come up with ways to solve things on their own, to make things go quicker and more efficient. So this is something that we wanted to suggest.

And also to talk about the metrics. There's also some SOPC comments regarding how ICANN measures things and that they have different measurements for different things. And the reply for that comment from ICANN Org was that they were going to review those metrics. And the question would be when will this happen or if it's ongoing or to seek how are they going to measure things since we're talking about prioritization, efficiency, and how to do things better.

And now I see that we have something in the chat. Let me check. So if you have—

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, you do.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Please note, this is the summary from ... So this is the extract from ICANN Org's public summary. If necessary, you can look at the full comment as well. But this is taken directly from the ICANN Org summary of the public comments.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: But in short what it says is that there is a concern of having too many things going in parallel and how resources are going to be distributed on that.

Yes, Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: Oh, yes. Sorry. I saw this comment and some things stood out to me. And I don't know if this is of concern for us or something that we want to take into consideration from this comment.

But it just strikes me that ICANN Org is saying like, "Yes, it's no fun to run in parallel like new gTLD, SubPro, and SSAD, and then Work

Stream 2 and ATRT3." But I'm sorry, Work Stream 2 has been here for six years. I'm sorry, ATRT3 has been here for how long? Three, four years.

It's like, okay, it's no fun to run them in parallel, but you don't have to if you actually deal with everything in time. And I don't know if we want to take this into consideration. Maybe not say it out loud, but at the back of our mind sort of have it that this makes no sense. This comment makes no sense because they're not in parallel. They're just piling up.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you for the observation, Tatiana. And, yes, it's the message that we want to bring to the Board. As in, things don't happen in parallel. They do get crammed together, and that's something that we can suggest to work on, as in how to make this not happen.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah. And we can also mention that now we have Holistic Review on the top of this, so …

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Exactly. So we keep having more and more things. So I'm not sure if there's anyone—now that our minds were a little refreshed regarding this from the SOPC—who would like to talk about this.

Or should I mention it and then people would chime in? But I'm trying to avoid this to have a monologue and to have more people from the Council to interact in the call.

TATIANA TROPINA: I can chime in at some point. I'm not a member of any prioritization group here so far. And I will politely provide a bit of a background to the Board if they're forgetful of how this actually came together because I was working on all of these for years on the GNSO. So if needed, yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So maybe I can do an introduction and then you can elaborate a little bit more?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, exactly. I mean, no worries. I was a bit venting here, but I will be polite explaining that things are piling up and some of them are not new. So what is the point here?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you. And definitely, what we don't want is to start any sort of fight or any bad feelings among the ICANN Board and ourselves. This is a dialogue, and it should be understood as such

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, exactly.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: This is something to take care of.

TATIANA TROPINA: That's why I made this caveat that I was a bit sort of venting here, but I'm not going to. So no worries about that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. And, well, that's the first part of what we would like to address with Board. At this point, I would like to ask you if it makes sense if we are comfortable with this because there's a second part of it. All good?

Okay. So the second part of the dialogue, it's … Let me take a step back. So the question from the Board is, "What collaborative actions should the community Board and Org be undertaking to further progress achieving our strategic priorities?"

So we took on the part of prioritization, efficiency, metrics, and all of this. And now we're talking about the collaborative part. And for that second part, what working together means for us. And here, what we suggest is to establish the ccNSO position in the community and how ccTLDs are different from gTLDs and how the [voluntary work] is motivated within the ccNSO.

So working together for us means transparency, often communication, knowing where things are and how they're moving, as well as if there is anything that ICANN would like to do that relates to ccTLDs in a way to communicate with ccTLDs first instead of taking steps on their own. Because however good intentions they may have, sometimes it can backfire if they don't consult with ccTLDs first.

So this is where we would like to go in this part, and I would like to know if there is anyone who would like to address this one.

Yes, Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: No, I'm not the one who is going to address this one, but I have a have a short question here. When you're going to convey this information to ICANN Board or Org, who is the channel for the communication with the ccTLDs? Is the Council? Is it the ccNSO? So, let's say, to avoid this situation which happened with the European Commission in The Hague, remember these to repeat.

What exactly ICANN Org or ICANN Board or whoever should do? So, to me, just saying to them that, "Okay, consult with us." But then we have the Council, we have the ccNSO, we have the ccTLD community. What are the points of contact? What is the one-stop shop here? Can we just offer them the one-stop shop? Can we

offer the channel of communication instead of just saying, "Contact us. Consult with us"?

I think it would be very practical and beneficial to offer some steps like, "Okay, if you want to contact us please do this, this, and that."

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, my first thought would be first consult the ICANN staff that is specialized in ccNSO matters just to see who it would be better addressed. Because, of course, the Council is not responsible to handle everything. But if, let's say, it's a particular thing in a particular ccTLD, then first contact the ICANN staff that is the ccNSO secretariat. And then they will come to us and give advice and maybe, then, redirect them to the specific ccTLD.

But I see Chris has his hand up first or [inaudible].

TATIANA TROPINA: So just to follow up. So basically, better communication with ccTLDs means also better communication within the ICANN divisions. I think that this is worth to mention.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Ale. So look, I agree with everything you said. But I would suggest actually going back to the basics. And the basics are ... This gets forgotten and new Board members don't necessarily know.

ICANN does not set policy for ccTLDs. The ccTLDs are here because we choose to be. We make policy, pretty much, that tells ICANN what to do in respect to matters where the ccTLDs think there needs to be an ICANN policy. So we think there should be an ICANN policy on retirement. We think there should be an ICANN policy on whatever we're calling it these days. What used to be called re-delegation?

[ALEJANDRA Reynoso]: Review [inaudible]?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So we tell them what that policy should be. If there is no policy that tells ccTLDs what to do because each ccTLD sets its own policy. So with that baseline, the question then becomes, "Well, if you want to do anything that has an effect on an individual ccTLD, a) you never should, and b) if you want to talk about it, you go to that ccTLD and you talk to them.

If you think there's something that affects a number of ccTLDs, then by all means come to the Council. And the Council will go to

the ccTLDs and talk to them as a point of contact. But there shouldn't ever be anything done by ICANN that has any effect on a ccTLD other than having a conversation. And the concept of writing letters and suggesting stuff like that is so far out of scope that it just needs to stop and it should never happen.

I hope that makes sense. It makes sense to me. And it might be worth—

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It does.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: —actually making that point as strongly as that. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, sorry. It does make … This is why I asked the question. Because if I was the Org or the Board, there are so many … Like, okay, I know that ccTLDs are independent. But let's say I want to talk to the Commission, and what I'm talking about affects all TLDs including ccTLDs. What do I do? And now it's clear. Okay, I am going to go here, here, and there. So there should be some clear way if you, a ccTLD, wants something. It's not only consult us. It's also how. And, yeah, that makes sense.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Chris, would you like to take that one with the conversation with the Board?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Nothing would give me greater pleasure.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Can I?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sure.

JORDAN CARTER: I just want to add. I think it's really important to make that point really strongly because we're all aware of various things that have gone on recently. And if we aren't clear enough now, it's going to get worse. And then we can't let it get worse because it actually calls into question the legitimacy of the ICANN model. And so it is time for a very firm stare from everyone around this table and everyone in the ccTLD community.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If I could just … Oh, sorry, Biyi. You go.

BIYI OLADIPO: Related but just a wild thought. Is there a specific role for ccNSO-elected Board members on the Board? Is there a specific role in all of these discussions that we're having?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I was just going to mention that point, so you're psychic. No is the answer. But, however … So I was going to start by saying I don't think this necessarily needs to be a comment built around anything that's happened. This is just a general comment. They're all going to know what we're talking about. We don't actually have to say, "And we point specifically to this and this." We don't say any of that.

However, the point is this. I think that had Board members known what was happening … Well, I know for sure if Board members had known what was happening, certainly Katrina and Patricio and Becky and Danko would have said, "Hold on a minute. What the hell do you think you're playing at here? You don't do that." I certainly would have done it if I had been on the Board at the time.

So my guess is that they didn't know about it because if they had known about it … So it's not so much about the Board,

necessarily. Because they may not know. But it's about delivering the message because they're the stewards. So they need to make sure that what happens in Org is done properly.

But they don't have a specific role other than to make sure that the position of a ccTLD is managed properly. I hope that makes sense, Biyi.

BIYI OLADIPO: Yeah. It makes a lot of sense. And that was actually the question that if anything is going off as far as the relationship between the Board and the CCs are concerned, is there somebody who actually brings out a voice to say, "Hey, guys. I think we're overreaching ourselves. We shouldn't go that way because this and that." So that's my thoughts about it, and that was why I asked that question.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And to round up, this comes to the internal communication as well within ICANN. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Should we not consider expanding this message delivery to beyond the Board to the CEO and also the CEO of both the Org and the CEO of the IANA?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: How do you mean?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: If we're going to follow Jordan's advice and make this crystal clear, yet again, that they need to stop meddling the way they did with the European governments, I am thinking that we perhaps want ... And Chris's comment that, well, probably the Board didn't know. Well, then it seems to me what we ought to do is take that same message that we delivered to the Board and deliver it to the CEO of both IANA and ICANN Org so that everybody knows how we feel about this, not just the Board. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Are you suggesting that we should do a statement to be delivered? Or shall we participate in the Q&A? Sorry, Jordan. I didn't see.

JORDAN CARTER: Stephen might have read my mind because I was going to say there are a couple of other opportunities to make it clear. And I think once we've had that dialogue with the Board, we can maybe be ... I don't know. The tactics may be a little bit more gentle, but there's an executive Q&A where it might be worth mentioning it there. And I think that we should put it on the agenda for the next

time the three of us are having a one-on-one meeting with the CEO as well.

I think if we … We don't want to sort of … It's juggling between being clear and firm about the message. And we're not here to embarrass anyone or anything like that. So getting the vibe right might be an interesting thing to think through, but I think …

And I don't know if we need to go as far as discussing it in the public forum, but I think that there are some other opportunities if we want to just be consistent and visibly drawing a line.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And also, that gives us some escalation methods. If we start with this approach and things are not fixed, then we can escalate. But if we go already public, then we don't have a way to do so.

Yes, Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So I don't disagree. I just want to check in first with … What was the result of the discussion? What did we agree when … Because there was a meeting with Göran and … I can't remember who was there. Was there not, last time? Wasn't there a meeting at which this letter was discussed? And there was an agreement that they would back off and it was all a mistake. Am I dreaming or did that not … Did that actually happen?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, it was a discussion between CENTR and Göran.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, it was CENTR.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It was CENTR.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Right, okay. But they did agree that they would put it down to pilot error, for want of a better way of saying it. I'm not suggesting that means anything other than just to get clear that that's what they said. And we'll remember all of that.

So discussing it with the Board delivers the message to Göran because he will be there. The question then becomes do you want to [inaudible]. The Q&A is tomorrow, which will mean that it's before we've had a meeting with the Board. And the question is whether you want to bring that up at the Q&A which effectively makes it public. And there's no background.

The other point to remember is that people who are listening to this will not necessarily have any background on it. So we just need to be a little bit careful from that point of view that we don't set some kind of rumor mill running or difficulties running.

Whereas if we're having a conversation with the Board, they know about it. So they will at least understand what we're saying.

So I'm just not sure. I just want to caution that we just be a little careful that we don't go too far. But I certainly think a strident message delivered to the Board is a given, is a must. The other stuff, I just need to think about a bit more and see what other people think just to be a bit careful.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah. I think that bringing it publicly at the Executives Q&A without the context is … As you said, it does not allow for any further escalation, especially if we take the background into account and remember that CENTR and whoever was there said, "Okay, there was a misunderstanding." So probably for ICANN, that question is resolved somehow. And for CENTR. I don't know if it is, but let's say publicly. Right?

So I think that instead of barking on the same tree, we will just implement the forward-looking approach and say in a bigger context, "Look, we don't want misunderstandings to happen. We don't want you to approach the governmental bodies without consulting us first. We understand that you're not making policy

here, but you're negotiating. You're asking for somebody to do something."

So without that particular case, without Executive Q&A. And I think that Jordan mentioned the meeting with chair and vice-chair. Right? So you can address it there.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Tatiana. Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Alejandra. And greetings to all. I would like to get some clarification because I do like Chris's idea of coordinating. When is the best time? Where do we have the most impact? In which session do we have the most impact?

And we should consider what Chris pointed out which is if we had the conversation with the Board first and then you guys can have the one-on-ones with them and follow that course in which we can bring these topics in a coordinated way such that it reaches not only the Board but the CEO as well. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. And just doing a quick recap. Again, the idea of having this dialogue with the Board, it's a dialogue so we're not looking for specific answers. It's just to bounce ideas and to send

certain messages through without getting to specific examples or to bring stuff up in the air again that might have been resolved already. It's just to say, "Okay, in general terms"—and everyone will know what we are referring to—"this is what we want you to do from now on" in a constructive manner. So it makes [inaudible].

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: I absolutely agree. My concern was to bring this topic, this subject in a session in which those who are present do not have a background or context. And so that could lead to confusions or to misinterpretations.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. So I think we should just do the addressing with the Board right now on what Chris suggested to do. If you're okay with it, Chris. Yes?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. Jordan's hand is up [inaudible].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sorry, Jordan. [inaudible].

JORDAN CARTER: That's fine. You don't have eyes on both sides of your head. This is really letting us down.

I think that's fair because also the Board-ccNSO Session is public. Right?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes.

JORDAN CARTER: There's a webinar and so on. And the other thing is, I think that's enough because one of the signals we want to send is to our colleagues in the CENTR family, that we've got their back on this. And I agree that beating a drum hard on this is hard enough, probably, in the Board for the first instance. And I think that it's not menacing the Board or anything, but it's like, "This is quite important to us and this can never happen again" in a really low-key way.

And the last suggestion I'll make is that maybe it's worth talking to whoever it was in CENTR who had the meeting that Chris referred to with ICANN to just see if there's any other [piece] [inaudible].

EN

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think that was Roelof. I think if I remember correctly, it was Roelof and Peter and someone else. I can't remember.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I think it was Byron.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Byron? Okay. It probably was.

JORDAN CARTER: So maybe just an informal chat with them before the Board session just to suss it out. Just as a suggestion.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If I may, Ale. So that makes sense to me. And I think targeted shots are better than shotguns. So targeting the Board and targeting specifically the meeting that the leadership has with Göran and whatever at the next opportunity, those are the two keys. The Exec is going to be a scattergun because 99.9% of those execs have nothing to do with any of this. It doesn't mean anything to them, etc. And the people listening are not going to care. So just targeted—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

**ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR**

CHRIS DISSPAIN:
Yeah, exactly. So that target. But I also agree. Checking in with Roelof. Roelof is going to be here at lunchtime. I know because I'm on a session with him and others. We'll be good. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:
Thank you, all. I think we are set for that one. Any other questions? Comments? Now I'm seeing both sides. Okay, well, thank you all.

Let's move to the next item in our agenda for the prep. It's Identify non-ccNSO sessions on main schedule in which to participate and highlight.

So the idea here is that we are going to be attending the majority of the ccNSO sessions, so reporting back on those. It's nice if you see something that the Council should pay special attention for next time. But now that ICANN meetings are going back to usual, there are other sessions around us that might be of our interest. And here we can see displayed the ones that the secretariat has put together. So today there's the CSC. There's also a GAC Capacity Building and Outreach Workshop that is specifically regarding DNS roles and responsibilities on country code managers and generic name relationships with governments.

Yes, my eyesight is still good. And there's a Governance Working Group. So I would like to know if there's anyone who's participating there, just to know that you are. And if you see something relevant, then let us know.

So Sean is looking at me like, "I'll be in CSC." Yes, I'm a mind reader. And Javier, you will be in [inaudible].

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: Hello. Yeah, I wanted to ask about that GAC session. If anybody knew about it. But I'm interested, so I'll go and report back.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, because I'm moderating it. I know some of you do know about it and maybe some of you done. So the idea was to ...This was two days of GAC capacity building because they've got like 150 new GAC people who've not been around before. Their governments have been, but their representatives have not.

So for example, the gTLD registry community is having a session with them this afternoon. The registrars are having a session with them this afternoon. And one of the things that I thought was important was that they understand the difference between gTLD

and a ccTLD. Specifically that ccTLDs have a relationship directly with the government. Each of you has your own government that you have a relationship … You might not talk to them, but they're there. And they're yours. And part of the pluses of being sovereign is actually, yes, you are. But at the end of the day, your government can tell you what to do. Eventually. They might have to fight to do it, but they can.

Whereas with the gTLDs, is it's a different thing. Although they have a corporate government—in the sense of your company is incorporated in and therefore is obliged to follow those rules—from a policy point of view, it's different.

So I thought it was important to try and establish that difference. I talked to Ale about it, and so we've got Ram from the Identity Digital. Edmon Chung from .asia and .kids. He's also on the Board. Roelof and Bruce Tonkin. So two ccTLDS, two gTLDs. And it's a session to basically talk to them about …

And it might … I don't know, but it might end up straying slightly into DNS abuse areas and the European Commission's attempts to control the world. Who knows? It might. But the key message is that there is a difference and governments need to understand that difference. Each individual …

It's fascinating. No individual government would allow another government to get away with commenting in the GAC on their

ccTLD. So if the Australian government heard the British government making comments about the .au ccTLD, they would object. But it's perfectly okay for governments in the GAC to make individual comments about gTLDs. It's quite a bizarre situation, and it's basically because they don't understand. So that's the goal.

I hope that helps, Javier.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: That is super interesting. I'm going.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I'm going, too. But anyway—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It's open?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: The other advantage, of course, is that the GAC room is normally mega-huge. And so therefore there's probably going to be room.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sorry, Chris. I missed that. What would be rude?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I said the GAC room is unusually enormous so there'll be plenty of room.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, room. I was, like, okay. Sorry, my ears.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] mask [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's the masks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. So, yes, this is happening today, just in case you are excited to go. It's at 1:15.

BIYI OLADIPO: Just a wild thought.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes?

BIYI OLADIPO: Chris, it's just a wild thought. We know that in some claims, governments have this thing of just deciding to take over ccTLDs.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.

BIYI OLADIPO: So maybe there's a way you can play it to let them understand that, yes, you can do it. But it's always in the best interest not to.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I so agree. And to be crystal clear, no part of any of the message is going to be, "You're actually in charge." None of that. It's just that I was just telling you guys the baseline, of course, as we know is that that's the case. But at the end of the day, we're not … But I'm not going to spend any … We're not going to go, "So let me explain how you take over your ccTLD."

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Excellent. So well. I see many of us are attending that session. But in any case, just keep your note taking, too, in case you see something relevant for us to discuss in the Council afterwards regarding these sessions.

Also for the RSS Governance Working Group, I see a note there that the Council could ask for a report by the ccNSO [inaudible]

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

to the working group. Okay, so that is easy. So on Monday, there is the Q&A with ICANN Org Executive Team. Not sure if any of you is going to attend that. I see silence.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: [I'll go].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, Pablo? Okay. Thank you very much, Pablo. So Pablo will attend that one. And on Tuesday ... And this is where things get a little bit more complicated because some of these things are in our schedule and some are against our own. But, still ... There's the Driving Local Change for Universal Acceptance. And we will have the IANA and CSC update that will happen in our own ... They're coming to talk to us. And there's the Internet Fragmentation Plenary.

Yes, Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: I can report from the plenary unless Jordan wants to do this. So I can report from DNS and Fragmentation.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSA: Okay.

TATIANA TROPINA: And I'm also going to attend Updates on Geopolitical, Legislative, and Regulatory Developments, but perhaps that will be asked after our meeting. I'm not quite sure. But I can report on both Fragmentation and Updates on Geopolitical, Legislative and whatever. Whether they are before or after, that does not matter for me.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSA: They're before.

TATIANA TROPINA: Okay. Unless somebody wants to take one of these over, I can report on both.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Put in your name—

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: I can help out.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And Javier's going to help you.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: Sure. We can switch or whatever.

TATIANA TROPINA: Cool.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Compare notes.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: Yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. And that's it. Well, there's one more. [inaudible] Scope on Universal Acceptance as well. So, lots of Universal Acceptance. If anyone is attending that, please report back if we need to do anything regarding that because that's an item that we are going to discuss after the session of the ccNSO and the Universal Acceptance to see whether the ccNSO has a role or not.

So with that, let's move on to our next topic, please. If I can see the agenda for today, Prep. Thank you very much. Too much, too much. A little bit. Thank you. That's perfect.

Ah, perfect way to get into this one. It's the ccNSO and Universal Acceptance [inaudible] Group expected actions. Again, we will

see from the session what suggestions we will get from the community regarding Universal Acceptance. And then as we did with DNS abuse, we need a small team to build a roadmap and to see this through. We have already three volunteers, if I'm not mistaken. Jiankang, Ai-Chin, and Pablo.

If there's anyone else that would like to join this, just let me know. But this is something that we need to especially put eyes on because that session is coming to feedback directly to Council for us to know what to do if there is a role for us to do something.

And how are we on time? We have some more minutes. So I am not sure if we have the people from the Holistic Review already in the room. But if not ... Do we? Can anyone confirm with me or is it too early? The people from the Holistic Review are still not here yet? Okay.

So then let's continue with the other topics, 6 and 7. So it says we were discussing on having a workshop on how to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the ccNSO process. So with this, this is not happening right now. But after ICANN75 it would be nice that this small team starts organizing and preparing the workshop for us and hopefully have it in in our meeting in November. So there's enough time to prepare the workshop and what we need to discuss.

I remember there is a list of people who volunteered, but I don't remember it by heart. If not, you will be contacted. No, it is in the meeting notes from the last time, but I don't remember right now. But if you are interested and you don't remember if you're in the list or not, again, let me know, or the secretariat, that you want to help building this workshop.

Jordan saying he's in. Thank you, Jordan.

Okay, we are going to do a really quick run through our Council agenda for this meeting. If I could ask Kim to pull that up. We have a draft agenda, and we are still ... Again, this is the draft but we will receive another one, a revised one with resolutions and everything. Thank you for zooming in. Thank you so much. My eyesight is not that good.

So we are going to do it the way we did it last time in The Hague, as in having different parts and leaving all updates and working groups and everything, if time permits, until the end. So there's the welcome and then administrative things. We will go through the action items. And if we can go a little bit further. Thank you very much.

There we will see the decisions that were made. And that's administrative. It goes really quickly. And then we go to the substantive topics. So the first one is the adoption of the letter to

ICANN Legal regarding the Article 8.8 in the ICANN Bylaws that we already reviewed and it's been circulated.

We will address the closure of ccPDP3 Retirement Working Group because we are assuming that the policy will be adopted during the ICANN Board meeting. And it will be nice if we are there to see this event happening.

Then we will need to take action regarding Holistic Review. Have we received an e-mail from Triage regarding this as well? And I did forward you some information regarding Holistic Review, and we will have a presentation soon from them because there is a public comment open to see what statement decision or what comment the ccNSO wants to make regarding this.

Then we are going to talk about the role of the ccNSO in Universal Acceptance and next steps. And if we can move forward, please. There. Thank you. We will have updates on the Board's [inaudible] nomination process and appointment. Well, the appointment ... No, it's already done. But it's the update. And the update on ccNSO Council elections that we are right now in the window of nominations and [inaudible].

Then updates from chair, vice-chairs, councilors, and regional organizations. Here, I already have two topics. It's to tell you a summary regarding the roundtable and the one-on-one with Göran.

And the last topic that we will discuss—and it's good that we had the chance to see it right now—is a brief evaluation of ICANN75. So please do take notes on anything you think might be improved or things that you really liked to keep or any observation comment that the MPC will find useful for the next planning of ICANN76.

And we have the Section D that are updates and other matters that, only if time permits, we will go through these. And again, all updates regarding these are taken from the meetings since most of the working groups are meeting today.

And I see that Bart has his raised. Thank you, Demi.

BART BOSWINKEL: Please continue. I just wanted to add a topic for the substantive topics in a moment after you finish, before I forget.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. So I'll come back to you, then. Thank you, Bart. And, well, here we will most likely not get here because of the time of the session. I believe we have only one hour, so there won't be time. And if we can continue just to finish the agenda. A little bit more. Thank you.

And here's where we will have Any Other Business, next meetings and "Thank Yous," and close the meeting. So I wonder are there any comments regarding the agenda or questions? I see none.

Then I can go back to you, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you, Alejandra. Just for your information, the Triage Committee just approved another action for the Council which we'll include. That's to start a ccNSO position paper statement on the CSC Review Initiation Report. The reason why it was so important is that one of their findings/recommendations, etc., will be about a review of the IANA Naming Functions Service Level Agreements. So the SLAs for the services that IANA is providing to the ccTLDs and gTLDs.

Currently there is no mechanism and, therefore, the suggestion is that the CSC will take on a role in this respect to do it on a regular basis. So again, that topic will be added to the agenda. We'll circulate it on Monday—so that's tomorrow—including the draft resolution. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Bart. Any comments? Questions? All clear? Okay, great.

So now I propose to have a really short break. As in nobody's allowed to leave the room. But it's a break. Really quick just because we will have a presentation at 11:30. Already? And we will take this opportunity to hand you some surprise, so be ready. Maybe.

So please, everyone, take your seats again from this short break. Soon we are going to start with the Pilot Holistic Review Update.

Welcome back, everybody. So now I would like to give the floor to our friends from the Pilot Holistic Review Update. Please.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much for having us. I'm Larissa Gurnick. I am part of the GDS Team, and my team reviews support and accountability, works on the various reviews. And I'm joined here by my colleague, Jason Kean. We wanted to provide an update on the Pilot Holistic Review, particularly because there is a public comment that's out right now. And we'll talk about that. So we wanted to encourage your contributions to the public comment, as it'll be an important one. So let's get started. Next slide, please.

We'll talk real briefly about what the Pilot Holistic Review is and where it originated. We'll cover the public comment proceeding that I mentioned already is underway and talk about what comes next. Next slide, please.

So as a way of background, the third Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3) examined ICANN reviews and to look at whether they function effectively. And as a result, they issued a number of recommendations that would impact how reviews are conducted. There is actually two in particular that I wanted to highlight here. While we're here to talk about Recommendation 3.5 which calls for a new specific review, a Holistic Review, there is also a companion recommendation, Recommendation 3.6, that suggests that organizational reviews should evolve into a continuous improvement program.

We're not here to talk about Recommendation 3.6, but as you will see—on this has already been our experience in presenting to other groups—there is inevitable connections and dependencies between these two recommendations. So I just wanted to kind of clarify that from the start.

So the Board approved this recommendation—as a matter of fact, all ATRT3 recommendations; but the one in particular, the calls for the new review subject to prioritization and available resources—and also directed that be done as a pilot first before it proceeds to the Bylaws amendments. And the reason for calling that it be done as a pilot is to address various informational gaps that the Board felt needed to be addressed and resolved before this would proceed to the next step and go through the Bylaws amendment process and get there.

So a subgroup of Board members and former ATRT3 members got together earlier in the year to develop a proposed Terms of Reference for this Pilot Holistic Review that would reflect on the intent of the ATRT3 recommendation. And they did the development of the Terms of Reference in parallel with the Planning Prioritization Pilot that was happening around the same time.

As it turned out, Recommendation 3.5 did get classified by the community group that participated in the prioritization. It did get classified as top priority, or P1. And plans are now underway to design the implementation of that recommendation based on that priority. Next slid, please.

ATRT3 had four particular objectives in mind for this recommendation, for this review, the Holistic Review. One was to review continuous improvement efforts of SOs and ACs and the NomCom based on good practices.

Two was to review the effectiveness of the inter-collaboration mechanisms between SOs and ACs and the NomCom.

Three, to review the accountability of the SOs and ACs or their constituent parts to their communities, to their membership.

And then four is quite a handful. So it's review how the SOs, ACs, and the NomCom as a whole and to determine if they continue to have a purpose within the ICANN structure as they're currently

constituted or if any changes in the structures and operations would be desirable to improve the overall effectiveness of ICANN as well as to ensure optimal representation of different views.

So those were the four objectives that were defined by ATRT3 three, and they serve as a cornerstone of the work that the TOR Team did to design the Terms of Reference. Next slide, please.

As I mentioned, Board had identified information gaps that ought to be addressed by the Pilot. And just to touch on what some of these information gaps are that they thought would be important.

One was how the Holistic Review Team should determine and prioritize its work to ensure that the review outcomes are effective within the recommended 18-month time frame—which was also defined by ATRT3—what the methodology should be for gathering and analyzing data to inform fact-based findings and other things like that; as well as an idea of estimated resources and budgeting that would be required to carry out a review such as this and determination of how future Holistic Review Teams would measure the success of the recommendations that were provided by the prior Review Team.

So the proposed Terms of Reference includes actions and deliverables designed to address these identified gaps. Next slide, please.

Key components of the Pilot Holistic Review, as it's reflected in the Terms of Reference, is to address the primary goal of the Pilot Holistic Review which will be to address the information gaps, but also to have the Pilot Holistic Review Team to create a Holistic Review program which means developing principles and criteria for evaluation by future Holistic Review Teams.

Also to ensure that the different principles and criteria for evaluation are practical and relevant across all structures. And that's an important point because in many steps outlined in the Terms of Reference, it calls for collaboratively working with all of the structures to come up with a process and a methodology that takes into consideration what all of the different structures are already doing. There are existing continuous improvement programs and ways that this would be relevant across the spectrum of different SOs and ACs. Next slide, please.

So the public comment preceding. It opened on the 30th of August, and it will stay open through the 20th of October. We have a link here for you to the public comment page. The public comment is being initiated at the direction of the ICANN Board, and the Board is seeking input that we've highlighted here, whether the Draft Terms of Reference seems fit for purpose and whether it's tailored to the community expectations based upon what ATRT3 included in their recommendation.

Also, the Board is seeking input on the scheduling of this Pilot Holistic Review and the timing in light of other community and stakeholder work.

And, of course, I think I skipped over one of the bullet points here. The implications for various community structures and groups are, we think, pretty important not just in terms of community time and attention, participation, having representatives serving on the Pilot Holistic Review Team; but also potential changes to how the various structures are organized and evaluated in the future as the work of the Pilot Holistic Review Team progresses once we get there. Next slide, please.

Upcoming activities beyond the public comment. As is the usual process, there will be a report of public comments, a summary, and the analysis will be presented to the Board through the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. And depending on the nature of public comments, there may be an engagement back to the team, the Terms of Reference Team that developed the Draft Terms of Reference to potentially address public comments.

Depending on how that all proceeds, that would lead to a call for volunteers and the process to initiate the selection of the Pilot Holistic Review Team which would follow the same process as what everyone had gone through most recently to select the

members of the ATRT Review Team and others based on what's currently in the operating standards.

The Board would also nominate a Board liaison to serve on the Pilot. While all of that would be going on, ICANN Org is intending to assemble different information in order to make the work of the Review Team most productive once they get started. And that would lead to the initiation of the Pilot Holistic Review work itself which, as I mentioned, according to the ATRT3 vision, that would last 18 months. No more than 18 months.

Let me pause here. I see there are some questions. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Is it okay to ask them now? Are you okay with that? Okay. So first of all, for clarity ... And forgive me if these are obvious questions because I may not remember stuff. Did the review ... Sorry, start again.

This pilot and this ongoing Holistic Review is intended to replace the series of independent reviews of each SO and AC. Is that correct in simple terms?

LARISA GURNICK: This and its partner recommendation to replace the organizational reviews with a continuous improvement program. And you're asking the question that gets to the heart of the—

CHRIS DISSPAIN: They stick together.

LARISA GURNICK: —connection of those things.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

LARISA GURNICK: But, yes. In concept, the vision is that organizational reviews as they were conducted, as you're all probably very familiar, would not happen in the same way as they did before. And this would all be once this goes through the process of being implemented into the Bylaws, that they would be replaced with a continuous improvement program and a component of the Holistic Review as well.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And this Holistic Review would be able to make recommendations on structure.

LARISA GURNICK: Correct.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Right. Okay, cool. So does the recommendation indicate that the Holistic Review should be done internally or externally? Or does it not comment at all about whether it should be done internally or externally?

LARISA GURNICK: Because the Holistic Review is specified to be a "specific review"... Specific review, by definition in the Bylaws currently, is conducted by community volunteers that are appointed by all of the different structures, much like ATRT, SSR, and so on.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm not saying this is a bad thing. I'm just trying to get clear. In essence, that means that a review that could make recommendations in respect to the structure of the ccNSO is going to be conducted by a community-wide group. Yeah? Rather than previously where it would have been conducted by an independent group liaising, basically, with the ccNSO and possibly going out to other groups to comment. I'm just using the ccNSO as an example because we're here in the room. Yeah?

LARISA GURNICK: Yes. You're right, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. So leaving aside whether I think and anyone else thinks that's a good idea for a minute, one thing that does occur to me as being really important is if that's going to happen for all of the SOs and ACs, is the structure of that team. And in the past what we've seen is circumstances where ccNSO has ended up with one or two representatives on the team that had 8 or 9 or 10 representatives from the GNSO.

And I just want to flag right now that I suspect that if that's looking like a structure that's going to happen, that is going to make a lot of people incredibly uncomfortable. So we just need ... I'm only making the comment basically to my colleagues, but it's just something that occurred to me while I was listening that we're going to need to deal with very carefully.

I don't know if your suggestion has a structure in it. I guess it doesn't, but I'm not sure.

LARISA GURNICK: No. There is no change to the structure envisioned by the ATRT3 or the Terms of Reference. So in other words, the current Bylaws specify that each group can appoint—if I remember correctly—up to three members to serve on the Review Team. That's how we get to—

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That each group being … The ccNSO is one group.

LARISA GURNICK: Correct.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And the GNSO is four or five groups.

LARISA GURNICK: No, I believe—

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes. I think so. If it's ATRT3 structure, I'm fairly sure I'm right. I'm happy to accept if I'm wrong, but do they not have representatives from each of their SGs?

LARISA GURNICK: I think it's up to three members per each SO. And I see … But let us clarify that, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If you could.

LARISA GURNICK: Absolutely.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Because if that's the case, then I don't have any issue per se. But if it isn't, then we've got an issue.

LARISA GURNICK: Yeah. I'll pull that up right now and we'll … But please, go ahead with your questions.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. I'm managing the queue of questions. Now we have Jordan and then Stephen. No? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: That was your question? Okay, thank you. So, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: My question is related. And I think Chris raises a good point, but mine is a bit of a different one. This community has its moments of inward looking-ness, which are quite common. And it seems like what this is proposing is getting rid, entirely, of any review

that brings an external independent perspective to the future of the ICANN system which is the advantage that the old reviews did. No matter how badly they were done or how off-point they seemed, at least there was an external lens.

So if the proposal is to replace that with an entirely community-driven review process, are we not at risk of just reviewing ourselves and patting ourselves on the back and saying how great we are?

So that's one. I just want to clarify if that's the case. And then I've got another substantive question.

LARISA GURNICK: Yeah. Thank you for the question. So again, ATRT3 Recommendation 3.6 which basically recommends that organizational reviews evolve into a continuous improvement program, the implication is that there would not be the old style of reviews that were conducted by engaged third parties. But if a group would like to still use that as part of their process, there is still an option to do that. But it's not mandatory.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. So then if we could scroll back in the slides to the slide that had the four bullet points with one very big bullet point at the

end. I can't remember which slide that was. No, one back. One back. That one, yeah.

Is that fourth one … So I guess the first three are quite simple. Continuous improvement efforts, effectiveness of the inter-agency [collab], accountability of the parts. Is the fourth one meant to be an opening to an analysis of the ICANN system as a whole and how it's serving the Domain Name System and the Internet? Is that meant to be the "everything systemic" look?

LARISA GURNICK: I'll answer that question with an observation that there's been different interpretations of what that is meant to do, even within the ATRT3 membership. Okay? I think some people look at it as an opportunity to look at how the different structures fit together and how together as a system—as an ICANN ecosystem—there could be improvements while others really see it as an opportunity to look at the way each SO, AC, and the NomCom is structured.

I would say it's a topic that was debated extensively by the TOR Team. And the TOR was developed, at least endeavored to set up a process for the pilot to establish principles, guidelines, benchmarks with input from all of the different SOs and ACs so that—this is where it becomes a program—on the next go around, these principles and measures and guidelines for how to go

through this process would be applied in order to make the assessments down the line.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay, thank you. That's helpful. I've got one last question. Would we be proposing to stop all of the other reviews that will otherwise be happening while we do this pilot?

LARISA GURNICK: That is already—

JORDAN CARTER: [inaudible]?

LARISA GURNICK: —happening, if you will.

JORDAN CARTER: Oh, great.

LARISA GURNICK: It's all part of the entirety of the ATRT3 recommendations. So far the Board has already deferred SSR3 which was supposed to have started in March at their meeting here in Kuala Lumpur. They will

consider a recommendation to defer RDS Review, again based on the recommendation of ATRT3.

And all organizational reviews, including the review of the ccNSO, have been deferred until such time that this work can evolve and become a little more clear with the kind of check back point in about two years' time, I believe, to see where things stand so that the Board could determine whether things are progressing in the direction to implement all of those.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. That's a piece of good news. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. In your answer to the first of the three questions that Jordan asked, in response to his question, part of that question to the effect of, well, if an SO/AC wants to put themselves through the old school torture of having an independent party come in and look them over because of this increase in celerity point that he brought out, you replied that, yes, an SO or AC could do that.

But what assurances do we have, if this is adopted and an SO/AC wants to do that, that there will actually be funding or some

guarantee of funding—some approval of the process—so that if an SO/AC elected to do that in addition to this, if there's no funding then we couldn't do it.

So I'm curious to know what assurances or how that's going to be structured so that if an SO/AC says, "Yes, we want to put ourselves through that external torture," that request will be honored, full stop.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you for the question. That would be addressed as part of the design of the implementation of Recommendation 3.6 where none of these elements have been developed or designed by ATRT3. They did include commentary that budgeting should be made available. So that's all part of the recommendation for that companion recommendation. But it hasn't … The implementation is still being designed, so these kinds of nuances of things that you're bringing up— assurances, how the budgeting would work—is yet to be defined and determined as part of implementing that recommendation.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Javier.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: And this is just following and building upon Jordan's and Stephen's comments. My experience of what I've seen from community self-reviews is that it becomes a self-defensive, self-justifying process. I saw that in the past in another community, and I'd rather have an adversarial process and then you try to justify and defend that position after being reviewed from outside than just starting from within to justify your own existence. So, just a statement.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Anyone else? If not, I have a couple of questions that are more on logistics and resources, as in if there is any time commitment foreseen for the members of this team? And you were going to confirm also the number of members. Right? But still, the time commitment. Do you think they're going to need?

LARISA GURNICK: It's an excellent question. Provided that the Draft Terms of Reference goes through the process and ends up being, essentially … As it's being proposed and, based on other experience … For example, from my team's perspective, we provided support to ATRT2 and ATRT3 and all of the other reviews, essentially. So we already know that the duration will be no more than 18 months. So that gives some measure. So it is a year and a half.

And typically, the Review Teams of this nature opt to meet either once every week/once every other week in a Zoom environment, periodic in-person meetings, if circumstances permit. There is also a possibility for the Review Team to ask to engage a third party, a consultant, to do any number of supporting work at their request. So that is a possibility.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks. You mentioned, and I remember from hearing about it, that there was some—even on the ATRT3 itself—some difference in the interpretation of what your bullet point #4 is actually about. Which one of those interpretations have you chosen to follow? Or is it an open question?

LARISA GURNICK: In the Terms of Reference, it attempts to come up with principles and definitions for how this should be interpreted. So the answer, I guess, depends on how this work progresses. In particular with input from all of you through the public comment process right now, but also through continuous engagement with the different SOs and ACs because, unlike almost any other review, the output, the work product for this Review Team will have direct

implications for all of the SOs and ACs—and the GAC, by the way, as it's designed by the ATRT3 which currently is excluded from the organizational review process.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So it would be fair to say that your key message is, "Read all of the documents, get your act together, and make heaps of comments."

LARISA GURNICK: That would be lovely, thank you. And we're happy to continue to answer questions. And I am looking up the explicit language on the composition of the Review Team. So I'll post that in the chat in a few minutes. But hopefully we had a chance to convey. It's a complex and deep and detailed topic, and hopefully the information that we shared at least provide some context and clarity.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry, is that okay? Just if I may. So it appears that the ATRT3 was 4 ALAC, 7 GNSO, 3 SSAC, 1 Board, 1 RSSAC, and 1 ccNSO. Now I have no idea whether that was because that was what was mandated, but that is what it was.

LARISA GURNICK: I just posted in the chat the exact language from the Bylaws. So if I may, "Each supporting organization and advisory committee participating in the applicable review may nominate up to seven prospective members." Then, "Any supporting organization or advisory committee nominating at least one or two or three prospective Review Team members shall be entitled to have those one, two, or three nominees selected as members."

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. It's filled. The gaps get filled.

LARISA GURNICK: So it depends on how many get nominated, but the idea … And by the way, this this all … I don't know if context in history is important, but when these reviews came out of the affirmation of commitments and got built into the Bylaws, this was all designed as part of the transition process and the Bylaws. So that's where it's coming from.

But the idea is that each SO and AC would have an equal opportunity to appoint an equal number of people. But if there's open seats, then others could [participate].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: One last one because we are running out of time. Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Just to add very briefly to what Chris Disspain said. We faced this kind of asymmetry in the NomCom, also. And I understand that the ATRT3 was built in the old standards of the old GNSO. But anyway, I think we can try to change this in the future. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Demi. And I will ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Pablo.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, [perdón]. Okay, go ahead.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Very quickly. The argument that I've heard about that in the times that is has been proposed to increase the number of ccNSO participation is that we don't want to continue to increase the

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

numbers. But the other side of the coin would be to then decrease the number. And that's not something that you want. Right? You don't want to avoid people from participating. We want to allow as many people as possible.

So there is this fine line between what is the optimum number of participants, what is the optimum number of representative who can significantly represent the community. It is self-evident that the number of participants from the ccNSO are in a disadvantage in comparison to ALAC and GNSO and others.

So this is something that we should consider and begin to explore how can we resolve the situation. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: And just to clarify, there is a maximum number. The maximum is set at 21. So in a hypothetical situation, if each SO and each AC appoints however many members … But the selection process calls for three from each. So if everybody has volunteers that they've advanced, if you will, ask as candidates that they feel are qualified and if at least three are selected from each structure, it's intended—at least the idea, the intention is—that everybody has an equal number of representatives. But that's provided that everybody does that. And in our experiences, that's not always the case.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. And I know we're ever-running. I just have one quick last question, and it's that if there is anywhere we can go to and refer to planning when things need to happen as in the Holistic Review approach because it's 18 months. But how do those 18 months look like and what are the deliverables or the plan there?

LARISA GURNICK: So the Terms of Reference attempt to anticipate that. So actually, in the body of the Draft TOR there are explicit deliverables organized by each of the four objectives. So it's the beginnings of what would eventually, when the review gets going at some future point in time, it would be the beginnings of a project plan.

And actually, Jason and I and my team, our job would be to manage the project plan and ensure that everything, that the work progresses on schedule. But within the 18-month period, by design there has to be fact finding. There has to be findings. There has to be the sharing of the findings with the different stakeholder groups and constituencies, the creation of the draft report, public comment. So all of the …

Well, I'm making an assumption that these things are familiar to you all. They're certainly very familiar to us. But that cadence would be applicable to this Pilot Holistic Review as well. Draft

EN

public comment/ final report goes out to the Board. And then the Board considers the recommendations and takes action within a six month-time frame after the 18 months.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. And we already ran out of time. So thank you very much for coming to us and giving us this information.

And with this, we close our Prep Call. Thank you very much, everyone, for attending.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you. You may stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR