KATRINA SATAKI:	Hello everyone, hello dear colleauges, friends. Today we have our ccNSO council meeting, 19 November 2020, 12:00 noon UTC. Welcome, everyone.
	We've received some apologies. Kim, could you please share with us?
KIM CARLSON:	We've received apologies from Margarita Valdez and Abdalla Omari.
KATRINA SATAKI:	So two apologies from councilors, and there's also an apology from Bart, unfortunately due to some family emergency he's not able to join us today so he sent his apologies and he also has of course prepared all the materials, so we will try to cover up for him.
	Last meeting, it was like a face-to-face meeting, which means that we do not have minutes, but we had action items. As you can see, some of them are completed or at least overtaken by events. That's action item 166.02 that was bout the ccPDP4 working group. No, sorry, that's another one.
	I think there was one. Yeah, the first one. So we have, if you remember, there was a misunderstanding or unclear process on how to select chairs and vice chairs, and we developed draft guidelines that have been presented to the GRC, so GRC is now working on that guideline. Meanwhile, the group agreed on the way forward so they have resolved

the issues and they're happy with the way it was handled. But of course, for the future, we need more clarity, a clearer process for that.

Second one, that was about the ... We thought we were supposed to issue a call for volunteers to serve on that community representatives group, but as it turned out, the call was sent out by ICANN and they did that yesterday night. Maybe it's in my spam box. I did not see it, but thanks to Kim, she forwarded it to me so they have sent out the call. Now we're waiting for people to apply and then when they indicate that they're looking for endorsement from ccNSO, then we will receive all those names and look. So there's no need for this call for expressions of interest, but there is need for the procedure. We'll talk about that later.

We also discussed this proposal to have outreach and involvement standing committee. Later, we'll have this presentation. And [inaudible] also is ongoing. We're also going to talk about that.

Intermeeting decisions, support for this draft procedure, and we also approved chair and vice chair of this ccPDP4 working group as they agreed and nominated among themselves.

So ccPDP, two parts, first one a retirement. Is Stephen on the call?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I am.

KATRINA SATAKI: Oh, Stephen, good. Anything you'd like to share with the council?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Part one, retirement. Okay, retirement is essentially done. Bart is in the process of carving it out and adjusting the charter. As you know, he's not here to backfill that. I'm not quite sure where that stands. We discussed this on the last call. So that will be presented to council soon, I hope, as a separate standalone item.

With regards to review mechanism, we had a call yesterday. We are making actually tremendous progress. Bernie and I are of the opinion that we may be able to wrap part two up by midyear next year, by June of 2021, which would be great. So that's where we stand with that. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. And according to the bylaws, we need more than half of quorum for the vote on the ccPDP, so it means that we will need to reach out to ccNSO members and convince them to participate and vote for that. As we discussed some time ago, you offered to prepare a summary of what it's all about so that people can easily understand what ...

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: It's all about ... how is that? Are you still working on it?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It's still in progress, yes.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, but it would be good to have it when we move forward.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I expect to have it out sometime early December.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Sounds good. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Any questions to Stephen? Thank you. Next one, ccPDP4. Joke, would you give an update?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Yeah, happy to do so. As you mentioned earlier during the call today, the chair and the vice chair of this group have been selected by the IGLC. Apologies, by the ccPDP4 working group. Have been appointed also by the council, so they will soon take over the meetings. The previous meeting was still chaired by the issue manager.

The group already started its substantial work. As you know, the work of the group builds on the work by the preliminary review team which evaluated the original IDN policy, the one from 2013, and also the board report from 2013. So substantial work has started and further updates will follow soon. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Okay, next one, that's about this community representatives group, the one that will look into those people who volunteer or submit their names to this independent review process standing panel. So there's terms of reference. I hope you had time to look into that. I know Alejandra had a question regarding that document. But I have to admit I don't have an answer to your question.

But ICANN Org asked us to look into those three questions. First, do we intend to participate? So apparently, that's yes. If so, does the ccNSO plan to send two or more members? There was support on the mailing list [but] we have those two. I don't know if there are any other thoughts.

At the same time, it'll probably depend on the interest, how many people would be seeking our endorsement. If there's only one person, according to the proposed selection procedure—we're going to talk about it shortly—if we decide that we need two, probably one of the ways if we do not have enough candidates that we want to endorse, then probably we should issue our own call, not rely on ICANN-wide call but only issue a call among our members.

And then just to try to find the second member. But probably, we will think about that when the time comes. It's really difficult to foresee development at the moment. But we're aiming at two. Doesn't mean that we have to appoint two, but at least we're thinking about that.

And last one, how do we feel about the terms of reference, the document that had been distributed? So draft resolution, you see it in front of you. Anyone would like to move? Okay, I have a limited space on the screen, but I saw Stephen raising his hand, and then I see Pablo. Others, I have to scroll, so it's really tough if you are raising your hands on video mode.

Okay, but as I saw Stephen and Pablo, I assume that Stephen moved and Pablo seconded. So, any questions, any comments?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, besides the one that I already asked, [regarding] section C that it's nowhere in the terms of reference. At least I didn't find it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. We can forward it together with our approval of the TOR to ICANN and just ask to clarify. Any other comments? Please use your other hands, virtual hands because otherwise ... Pablo, I see your hand.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Katrina, and hello. I do support the two member participation and currently, I have no objections to the terms of reference. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:	Okay. Thank you very much. If there are no further questions or comments, let's move to voting. Anyone against? Anyone abstains? No, so everyone in favor, so passed. And second one, that's selection procedure, so how we're going to select those candidates, how we're going to vet them, look at the type of materials they have submitted and how we're going to vote. It's really very traditional, let's say, way of selecting candidates. That's what we usually do, but we just decided to put it in writing because otherwise, we do not have a specific general procedure for selecting people yet, so now we have this procedure which is our interim, really quick patch, so to speak.

You see the decision in front of you. Anyone would like to move? Please use your virtual hands. Okay, Stephen moved, Pablo seconded. Thank you. Any questions, any further comments? So the announcement has been published, the call for expressions of interest. Hopefully there'll be people willing to represent ccNSO. Of course, we will forward the call to the relevant ccTLD mailing list. Any questions, comments about the procedure?

Okay, none. Thank you. let's proceed to voting then. Anyone against? Anyone abstains? Which means that everyone is in favor. Thank you very much. Let's move forward to the agenda item number seven, that's an update on council election process. So Joke as the election manager, the floor is yours. |

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you very much, Katrina. There was only one candidate nominated and seconded within the nomination period for the African, European, Latin America and Caribbean, and North American regions, so no elections needed to be held in those regions.

There were three candidates that accepted their nominations for the Asia Pacific regions, so elections needed to be held there. They closed earlier this week, and at the closure of the elections, there were 60% of the members that cast their votes. There were three candidates, as mentioned previously. Anil received 11 votes, Boyoung as well 11 votes, and Jiankang received 13 votes. There were no members that voted without selecting any of the candidates.

The results of the election were sent to the members mailing list yesterday, and following that announcement, there were some questions from community members regarding one of the sentences that was copy pasted from the applicable guideline. And the sentence says that in such an election, the majority of all ccNSO members in the geographic region entitled to vote shall constitute a quorum. So far so good, no comments regarding that.

But the second part of the sentence says that the selected candidate must receive the votes of the majority of those cast by ccNSO members within the geographic region. So there were some questions on how to interpret majority. However, when you continue to read into the section 6 of the guideline which talks about the elections, it further says that the winner is the candidate who receives more votes, so indeed, 13 votes are more than 11 and this is why Jiankang is the winner of the election.

In the election report which I will send to you shortly, I will make a note that there are some questions regarding the sentence that I mentioned previously and that with the advice for the guideline review committee to look into it and to make sure that any possible doubt is removed. So that in terms of the Asia Pacific region election. Once the election report is formally adopted by the council, there will be five new members which will take their seat. Their three-year term will start at the conclusion of ICANN 70 which is being held at the end of March 2021. I'm happy to answer any questions you might have. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Joke. The more I think about this, the more questions I have. I'm not sure we can interpret ... If we look at the guideline, they clearly use two terms. One is the majority of votes, which clearly is majority of votes cast which means at least 50+1, but then it further explains that those who receive more votes win.

And actually, only now I just realized that the first sentence might be the sentence from the bylaws. I haven't checked that. Which means that ... I think it's not so obvious that we have a winner in the AP region, which of course raises further questions, what to do, because normally, you would remove those—one of—or let's say you just keep removing the candidates who do not receive enough votes, and then those who voted on those candidates next round, they can cast their voted for a remaining candidate, which can change the outcome of the vote under any setup, not talking about this particular case.

So honestly, I would like to hear your opinions. I hope that we can find a way out of this situation. At the moment, I don't know how to move [with that,] because I'm really not sure that we can clearly interpret what we say in the guideline, the results.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Katrina, if I may.

KATRINA SATAKI: Of course.

JOKE BRAEKEN: I copy pasted the text of paragraph six into the chat. The last sentence of the first item that I copy pasted says in such an election, a majority of all ccNSO members, etc., so this is what also was mentioned in the announcement of the election results.

The last paragraph that I pasted was not explicitly mentioned in the announcement of the results, but it is from the guideline, and it mentions how the voting will be conducted and that the winner is the candidate who receives more votes.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you, but that's from the guideline.

JOKE BRAEKEN: That's indeed from the guideline.

KATRINA SATAKI: So that's the question, what's in the bylaws. I cannot check at the moment, but I suspect that the first one—it's just my inner feeling. I don't remember—I've read bylaws an umpteen times but really don't remember. Stephen, I hope you checked. Yes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Greetings. 10.4(j) if you go to the bylaw, 10.4(i), really, written ballot ... In such an election, a majority of all ccNSO members in the Geographic Region entitled to vote shall constitute a quorum, and the selected candidate must receive the votes of a majority of those cast by ccNSO members within the Geographic Region.

So presumably if we had a majority of eligible voters in AP voting, then we're good to go. Otherwise, I think we have a problem, as you point—

KATRINA SATAKI: A majority did vote. That's clear. We have quorum. It's fine with the quorum. The problem is that according to the bylaws, as Stephen just read, the selected candidate must receive the vote of the majority.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, you're right. Did not receive majority of the votes that were cast, given that there were three candidates. So you have 11, 11 and 13 [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Which clearly means that the winning candidate has not received the majority of votes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Now what do we do? We have a problem.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's exactly what I'm saying. Yes, we do have a problem.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We have definitively identified that we have a problem.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's what I said. But okay, I'm glad that now you agree. So we have a problem. And the fact that the guideline says the more votes, unfortunately is irrelevant at the moment because we have to look at the bylaws, and bylaws say that selected candidate must receive ...

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: 10.4(i) says a majority.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. So what does it mean? It means that ... Javier, I agree, that would have been the right way, but we do not have top two. We have top one, and two were the same number of votes. When I was thinking about that before I got the idea that it might be in the bylaws, I thought that one of the ways—I'm not saying I'm a fan of it—would be to extend the

voting period and ask those [members at least] vote and then see if we have clear two winners. I don't know, two, three days. Again, I'm not saying I'm a fan of this solution. I'm not a fan of moving deadlines. But that would be one of the ways. Probably, that's the only one I can think of.

So, any other suggestions how to move forward?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Why not do another round, as in a separate one, maybe people change their minds?

KATRINA SATAKI: No, it is possible. When they see the distribution of votes, it is possible that people change their minds. But then we can run into another issue. We still need quorum, so we need at least the same amount of people to vote again. And people get tired of voting if they need to vote all the time. And I'm just afraid that—

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It's their councilor, right?

KATRINA SATAKI: I agree with you, but when you have to vote for same candidate several times, it might be ...

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, it's just a second time. If we end up with the same result, then we do have a problem, a more pressing problem.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thanks, Katrina. It seems to me that this is a matter of interpretation also, right? Because if the bylaw says that the winner must have the majority of the votes from all three, the one that has been selected as the winner has the majority of the votes, the 13 votes. To say that we want for example to have a score of 17 votes or 18 votes for the winner, that would be a matter of interpretation from our side, no? We were saying let's do a second round of votes. Why? Because we didn't like the results of the first time?

Seems to me that from my perspective, whoever wanted to vote from that particular region could have voted. The votes that we have comply with the requirement of quorum, and these are the results. So I don't see what's the problem. There would be a problem if we believe that the majority of the votes means the aggregate of all the votes—

KATRINA SATAKI: No, no. Pablo, I think the bylaws are pretty clear. The bylaws say that a selected candidate must have a majority of votes cast. I'm not a native English speaker, but to me, majority of votes means 50% plus one.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:	But you see, that goes to my point, it's a matter of interpretation. We would need to have that clear, right? To say that. Majority of the votes means X. And then it's clear. But this is open for interpretation.
KATRINA SATAKI:	I'm not sure that there's a way to interpret what majority means, but okay, please, anyone who has …
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Sorry for interrupting, but just doing a plain Google define majority, it says the greater number. [inaudible].
KATRINA SATAKI:	If that's fine, then that's a greater number, majority of votes cast. Okay. I don't know. Nick, please.
NICK WENBAN SMITH:	I have to say the plain black and white of majority means 50% plus one, so I see where the problem is. But I'm trying to work out whether this is just … If you try to work out what is the true intention of the bylaws, did the people writing the bylaws really intend for there to be that wording to be put in place, or is it essentially a mistake and what they mean is the person with the most votes is the winner of the election? Because that would kind of be the more logical interpretation. Because as you say, if you've got more than two candidates, majority doesn't give you the winner of the election. It has to be the most votes.

So I just think it's essentially an error in the bylaws, but it's up to us as the council to interpret what is the intent behind this. It seems to me it's pretty clear there's a winner of the election, right? So that's obviously ... And I think we can note the bylaws and say that it's unfortunately worded. When we say majority, when there's more than two candidates, obviously we just say the person with the most votes, and move on. Because let's face it, supposing we're slightly wrong, who's going to take enforcement action against us? I think it's pretty clear that there's been an election that's been fair, the quorum has been cast and there's a winner and we just note it, and perhaps the next time the bylaws can be amended and things, this is just another one on the list of numerous points of the bylaws which are not really as good as they should be.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Nick. I don't know what those who wrote the bylaws had in mind, but technically, when I think about those elections, there are plenty of examples when for example they have presidential elections in other countries—not in the US clearly—but if you have many candidates, the winning candidate is expected to have majority, which is 50% plus one. And then they have several rounds, so at each round, they eliminate somebody and at the end, those who voted for other candidates in previous rounds can still choose between the remaining ones, because if we have for example—okay, that's all theoretical. I'm not going to talk any further. Byron, yes, did you mean to raise your hand or you agree with something?

BYRON HOLLAND:	Yes, I meant to raise my hand. First, I'd just like to support everything Nick said, and I think we need to look at it as for us as a council, in a sense, it's a choice of least worst alternatives. Neither alternative here is perfect, but what is the intent? And I think that Nick picks up what should be our focus, is, what was the intent?
	Clearly, the bylaws were poorly drafted in what they meant. As a native English speaker, is a plurality, not a majority. A plurality speaks to more than two candidates potentially, and the person who ends up with the greatest number of votes. That's a plurality, that's what he word should be.
	But I think, what are our choices here? To take a strict definition of what is obviously a flawed bylaw and rerun an election and thereby potentially change the results when the people eligible to vote have already voted and made their choice? I think we recognize what the issue is, and that is a poorly drafted bylaw. What we should also recognize is the people from that region have made their choice and we should respect that. So neither is a prefect solution, each has its warts, if you will, but to my mind, a poorly drafted bylaw should not actually thwart the will of the voters which has already been expressed.
	And we should definitely change the rule in due time. Thanks.
KATRINA SATAKI:	Thank you. I see Stephen has his hand up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. Byron just nailed it on the head. The idea of plurality. And I think we should, before making a decision on the election outcome, consult with ICANN Legal and see if they will buy into that interpretation, because if they do, then our problem is solved and the election is done with. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. So I see some good comments in the chat, but still no clarity on the way forward. But as I heard from previous speakers, the suggested interpretation is plurality, not majority, meaning that we have three candidates and ccNSO members in that particular region have spoken. And so that's one thing that we have on the table. Another suggestion is that before we move forward with approving this interpretation and the results of the election, we go and ask ICANN Legal whether they agree with this interpretation.

So first one, let's vote on the proposed interpretation of the bylaw. And that is that we believe that it means plurality, or more votes received, the most, largest number of votes received by a candidate. So that's the first thing as proposed by Byron. I hope I summarized it correctly. So, do we have a support to this? Is anyone against? Thank you. Anyone abstains? Thank you. So everyone is in favor of this interpretation.

Second question, before we move forward with this interpretation and subsequently approving results of the vote in the AP region, do we ask ICANN Legal for their opinion? So, anyone against asking ICANN Legal? Yes, please use some tools because I can't scroll through. I see that Nick had a question.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Yeah. Sorry. I wasn't sure if I'm raising my hand to say yes I don't agree with it or no I don't agree with it, [or which way I should] indicate. But I suppose I'm nervous about we've made a decision that we think the election has been valid, and then we're going to go and ask ICANN Legal a question which potentially the answer might mean that the election isn't valid. I'm just thinking through whether that's a smart thing to do. And it's none of ICANN Legal's business, really.

But I think we might want to make an observation to Org somewhere— not necessarily the legal department—that notwithstanding the language of the bylaws, we've had an election, there's a clear winner and that's what we've done, and that should be noted and perhaps when it comes to tidying up bylaws, the next opportunity, that the wording could be improved to reflect what we think it actually should mean. I don't think we should ask them for ana interpretation because I'm worried that they'll come back and say, "No, actually, strictly speaking what it means is you should have held the election differently to have a single transferable vote system or rounds of elections until you get a majority," which I don't think is what we want. So that's my only reservation, which is as a lawyer, you need to be quite careful kind what question you ask of another lawyer, and I don't like asking questions where I'm not quite sure what he answer might be in advance, if you see what I mean. So that's my reservation.

I understand the sentiment, which I think is quite sensible, but whether it's going to solve our problems, I'm not quite convinced.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Actually, I was going to say almost the same thing as Nick, and I support what he just said. Also, I would add we're dealing with a US-based lawyer who is going to be extremely conservative by nature, and just having had to recently deal with ICANN Legal and solicit their opinion on something, for one thing, the length of time to get a response is quite frankly unacceptable, but let me just say extraordinarily long, and the answer will be very conservative and probably a strict interpretation of the black and white letter that we see on the page in terms of bylaws. So just to reinforce what Nick said, I think we need to be very careful before we ask them their opinion on something that we've already made a judgment on. And quite frankly, I wouldn't necessarily be supportive of that. I think we've had a good discussion, it's been a reasonable discussion. We've had the report from Joke. I'm not sure of the value, and it might actually work considerably against us, going to ICANN Legal.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: I think that's totally right, Byron, and just reflecting actually, what's the point of having a council? There needs to be some element of self-governance. Obviously, we have to pay due respect to the bylaws, but actually, the point of the council is to have some element of control over how we govern our own affairs, and yeah, the bylaws are the bylaws, but it's not like Moses's ten commandments, I don't think, it's

more of a guideline, some of this stuff, around how to conduct elections. So I totally agree.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's how I thought about Moses. But okay. So still, the question remains. There was a suggestion to ask ICANN Legal whether our interpretation was correct. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Nick and Byron have convinced me that we should just go out on a limb and say this is our interpretation, and challenge us. Getting anything out of ICANN Legal, as Byron has properly described, is trying to get a tortoise to come out of their shell. They just don't. And we should not wait. We could frame the question to them with a tight deadline timeframe for responding. I don't think we would get any satisfaction there.

So if we interpret as council the word "majority" for plurality, then I think we're good to go, and I'd be curious to see what other council members feel about that interpretation. I thank both Nick and Byron for changing my mind on the fly. Well done, gentlemen.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Still, there was a question, and I would like the councilors formally express their opinions. So the question is, proposal was that we ask ICANN Legal if our interpretation is ... Well, comment on our interpretation. So we heard some arguments why it's not a good idea. Still, the question remains. Is anyone in favor of asking ICANN

Legal to provide a timely response to our question? I see no one in favor, which means that the suggestion is refused. So we do not support the suggestion.

We still need to draft and agree on the wording, how we understand the word "majority" and how we interpret results. Probably, I wouldn't use the words "clear winner," because elections were quite tight in the region, which his great to have three strong candidates.

So, anyone would agree to help with drafting of these wise words from the council? Nick, you agree. Okay. So Nick, will you take the first stab and then share it with the council? Thank you. Joke, you have a question.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: I was just going to say, interestingly, what would have been the situation if all three candidates had the exact same number of votes or there were two candidates with the same number of votes? What happens then? Do we have a runoff election? Are there other questions once we sort of start to scratch under the ...?

KATRINA SATAKI: If we have two candidates with the same number of votes, we have runoff election.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Okay, that's fine.

KATRINA SATAKI: It is in the guideline, and it is clear.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Okay, thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Joke.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Not a question, I just wanted to make a procedural point. The election report is still due, so I will send it to council shortly. So this will be sent to the council for discussion and adoption. And that election report actually formally closes the election process, just to make that clear. It will obviously include a detailed summary of possible issues and the discussion that we had today.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Councilors, please stay tuned. Thanks. Next one is one of the action items from the last meeting. that's about this outreach and involvement standing committee. Kin, could you please show the presentation? We've already spent a lot of time on discussing important issues, so I will be really brief here. Initially, it was intended to be presented by Bart. Next slide, please.

The idea of this outreach and involvement standing committee with currently proposed abbreviation of OISC. Personally, I'm not able to

pronounce that so I would be really interested if anyone can come up with a better name for this group, for example, my suggestion was to use outreach and involvement and call it "out in." At least I can pronounce that. But if you have any other ideas of OISC, then please suggest good names.

So we talk about outreach, so how we tell the story on the ccNSO, and involvement of course is how we get people onboard and make sure that they can actively participate. Next slide, please.

So that's the purpose and added value of this. When you see the list of all activities that take place, it's a quite impressive list and we need to be more productive in how we deal with this. Joke, is that an old hand or a new hand? So, what we do here, yeah, we try to inform community and involve community. Next slide, please.

So what the idea of this committee, out-in committee, first is coordinate all the work that we have to do related to outreach and involvement. They also should develop strategy and balance the workload, and of course, oversee how this strategy is being implemented by the ccNSO council or any other group. Next slide, please.

All these work items should come to one big list. So the idea here is that instead of travel funding committee, we move all responsibilities for the things that travel funding committee was doing—they haven't had much work to do this year. But still, the idea is to move this travel funding thing to this committee so that this committee could have this overview of everything that's going on, of those community programs,

everything that's related to meetings where they know where people participate and where we need volunteers. Next slide, please.

So currently when we talk about ccNSO-related meetings, of course, we have NPC, they do their job, they plan members meeting, they run all the satisfaction surveys so they gather information from the community. It's also organizing webinars for presenters, for sessions chairs,, to some extent maybe even to newcomers and so on. Next slide, please. It also has SOAC planning where we get involved into ICANN-wide activities.

Here are things that are related to capacity building. Travel funding, already mentioned that, but then there's also fellowship program, leadership program, very useful exercise. There's everything that's about ICANN Learn, the platform where we can have information about ccNSO onboarding materials. Then there's the onboarding program, already mentioned webinars to newcomers, quick guide to the ccNSO that we have, and all these activities that would naturally fall under this out-in committee. Next slide, please.

So here, you see a list of [inaudible] channels that we use. Next. The community programs that we currently have, excellence award, Tarek Kamel Award and NextGen. The list is really very impressive, and every time when we need to select someone or appoint someone to a committee or select members or mentors, it's just like come as unexpectedly as snow in the middle of winter. So we just deal with them if they appear. But the issue is that we're very reactive here. The idea of this out-in committee would be to be more practice and

probably participate more in the planning process so that it doesn't come as a surprise every time. Next slide, please.

So yeah, the strategy here would be to balance those work items with the resources and capacity that we have, and to understand workplan, so what must be done, what's the timeline, what we can skip, perhaps decide not to do and so on. And probably, the last part is the most important one, what we should skip to make sure that we have enough resources and time for other more important things. Next slide, please.

When the committee would oversee all activities, they would ensure that all those things are in balance. Next slide, please. So the structure—as already mentioned, the idea is that it's not a working group, it's a committee. Membership is very important here, the proposal, so suggest around four councilors. Travel committee, we currently have three. Here we would have more, four councilors. We also would invite community members to join. Of course, as you could see, we need to stay in touch with the NPC, so the chair of the NPC would also be on this committee.

Observers, maybe we should invite regional organizations, or maybe some others would also feed into this out or in thing. Ensure geographic balance and diversity so that all those councilors come from different regions and community members, they're not all from the same region, so have this geographic balance.

And of course, the question of the term limits. Of course, when we talk about councilors, councilors also have terms when they serve on the council, so if a councilor is not a councilor anymore, he can stay on as a

community member for a longer period. Some of these questions are here. Next slide, please.

And the idea is that they would report back to the council, inform the community, regularly meet and before council meeting for example to report to the council and some other meetings. Next slide, please.

So I don't know if you had time to look at the presentation. It was distributed earlier. I don't know if you have anything to say, anything to add, any immediate comments. We can start working if you like what you saw or at least some of the ideas, maybe we could start already drafting the terms of reference and present a document to you so that you can see how it works. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. Is the proposal here to roll the travel funding committee into this or keep it as a separate standalone as it is currently?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, the idea would be to move travel committee under this committee. So this committee also—as it oversees all ... There are different programs. For example, if there are newcomer sessions, if we select somebody—or newcomers was not a good idea, but there are some programs like mentorship program where people may receive funding to come to meetings. So they have all this information and then they can easily look at those request for travel funding that ccNSO receives. So basically, they would have this overview of all the programs

... If somebody applies to get our funding but maybe do not qualify ... Again, they can suggest to apply to another program and make sure that—

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That all makes sense. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Javier.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: Hi. Good morning to all. An honor to be here, my first official meeting as council member. Really proud to be part of this community. Just a question.

KATRINA SATAKI: Is it me, or—okay, apparently ... That's what happened to me in the early days when we had teleconferences.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: When that happens—

KATRINA SATAKI: Wait, Javier. We've lost you for some time. So could you please start your question from the beginning?

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: Sorry. Can you hear me okay?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Now we can hear you well.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: Sorry. Yeah. So, what value would this bring to something like the community ethos, community excellence award? Because when that happens, it's basically ICANN Org asks for whoever r the volunteers for that from each community.

So what would be the added value of something like this working group we're talking about or this organization we're talking about in regards to something like the community excellence award?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thanks, Javier. As I already mentioned, there are many different committees, many different groups or programs where we receive a request to appoint ... either we have to appoint people to committees like the one that used to be called ethos wards committee, so we appointed people to that committee, but this out-in committee would keep track of all appointments to these outreach involvement committees. First, all appointments that we need to make, and then all the programs that are out there where we need to select people to participate in those programs. Plus there are also programs where people can apply themselves if they keep an eye on those, people from our community who participate there for example, we see that from some ccTLDs, there are people participating in NextGen programs. So

maybe this committee could reach out to them and invite them to be more active in the work of the ccNSO. So basically, this committee would keep an eye on all those outreach and involvement activities around ICANN and also within the ccNSO, and try to coordinate these activities, have a clear timeline and know when we have to do what, and then also suggest, should we do it or maybe we should just skip it?

But that's of course up to ... That's how I see, but when we have this committee, they can look at all those programs that are out there and decide that they want to go another way. But currently, this is the proposal for terms of reference. If you think it might work, it's fine, we can start working on the actual document and present it to you. So, any comments, suggestions? Does it sound fine? Okay, so we continue working on the document and try to work all these ideas into the document. Hopefully we'll present it to you during our December call.

Okay, next one, results from ICANN Org meeting survey. I hope you had time to look at at least the results from our group, ccNSO. There were 25 responses. Not so many, I must say. Any comments, anyone would like to share their opinion? Yes, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Just a comment. I was honestly surprised that people still want to have three meetings. I thought that maybe we should see some other tendency. But it's just a comment.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you. Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thanks, Katrina. It seems to me that the issue of the times and the length of the events seems to be an issue for most people. So that is something that should be rethink. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you very much. Well, personally, I was not convinced by the survey, by the questionnaire. I'm not sure that that was the right approach. At the same time, I can't suggest anything better. But yeah, maybe we'll see how it all evolves, but currently, at least we understand that ccNSO, many people think that—not many, but there's support for 75-minute session or something like that, there is support for having less meetings per year. Yes, there are people who still want to have three, maybe even four or five, but yes, that's the issue, that there's no one clear suggestion how to move forward. And I don't know how to balance all those different views and perceptions and expectations from [our] communities.

So, anyone else would like to comment on that?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: The only comparison I did was our responses with all responses, because going through each of them was maybe too much. But what is evident—and this is because we are a very wide audience—is that we all have different priorities or different preferences. So it is a tough job for ICANN in general to please everyone. But we can take away some things for us, as in what ccNSO responses were made, of course, the NPC

should look at them and guide them while preparing things for us, but I n the general overview, I think it's too complicated to have any conclusion on what's the way forward except let's continue doing what we're doing right now?

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. I'm going to have a meeting with other chairs where we're going to discuss this with some ICANN Org people. So what would be the main takeaway from this survey you'd like me to stress with other communities? Currently, we do not see a clear winner, so to speak, or ... So, any ideas how to present what we're looking for when we come or participate in ICANN meetings?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Maybe we can ask for flexibility while developing ICANN meetings, because for some people, 60 minutes is enough, for some 75 is enough, for some two hours. So maybe not be too strict on that. That's one takeaway. The issue with time zone, it will be an issue always for people, because we are all scattered around the world. So that is not fixable. And to me, it would be irresponsible to say, okay, let's have a fixed time that serves me, and everyone else should comply. I think that's the two takeaways I would have for this.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments on this?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: I was wondering that perhaps we can generate our own questionnaire with very specific and clear questions regarding the length of an event such as the one we just passed, ICANN 69, where we can determine, do we want to split this in two weeks, do we want to split this in perhaps maybe pack in one week a set number of sessions? And what the length of that session should be. And perhaps that can give us a clearer path on how to go about this.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you, Pablo. I think that's very much what NPC is trying to do. The satisfaction surveys when they try to measure how people feel, get their feedback from meetings. But yeah, maybe there are some questions that could be included into those satisfaction surveys. Yes, Joke.

JOKE BRAEKEN: When you mentioned the NPC, Katrina, there's also another thing that maybe is worth mentioning. Before ICANN 69, the NPC organized a number of sessions that were outside of the official ICANN schedule, such as for instance the ccTLD news sessions, there were some webinars that the NPC organized for newcomers for instance, there were also

some other webinars related to call for volunteers and for the council nominations and elections, and the NPC is currently in the process of thinking about how to shape ICANN 70 and is having a strong preference for having again ccTLD news sessions outside of the official ICANN n70 schedule, so prior to the meeting. And if there are other suggestions on alternative sessions, to organize not necessarily as part of ICANN 70 but prior or after the meeting, the NPC is always happy to receive input. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Okay, let's move forward. I see we're a little bit behind the schedule. Okay, next one, that's about the procedure, amendment of Article 10 of ICANN bylaws. last time, we discussed the way forward and it was agreed that we are moving with ccNSO statement. There is now a clarity of all the steps that are necessary to take, and we will start moving forward pretty soon. Thanks a lot to Ai-Chin. She agreed to lead the effort on this, so she will . We're working on that. So everything is under control there.

The next one, I don't know about this one. It will be adopted online, [inaudible] talk about that IFRT draft final report, and we'll also move forward with that.

Update, ECA. Anything?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. Change of membership from GNSO, we're in a quiet period, we're awaiting board adoption of PTI strategic plan and budget

coming up, which would be the next thing that will go out to the community as rejection action item. That's it. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. CSC, Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Everything is happily boring. The IANA again met 100% of the SLA, so we are good for October.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Any updates from councilors or regional organization secretariat? No? Nothing, no one wants to share their good deeds? Okay. Update from working groups. Anything, SOPC? Probably a quiet period at the moment.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. Hi Katrina. Indeed, a quiet period. We're waiting for fiscal year 22 to be presented so that we have something to enjoy during the lockdown holidays. We may double enjoy that. But we are about to submit a nice statement to support the IANA and PTI operating plan and budget. That is having a deadline for the public comment period of 30 November. So we're about to submit that statement. And it's been quite a good interaction among SOPC membership. And the SOPC is also about to launch a call for volunteers, and we have agreed on the skillset that are ... you just need three degrees and a master and a bachelor and a PhD and a whatever. And then eventually, after consulting with ICANN

Legal—because nobody wants ICANN Legal anymore but we still love ICANN Legal—you can become a member of the SOPC. So those are some of the new rules. No, I'm kidding, but we're indeed launching a call for volunteers for the SOPC, and in the call that we have put together with all the SOPC membership, thank you so much for all those who have contributed to refine the skillset, there is going to be indeed this skillset as well as other information on the working methodology and the process. So stay tuned, and we'll be soon sending out—actually next week this call for volunteers. And there will be also a webinar that we plan to have possible new members onboard. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Didn't sound like a particularly quiet period to me, but good. GRC. During our last call, we analyzed results from governance session feedback that we received during that session and thought about the way forward. We're also thinking about the call for volunteers to join a subgroup that would look into the rules of the ccNSO, but they're still working on that. We also reviewed some of our ... Let's say, not finished items on our to-do list, something that we're still working on. One of the things actually also briefly looked at the procedure for selecting of chairs and vice chairs to working group. So we will finalize some of those documents during our next call.

We have the MPC. They also had a call. I don't know, Joke, I think we've already spoken a lot about the MPC, but if there's anything specific you'd like to stress.

JOKE BRAEKEN:	I think Alejandra is ready to give an update on the MPC.
KATRINA SATAKI:	Alejandra. Okay.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Yeah, thank you. Well, just to say that the MPC has already sent the feedback regarding the survey of the ICANN 69. Also, they're starting to plan ICANN 70 as Joke already mentioned. There are going to be ccTLD news and newcomers webinar before ICANN 70. And also, the MPC chair will consult with the current members whether they wish to continue as members of the MPC and a call for volunteers will also be circulated in January. So in short, those are the updates.
KATRINA SATAKI:	Thank you very much. And we've received a written update from IGLC. We also received apparently written updates from our liaisons, but Maarten, is there anything you'd like to stress? Your eon the call today.
MAARTEN SIMON:	Well, the most important part is that of course the council changed a lot of seats, and a lot of people—I think tonight, there's another call, the first call since the ICANN meeting and they will formally appoint the new liaison from the GNSO to the ccNSO council.

KATRINA SATAKI:	We're looking forward to it. Okay, good. Let's move forward. Next meeting, December 17 at 18:00 UTC. We're already looking into dates for January, February, March. Please let us know if you're traveling anywhere so that we can work them into our schedule.
	Any Other Business? No. If not, then with that, I'm closing the regular meeting. I will leave you. You're apparently staying on the call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]