KATRINA SATAKI: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the ccNSO Council meeting on the 21st of May, 2020, at noon/12:00 UTC. So hello. I hope you're all feeling well, everything is fine, you're safe, your friends, colleagues, and families are safe. Hopefully, some day very soon we'll meet in person, but currently we're still working remotely. Well, for us as councilors, that's a usual thing. We have our calls. That's something that we're used to.

Let's look at the agenda. We have … Well, actually there's a few things we need to discuss today. First is that minutes from our April call were distributed. We haven't received any comments, so they have been approved. Action items: still two pending, one ongoing. Others are in pretty good shape. Completed most of them. We also discussed timing for our virtual ccNSO Council workshop. So I think we've already done that.

We had some inter-meeting council decisions. One [inaudible] initial comments on the guidelines [for] ccNSO Board Seat 11/12 [inaudible] process. We sent this updated guideline to the council. We received a question from Jordan—I hope that we address the question—and then the guideline is being sent to the community for further comments. We'll talk about that a little bit later today.

There was another one—question—that was about the appointment [of a] member to one of the working groups.

Joke, could you remind us? I'm sure I have it somewhere [inaudible] remember.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Yeah. Can you hear me okay?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Very well.

JOKE BRAEKEN: It was the PDP on Review Mechanisms Working Group, where it was one additional member, [Ancatre Marcason] from Norway. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Actually, we had two, so please add one more inter-meeting decision to the list.

                         The next one is the ccPDP 3, Part 1: Retirement. Oh, yeah, they have published the document for the public comment.

                         Stephen, anything you'd like to share with us?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. I [inaudible] the [inaudible] admin committee [inaudible] a twelfth-hour fight breaking out over the definition of consensus. It appears [inaudible] report. Two recommendations, Mechanisms A and B, but [inaudible] one over whether or not they can use the word "consensus" in the report or whether there'd be a couple minority reports in there. So they will appear in Annex [inaudible] the final report or [inaudible] [link] to the wiki page. So that should be coming out

shortly, actually, because the deadline, which I believe is today, actually, of submitting your thoughts on the members and their thoughts on the consensus question. So [inaudible] we'll get it wrapped up next week, and it'll be out shortly for public review. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. That's [inaudible]. You [inaudible] only gave an update for [one] parts, or you can say something more for 2?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That was for [ccTLD] Auction. In regards to the PDP—is that what you're asking?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, but I have to admit that I … Well, the audio quality is not particularly good. I don't know if that's a problem at my end or something from Stephen's end. You're breaking up for me and it's really difficult for me to understand what you're saying.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE   You're breaking up for me as well. With regards to the PDP, we had our last meeting yesterday. We have a couple more presentations set up for the Review Mechanism Working Group. Hopefully, we get the IANA in on our next call and, perhaps as well, Becky and Sam Eisner out of ICANN or Legal as well. The Retirement Working Group [has] pretty much [advanced] at the moment, but the Review Mechanism Working Group is plodding along. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any questions to Stephen?

No? Then the next one … Here we have draft resolution. We'll need to vote. A question to the Secretariat: Do we have anyone from the African region now? Are we correct? Number-wise, we're fine, but I'm not sure we're fine—no, I don't see anyone from the African region.

BART BOSWINKEL: Katrina, I've reached or we've reached out to [MichiMichi], who's trying to get in, so he'll be present in, hopefully, a few minutes. He tried to attend the call, so that's definite.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. That's excellent. Good. There might be some technical issues because the audio quality apparently is not so good. Kim also noticed some issues with Stephen's line and for Pablo. There are issues for both of us—Stephen and me.

While we're still waiting for our colleagues from the African region to join, let's just look at IDN ccTLD-related work items. The first one was this issue report. Hopefully, you remember all of the story with the IDN ccTLD PDP since very long ago. Basically now we're ready to move forward. Here is the proposal for your review on how to proceed. We also received back information from ICANN Legal.

Bart, maybe I'll give the floor to you to walk us through all the documents that have been prepared.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you, Katrina. First of all, on the issue report on ccPDP 4, it has been available, at least for the oversight group, since February. So they've looked at it and it's updated according to their comments. It was circulated to the [inaudible] because that's a requirement: to include the general c[ounci]l's opinion on whether the issues identified are within ICANN's mission and within the scope of the ccNSO policy-making process and whether a policy would have lasting impact. They all were confirmed. So the general c[ounce]l opinion is also concurring with the need for a policy development process on IDN ccTLD string selection. This particular one builds on the previous effort, which, first of all, included the IDN string selection, which would really [place] the fast-track process and also the includes of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. As you may recall, the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO is dealt with in a separate track. This is Point 5B on the agenda. Most recently, the ccNSO Council sent a letter including the proposed changes of the bylaws to ICANN. The Board has responded that ICANN Org will look at it and that they will initiate a public comment on, at one point, these recommendations. Hopefully, by ICANN68, this process will be launched. So there's progress on it.

Back to the IDN ccTLD string selection, if you'll recall, the council first, as a start of the whole roadmap, has first asked a review team to look at areas that need to be updated in the proposed policy. The proposed policy of PDP 2 was concluded in 2013. In the meantime, the fast-track has evolved and other issues became emergent—for example, the need to do variant management and the bit around the divergence between the fast-track process and the proposed policy with respect to the

evaluation of confusing similar strings. So there were areas that need to be improved. This PDP—that's the proposal, at least—is effectively an update of the proposals at the time and, in addition, review [of] the confusing similarity and [a] review or introduc[tion of] variant management.

There is one major addition. That's at the request of the Retirement Working Group and the Retirement PDP. It's that this working group or this PDP should also define the trigger event for the deselection or the removal and the retirement of IDN ccTLDs. With IDN ccTLDs, there are additional requirements for requesting IDN ccTLD string. The question is whether a change in any of these conditions or requirements warrants a change or a requirement of the ccTLD or not. The Retirement Working Group did not feel comfortable in doing so.

So that's more or less in a nutshell the background for this policy development process. In the background of the resolution, you see the different points of consultation of the community, your deliberations, etc., and an attempt to delineate the scope and limit the scope of this IDN ccTLD string selection or ccPDP for PDP as much as possible. That's all I have to say to it, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. By the way, [you call it].

KATRINA SATAKI:	Yeah. That's excellent. That's good. Abdalla is joining, so we are quorate now, which is good. Thank you.
	Are there any questions on this part?
	Okay. If not, please scroll down. This is the history, so to speak. Please go down. Here are the decisions. Thank you. Now we're ready to move forward with officially starting the work on this. According to Annex B, Section 3 and 4, of the ICANN bylaws, now we have to decide first to initiate the development of policy recommendations. Then we need to start working on getting people to this group which would work on that. We also asked the Secretariat to send out a call for volunteers. The idea is to do it after the ICANN68 week. We also need to invite other stakeholders to participate in the work. We also need to formally inform the Chair of the GAC and ask GAC to advise or provide an opinion. We also need to publish this resolution. This resolution is a little bit different than other resolutions or decisions. This one is not subject to the rules of the ccNSO because it's according to the bylaws. So this decision will be effective immediately after publication.
	Anyone who'd like to move?
	Okay. Giovanni moved. Pablo seconded. Thank you.
	Are there any questions? Any comments? Anything you'd like to discuss here?
BART BOSWINKEL:	Katrina, this is Bart.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: May I add a little bit more detail to two of these decisions? One is around the mid-July timeframe, and this is more informational. Before we launch the call for volunteers, we'll do a webinar again to inform the community as much as possible on the scope and working methods of the policy development process because I think we've done it with the review mechanism. It really paid off in that we got a lot of new interested people on the working group and also with the GAC. So that's the reason for doing it post-ICANN68. Otherwise, it's getting too cramped and it's too overwhelming.

The second point is with respect to the working group. It's very obvious, to working groups, that to run PDPs is the usual method. However, for this particular effort, what is introduced is the opportunity to create subgroups. The reason is that, based on previous conversations and meetings, it's very obvious that other communities are interested in, for example, only the confusing similarity discussions. To force them to participate in the full working group is probably a waste of everybody's time and energy. Again, this is a method that focused the efforts of the workings groups as much as possible.

Thank you. Back to you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Bart.

Any further … Maybe now somebody has questions or comments.

No? Nothing? Okay. Well, in that case, we can move to voting. It's good that we're now quorate. So let's vote then. Anyone who would like to vote against?

No. I don't see anyone.

Anyone abstains?

Nope. Then everyone is in favor. Thank you very much.

Let's move forward then: progress on the bylaw change. I think Bart already mentioned that. Yeah. So we have submitted the request to change bylaws and received acknowledgement from the Board. Now we're waiting for a response from ICANN Legal.

Thank you. If there are no further questions, let's move forward. I already briefly touched upon the issues. We have this updated guideline on the ccNSO Board Seat 11 and 12 nomination process. The council had a look at it. As I mentioned, we had one question from Jordan. Hopefully, that question has been addressed. Then we submitted the guideline to the community for further comments. I think they had time until yesterday. No comments have been received, so basically we can move forward with the approval of the guideline because we will need it pretty soon.

The major changes made clearer how many nominations and [inaudible] one can submit. If the majority of votes or members is none of the above, then terminate the process and start again with the new timeline. And we also changed the terminology to make things clearer.

"Nomination manager" we changed to "nomination process manager." So we have a decision. This decision will become effective seven days after publication, according to the rules of the ccNSO.

Anyone who would like to move?

Pablo. Alejandra seconded. Thank you.

Any questions on this? On the process? On the changes? On the guideline itself?

No? No questions.

Then I propose that we proceed to voting. Anyone who would like to vote against the adoption of the updated guideline?

I see none.

Anyone who abstains?

No.

It means everyone present is in favor. Thank you very much.

The next one is B on the same agenda item. We need to adopt the timeline for the Board Seat 12 nomination process. We also need to appoint a nomination process manager. Again, as you know, now we do these background checks as [we did] the last time. We went through the process. It was last year when we started it. It turned out that these background checks can take longer than expected. With that, we run into the risk of missing the deadline of appointment. If we miss it, it doesn't mean that we cannot appoint someone to the Board. It just

adds an additional layer or complexity to the selection process. So we see that we need to start the process earlier.

As you know, the first term of Nigel ends at the end next year in October [after] the ICANN meeting/ICANN AGM. But the process is so lengthy that we need to start it earlier. Yeah, the first term. He still can be appointed for two more terms. Still, formally, we need to go through the process. For that, you saw the timeline. So we started, as I said, earlier. We also need to appoint a nomination process manager.

Stephen, you have a question.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. On that six-month deadline prior to the AGM for getting a ccNSO Council or Board member appointed, I really don't think we want to stress-test that part of the ICANN bylaws. It's really, really murky, and I think we have got to get a nominee up to the Empowered Community administration within that timeframe. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. As you can see, that timeframe is the 28th of April, 2021. So it's almost a year, but, with all those background checks, it might take some time.

Can you scroll down, please? The idea is that we announce the nomination period on the 9th of June and close it … when do we close it? Can you scroll it back? I forget the … I think it's the 30th or June or … Yeah, the 30th of June. Then we enter this background check period and we aim for having a Q&A session with candidates during ICANN … 69,

right? Yeah, ICANN69 in Hamburg, or at least the Hamburg time zone. You see decisions in front of you.

Anyone who would like to move?

Stephen, is that a moving hand or an old hand.

Well, in any case, I have Alejandra and Giovanni. Alejandra moved. Giovanni seconded. Thank you.

Any questions? Now we can have discussion. Any questions?

Stephen, your hand is up. I assume you want to say something else.

Stephen, you're muted.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Old hand. My apologies.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. If there are no further questions, then the suggestion is to appoint Joke Braeken, the ccNSO Secretariat, as our nomination process manager and, second, we adopt the timeline and sequence for the call for nominations. This needs to be done according to the guideline, which we amend today. So these are two decisions.

Going to voting, is anyone against?

Anyone who abstains?

Nope.

Which means that we're … Thank you. Decision approved.

The next one is NomCom-related matters (two of them). The first one is that we received a letter from the Chair of the NomCom Review Working Party and they asked us a set of questions. Unfortunately, I have to admit that we missed those questions, so they had to resend them and repeatedly ask us to provide our feedback. We have prepared a Google Doc with responses. Last time I checked, there were comments/edits from Giovanni. I don't know if anyone else has added anything.

Kim, could you now switch to that document? I'll just very briefly walk you through it. It basically has two parts. One part is about NomCom members, meaning those people we appoint to the NomCom. The second part is about NomCom appointees (people selected by the NomCom).

I see that Marie-Noemie says that she has added a comment/suggestion about diversity. Okay, good. We can go through this. They have several recommendations, so they asked specific questions on what we think about those recommendations and how they should be implemented. Apparently, they want us to appoint members to the NomCom earlier in the year. Normally it was around August. Now they want to have our appointees already in June. That's related to the second part of this agenda item. I think it's pretty clear here.

Can you scroll down, please? Here already we have several more suggestions. "Which information, if any, on desired diversity would you

incorporate into the job description?" Here we talk about [appointees], not about NomCom members. It's still about NomCom members.

As you can see from the numbers of the composition of the NomCom, except for GNSO, they appoint seven people, and ALAC appoints five people, because of their regional composition. Others appoint one person. I think it hardly seems fair because we also have regional composition. ASO also has regional composition. So it should be either that the ccNSO and ASO also get five people appointed, or everyone should have one seat. I think it would be more efficient in terms of any discussions and probably finances, too. So this is something we can only comment on. So I think it should be more balanced. But, yeah, the decision is not ours.

As to Marie-Noemie's comment here—"A positive stance could be added, such as "Due consideration will be given to diversity when selecting the NomCom delegate as appropriate"—NomCom delegate[,] you mean?

Marie-Noemie, I see your hand is up. Please go on.

MARIE-NOEMIE MARQUES: Hello, everyone. I am very happy to explain why I am proposing this. First of all, I would like to let you know, of course, that I fully understand what you said in this sentence/comment. What you mean is that we, as the [ccNSO] Council, have only one possibility: to nominate/select one NomCom delegate to the NomCom. I understand we can not be diverse, but diversity is also about gender and geography. It means that, when we do select one person to the NomCom, we can have a look at

supporting gender or geographical diversity because what you're targeting here is not gender or geographic diversity. It's diversity of members due to the organization of ICANN, which is something different. So, as we know we've been working at ICANN on diversity, meaning gender and geography, which is in fact the real concern of ICANN, which is to improve diversity in terms of gender and geography, I think we need to have a more positive stance in this regard, considering that this sentences that we have put here are a bit restrictive and include some criticism to the organization. I don't think that this is the best thing to do. We should have a more positive and constructive saying. So that is why I proposed a sentence just like that, saying, of course, when we select a member to the NomCom, if we have ten candidates or five candidates, we'll have to choose and this is one criteria that we can take into account in addition to skills, of course, because I fully agree with you that the first sentence is just right. I think that the first priority is the skillset. Diversity comes secondly. But it's true that, as a council (the ccNSO Council), may and have taken into account diversity concerns. So this is the reason I proposed a positive and constructive sentence: to be more in tune with the objectives of ICANN and more open also. So I hope that you will understand. Of course, I will understand if you modify this sentence, but I really think that we should keep the spirit of it because it is a constructive and open and future-like and not too restrictive, as it is now. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Miguel?

[Nacho], please unmute.

MIGUEL ESTRADA: I'm sorry. I don't know what happened. I didn't raise my hand.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. You did not raise your hand. Okay, thank you.

                         Marie-Noemie, please lower your hand. Thank you.

                         We had a pretty lengthy discussion with the Vice-Chairs on this one, but finally we agreed that, if we appoint one person, we can't be diverse, unless, of course, we [inaudible]. Last time, we appointed someone from the European region. This time, we appoint someone from the African region. But, in any case, we can do it only if we have enough volunteers to choose from. If, for example, we have three volunteers, and all are from one region, then we can't select someone from another region because no one has volunteered. That's one thing.

                         Another thing is that, for example, this year, our representative/appointed member to the NomCom is Annebeth from the European region. So should we appoint a male next time and say, "Women, please do not apply"? This is really not a good approach—or at least I think that—because we have only one person to appoint.

                         Here, in any case, we should look at the total composition of the NomCom. But, again, with one member, we can't … It's like with the appointment with the CSC. We've been through that (Customer Standing Committee). They also have this diversity requirement, but it's so difficult to impose because each organization appoints, except the Registry Stakeholder Group and the ccNSO, appoints two members

each. Others appoint liaisons. We have to look at the overall composition. But, if others appoint one person, it's really … Even though we appoint, we have to approve the full slate. Still, I can't imagine us going back to the GAC or other organizations, saying, "No, no, no. You can't appoint this person. You have to select somebody else just because we need diversity on the CSC." So, to the extent possible, yes, but this is something that we really can't address artificially or at least try to impose it on organizations. This is something that should be addressed differently. It should be addressed by us reaching out to those regions that are not probably active or those parts of our community that are not and will probably never step forward. So I think this definitely should not be something incorporated into the job description when we are looking for candidates. It's something that we should do differently.

At the same time, again, as we discussed when we talked about the Customer Standing Committee, we, the council, are the ones that select two members on this Customer Standing Committee. We, the council, are a really diverse group of people. We have three councilors per region. We have three NomCom-appointed councilors who give us another perspective. We also are pretty well-balanced in other terms, like big registries, small registries, and gender diversity and also are pretty good on the council. So this diverse group of people selects, in our case, one person to the NomCom. I think diversity in decision-making also counts in this case. So I think we should really strive for having more balanced representation from different SOs and ACs on the NomCom rather than try to get diversity in one person per year that we are appointing. That's really tricky and difficult here.

Any other comments on this?

If not, thank you very much for your suggestions, additions, and comments. So thank you.

Let's go back to our agenda item because … If you're fine with the rest of the document … Here is the draft resolution—wait, wait, wait. The draft resolution. [If] we support the response, [then] we can send it to the Chair of the Review Working Party.

Anyone who would like to move?

Giovanni, thank you. Anyone—Pablo seconds. Thank you.

Any further questions? Comments?

No? If not, then let's proceed to the voting. Anyone against?

Anyone who abstains?

Okay. Everyone is in favor. Thank you.

The next one then: I forwarded the request from the NomCom, so they asked us to appoint a new—okay, not necessarily new, as you see that Annebeth is not term-limited … So, if she steps forward, we also still can evaluate her candidacy. So the proposal is to issue a call for volunteers on the 26th of May—next week—and close it on the 9th of June. The council would look at all of the volunteers and select their preferred candidates from the 10th to the 17th of June. With that, we can meet the request of NomCom [on] the deadline for the appointment.

You see the decision in front of you. Anyone who would like to move?

Pablo, thank you. Margarita seconded. Thank you. So we adopt the proposed timeline and selection procedure and issue a call for volunteers.

Let's proceed with voting. Anyone against?

I see none.

Anyone who abstains?

No. So everyone is in favor. Thank you.

The next one you probably have forgotten, but that was some time ago—more than a year ago, actually—when we had this CSC effectiveness review. They were very efficient, very effective, and they published their report and received one of the ccTLDs. They asked us to request some clarification from ICANN. They asked us to ask ICANN to perform some GAP analysis, and we did that. That's in the report. So they asked the ccNSO Council to submit this request. So we did it, but then, in Barcelona, we were asked by ICANN to provide some additional information because it was not entirely clear what kind of GAP analysis we mean. So they asked for a clarification to clarify and be more precise on what exactly is required. So we reached out to the ccTLD representative, who raised the issue. Unfortunately, after numerous requests to clarify and provide some more information—something that we could use when we get back to ICANN Org—it's been more than a year and we still haven't received that clarification. So I don't know if there is any use to keep dragging this any further because apparently there's no interest from that particular representative ccTLD to clarify anything. Therefore, I suggest that we take no further steps in seeking

clarification and just close the query and inform ICANN Org accordingly, saying, "Thank you very much for your patience." So let's consider this item closed. So that's the background.

Anyone who would like to move?

Stephen.

Any secondings?

Margarita. Thank you.

Any questions on this?

Okay. I see none.

Can we then proceed to the voting, please? Anyone against?

No. Anyone who abstains?

No. Then everyone is in favor. Thank you. We will prepare the letter.

The next one: Internet Governance Liaison Committee. A very active committee. They have asked us to update the terms of reference. They specifically introduced a mechanism for IGLC to select the chair in just the way it happens in other groups. So, basically, the group suggests and nominates a chair, and council appoints.

Anyone who would like to move? Any movers?

Thank you, Alejandra.

Seconding?

Pablo, thank you.

Okay. You see the decision in front of you. Any questions? Discussions?

Nobody wants to discuss the changes? No? Okay, thank you.

Let's proceed to the voting. Anyone against?

Anyone who abstains?

Okay, thank you. Done.

Next one: update on the Empowered Community administration. That's actually a very interesting one. Here we need to discuss in more detail some of the recent things/changes. As you know and probably saw my e-mails on the list, we have entered Phase 2 of rejection action processes. As far as we are informed, some … Let's take on step back. As you know, in December, ICANN published draft documents for budget and operating plans. Or let's be more precise … I always forget those names of those documents because they all look the same. But, at the same time, they're different. The first one is the operating plan and budget for financial year '21. The other one is the five-year operating and financial plan for financial years '21 to '25.

The Board approved those documents on the 7th of May. On the 14th of May, we received a notice from the ICANN secretary as requested by the bylaws. Why it took seven days I have no idea, but I think this is one of the things that we might propose to change in the bylaws when it comes to discussions on those things that need to be changed because I think there's probably no need to wait for seven days. But that's irrelevant here.

EN

In December, they published the draft documents and there was a public comments period. Then, of course, this COVID situation happened. Of course, it changes everything. So it was a responsible thing to look at all those financial projections and numbers and see what can go wrong. At the end, of course, this budget was changed. It was reduced in light of the crisis. Most probably incomes will not be as good as projected initially. If you go to the ICANN website, you can see all those changes. They have highlights of all the changes in the document. It has a very good table comparing all the things that had been changed. So I think there's no question that this was a responsible thing to do. It had to be done.

The issue to informed about is that these significant changes were done without properly consulting with the community, meaning that there were two webinars during which those changes were presented. Those two webinars are quoted as, let's say, consultation with the community, saying, "No comments were received during those webinars, so we're fine. There's no need to change anything in the changed budget." So the only question here is about the process and if everything possible had been done in terms of consulting with the community.

So that's the situation here. I know that some community members are definitely not happy with the way it was done, again, without questioning the fact that it had to be done.

So the question here is what we, as the ccNSO Council, on behalf of our community, thinks. Should we react somehow? Or let's just consider this part of the inevitable process, let's say?

Anyone who'd like to comment? For example, Giovani, the Chair of the SOPC?

Yes, Giovanni, please.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Katrina. As Chair of the SOPC, I also received some, let's say, comments from SOPC members about the procedure that ICANN forwarded to reach a decision about approving these revised fiscal year '21 and also fiscal years '21-'25 operating and financial plan. There were also other comments from other SOPC members about the fact that, indeed, as you pointed out, this is a responsible decision. But the questions were still on then process, rather than on the decision itself.

If you go to the blog entry by the ICANN CEO and Board Chair, you will see that you can read that they define the two webinars as two webinars with a high level of participation and engagement. I personally believe that ICANN could have done a bit more in terms of reaching out to their community and consulting the community. At the same time, again, I fully agree that this is a responsible decision.

Just a couple of highlights of the key changes. The estimated funding for fiscal years '21-'25 is reduced by 5% in the revised plan. It is also assumed that it's going to decline by 8% just in fiscal year '21. The results of a reduction in the headcount should move to 410 staff members, and it is stabilized in some ways at 395 staff members. At least that's the revised projection at the end of fiscal year '21.

I had a call because of those concerns about the process. I had an informal call with Xavier, ICANN's CFO, a couple of days ago to draw his attention to the fact that there are these concerns, at least in some members of the cc community. I must say that he agreed that they could have done better terms of communicating [that]. At the same time, I understand there was a lot of pressure on ICANN Finance to revise the plans as soon as possible in a very short timeframe and, therefore, the two webinars were, let's say, the best and only way they did [prepare] the consult with the community.

Again, I think that nobody is questioning the decision itself. Rather the question is on the process. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Giovanni. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. I completely agree with Giovanni that what they did they needed to do. It's the process that's at issue here. It may well be appropriate for council to draft a correspondence to the Board, saying something to the effect of, "Okay, we're giving you a pass on this one, but do not consider this precedent that you can get away with this again going forward." Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any other thoughts?

                       Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I agree with Stephen. What he's recommending is a very good way forward: just flag to make sure that the Board understands that we also understand that the current situation but that doesn't mean that this should be the process that they have to follow in the future.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Giovanni. Any other comments?

Currently we have a suggestion that we draft a letter in which we express our understanding of those special circumstances and probably congratulate ICANN Org on this move to revise the budget and take into account the current situation. So we flag the issues with the process and probably say that this should not be considered as a precedent to follow in the future and, even more than that, that they should think about expedited procedures in cases like that so we have a special procedure on, for example, shorter public periods—something that definitely shows that the community can get involved with and is consulted. So that's a summary.

Any other thoughts? Definitely we will draft a letter and, before sending it, show it to the full council so you will have an opportunity to add or remove something. But maybe you already have something to say. Yeah, we need to do it pretty quickly—so probably next week as something of the timeline here. When do we close this time for the rejection action period? It closes, I think, the 4th of June. So it's a statement, not a rejection action, because I think this rejection action

mechanism is too heavy to be used here because, as we all agree, this is something that had to be done. The question is only about the process.

So we'll have the draft to share with you so, if there are not any suggestions on what to include in the document, you will have this opportunity when we discuss the draft.

So still not comments? No other suggestions on the way forward?

No? Okay. Thank you.

Then let's move to the update from the CSC. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. I'm taking the honors from Alejandra this time. Updates from the CSC. The CSC met last week. PTI performance was again 100%. The SLA updates, which are relevant for ccTLDs, are on the transfer and delegation or creation of ccTLDs. So the PTI performance on that one is on the agenda of the GNSO Council for today—on their consent agenda—so it is very, very likely that it will be adopted, so the new SLA will be implemented as soon as the CSC has been informed and informs PTI. So that's good news.

With respect to the CSC itself—this is important for the council--#2 on the CSC agenda is the upcoming council or CSC members and liaisons selection process. The CSC was informed that the communities—the SOs and ACs—will be asked to launch their procedures by the 1st of June. The fortunate thing of being fully involved in the CSC is that the council can take a decision to launch a process in anticipation of the upcoming CSC members selection but also with respect to the role of

the Selection Committee because that needs to be confirmed again. So that's the resolution in front of you.

I don't know if there are any questions.

KATRINA SATAKI: Are there any questions?

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe one more point, Katrina, with respect to the members. First, a call for membership and the member selection. Brett Carr has completed his first term. He's also a Vice-Chair, and he indicated he's willing to stand again. So expect this to happen. And he's not term-limited to date. So that's the final thing I had to say about this. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Basically, the background information should not replace Brett Carr but seek volunteers to the CSC. Thank you.

This is the proposed timeline. As you see, his term ends on the 1st of October. We need to find a [cover]. The only thing is that, in the proposed timeline—I missed that when I … You should have the 2020, not the 2019, I assume.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. Correct. [Updated], and I'll replace the word "replace."

KATRINA SATAKI:	Yes. So this is the proposed timeline. Keep in mind that 2019 is 2020. The process, again, is that we work in collaboration with the Registry Stakeholder Group. We need to consult and the approve membership, and then both councils—the GNSO Council and the ccNSO Council—approve a full slate.

So the decision here is in front of you. If Kim can scroll a little bit down—thank you—we need someone to move.

Stephen, seconded by Pablo. Thank you.

So the decision basically is that, first, we approve the timeline with the corrections, of course, and request that the Secretariat launch the call. Then we also need, according to the guideline, this CSC selection committee. That's the one that will, on behalf of the council, approve the full slate, among other things. But please remember that the council still sees all the volunteers and will vote on them, but those formal approval steps and coordination with the Registry Stakeholder Group will be done by the CSC Selection Committee. So that's about the decision itself.

Any questions? Comments?

No.

Then we can move to the voting. I hope that everyone who is currently on this CSC Selection Committee—myself, Margarita, Pablo, Ai Chin, Soulemane, and Marie-Noemie—you don't mind/object to being on this selection committee.

No? I don't see any objections. Okay, good.

So we can proceed with the voting. The decision is in front of you. Anyone against?

No.

Anyone who abstains?

No.

Approved. Thank you.

Let's move forward then. We still have time. Any updates from anyone? Is there anything you'd like to share with the rest of the world?

No, not much. Okay, thank you—oh, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: A quick update on the Tech Working Group: working on a virtual check day that will be DNSSEC-oriented. And we're pulling in some presentations that were scheduled for Cancun. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any other updates from councilors, regional organizations, or secretariats?

Okay. I see no volunteers.

Then we move to working group committee updates. GRC. The GRC is actually still working on the same document as the last time when I

reported the work on the document that talks about the ways we can deal with when we need to recall our appointed Board members. That document will actually cover a broader thing, not just those [appointed players] but also how to deal in case there is a request to recall a NomCom appointee or, for example, the entire Board. But currently we're working on what we do if someone—according to the bylaws, it can be any individual—asks us to recall our appointed Board member. So it's what's the process and how we deal with that. I don't know when we'll be ready to share the document with the council. We still have a lot of work to do on that document. So that's about GRC.

SOPC. Anything else in addition to what you already shared with us, Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Katrina. We have had a call and had planned to have a meeting during the ICANN virtual next meeting in Kuala Lumpur. At the same time, we will start reviewing the charter of the SOPC. Also, we are all committed to have a look at the feedback that ICANN Finance provided to our comments on the financial year '21-'25 operating and financial plan and see if this feedback is satisfactory or if we were expecting more. Also, we plan to ask ICANN Finance, now that the revised planning has been approved, what's next in the pipeline. So there are some things boiling, and we will follow up and I will inform the council as well. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I don't know if we have any updates from TLD Ops (the Tech Working Group). Thank you. We already had that. I heard that from Stephen.

Internet Governance Liaison Committee. As I mentioned, they're very active now. [The GNSO] just approved their amended terms of reference.

Anything else? I know that they will participate in the sessions during ICANN68. We'll talk about that in a minute. Anything else, maybe, Joke, you would like to add on the IGLC?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Nothing important to add, Katrina. Indeed, as you mentioned, they will participate both as a group, having a group meeting, at ICANN68, and they will contribute to one of the sessions as part of the ccNSO members meeting at ICANN68. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. MPC (Meetings Program Committee). They're also working hard on planning for this upcoming ICANN68. We'll talk about that, again, in a minute.

Any other updates on that one?

Okay. Apparently not.

Liaisons written update [. [We'll] have upcoming meeting, so let's dedicate enough time for that.

Kim, could you please switch to the schedule? I'll give the floor to Alejandra to brief us on this one. Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Hi, everyone. What you see in front of you now is the month of June. There are several activities that are scheduled previous to ICANN68. On Tuesday, the 2nd, there will be the two ccTLD news sessions at two different times, of course. I will give a little bit of the details in a minute. We will have our council workshop on Wednesday, the 3rd, at 18:00 UTC. On Thursday and Friday, the 4th and 5th, there are preparations for ccNSO and GAC webinars. Next week, there will be the two ccTLD community webinars, where Katrina explains what the ccNSO is doing to newcomers and explains also what's going to be at ICANN68. In the next week of that—if I'm not mistaken, that's ICANN prep week—there will be the policy webinar. At the end of June, we will have the ICANN68 virtual meeting.

Can we please move to the next document, please, Kim? Of course, if you have any questions, please interrupt me. This is how, in a very general view, we have the ccNSO view of the ICANN68 meeting. On your left, you can see the Kuala Lumpur time zone, and, on your right, you can see UTC time. That will help you see when the meetings are actually going to be for you. On Monday, we will have the DNSSEC Workshop. Then in Block 4—that's the only block of 90 minutes—is where all the plenary sessions are scheduled. I will take one step and explain something. The block of these ICANN meetings are 60 minutes each, and there's 30 minutes of break between every one of them. That's the [colored lines]. There will be a plenary on DNS abuse and malicious

registrations during COVID-19 on Monday. After that, Tech Day will take place.

On Tuesday, the 2nd day of ICANN68, there will be a plenary on DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges. This one was supposed to be done in Cancun and will be done remotely. Then we will have our ccNSO members meeting session on governance models for ccTLDs. And we will have a ccNSO virtual cocktail, so be ready for that.

On Wednesday, we will have other ccNSO members meeting session. That will be on DNS in times of COVID-19/the ccTLD experience. Then there is the ccNSO and GNSO Council joint session. In Block 5, we will have our ccNSO Council session. Then there are working groups that are meeting during ICANN68. Those are the IGLC and the SOPC, as we heard from Giovanni. The SOPC will be on Thursday.

Moving to Thursday, there will be a plenary on ICANN post-COVID-19: The Use of Virtual Meetings. After the SOPC meeting, it's the Q&A with ccNSO-appointed Board members.

Outside of the ICANN68 schedule, on Friday the MMPC will meet to review what happened in ICANN68 and plan our next steps for the next meeting.

Kim, can we go to the agenda now, please? Thank you very much. These are the details of both the sessions that I just mentioned, just to let you know the details. For the ccTLD News Part 1, Barbara will chair that session and also Part 2. There you can see [v]ccTLDs who will participate in these sessions. Again, it also has the date and time in UTC. All these

documents I will share with you as soon as I finish. It will be sent to the ccNSO Council list. Then Governance Models for ccTLD Managers will be chaired by Katrina. There are the participants in this session. In this case, we are in the ICANN68 schedule. The Kuala Lumpur time is also added there. DNS in Times of COVID I will be chairing. It will have two parts also. Finally, the session with Q&A with ccNSO-appointed ICANN Board members will be chaired by Jordan.

That's it from me. If you have any questions, please let me know.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Alejandra. So, as you can see, there are some changes to the usual structure of the ccNSO members meeting. We have, for example, the ccNSO news sessions we have outside the ICANN week. So that is a new thing. MPC decided to try it and see how it works. Basically what we do is we try to get our members and non-members engaged more actively even outside those traditional ICANN meeting weeks. This is something that we actually started even before we were forced to move to a virtual meeting format. We are started with newcomer sessions before that and different webinars. Now we use that experience we already gathered before and now add some new sessions, a new approach, to working with our ccTLDs and providing this global platform not only during ICANN meetings but also between them. So this is a new thing.

If you have any other ideas on what else we could do outside those three ICANN meeting weeks, please come up with your ideas. We always would be happy to help our ccTLDs around the world to share

their information and learn from each other, which is probably even more important.

So thank you, Alejandra. I still see no hands up, so there are probably no questions on that. Thank you.

Let's go back to the agenda. Thank you. It's still not clear—are we going to have the joint meeting with the GNSO Council? I think, at some point, we had this idea that we need to meet probably outside this ICANN68 week to discuss certain things.

Okay. We will let you know as soon as we have more information.

Council virtual workshop. As you saw, it's on the 3rd of June. I already have one volunteer. Barrack volunteered to help with that. If there are any other volunteers, that'd be great. We'll start thinking about—well, we already started thinking about it—more actively working on it next week. So, if you have ideas or want to participate, please also step forward.

No? No volunteers so far? No? Okay.

Let's move forward then. A meeting with the GAC. Again, this is something that is going to take place outside the ICANN68 week. We'll talk about DNS abuse and COVID-related topics. This will take place before this ICANN week and we'll have two times to make sure that every GAC member can join and find the time that suits them.

The next council meeting is going to be Wednesday, the 24th of June, of Block 5, as you saw, at 23:00 UTC. Oh, sorry for all for whom this time is

not a very good one, myself included. However, that's when it takes place.

Alejandra, please be brief. We have only three minutes.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Just to clarify that it's not 23:00 UTC. It's 7:00 UTC.

KATRINA SATAKI: 7:00 UTC. Good. I'm really happy to hear that. Actually, at some point, I think we had it—okay, yeah, Alejandra. Thank you. So I hope you'll make it and be there.

Any other business? We still have three minutes. Any other business?

If not, then thank you very much. Thank you very much for joining the call. Take care. Stay safe. Good luck to all of you. See you pretty soon, actually. Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]