KATRINA SATAKI:	Hello, everyone. Welcome to the ccNSO Council Meeting #168, on the 17th of December, 2020, at 18:00 UTC, the last council meeting in 2020, probably for the best because this year hasn't been very good. Let's put it that way. So welcome, everyone.
	We received—Stephen, you have a hand up.
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	I do. I would like to raise a point of order with regards to the agenda.
KATRINA SATAKI:	Okay.
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	I do not understand the need for the extraordinary session that is on the agenda. I don't understand why we would ever want to adopt the nomination report, nor continue with the nomination of yourself for Board Seat 12, and the request for the GRC to develop conflict-of-interest guidelines in a private meeting. I just think this is really bad optics. I wrote to the list yesterday about this. I do not see the need for it, and I will not participate in it.
KATRINA SATAKI:	Okay. Any comments?

[ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:]   What are the reasons?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: This is unprecedented—that the council would select a Board member seat for either Seat 11 or Seat 12 in a private, non-public session. I just do not understand, from a transparency standpoint, how that could be acceptable. Someone explain that one to me.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: But, from memory, it has not been confidential previously. Or have I misremembered that? This is a change from previous question? I suppose that's my question.

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible] It's because of the nature that the Chair is excluded. And you could also change it by that Katrina steps out of the room. This follows the discussions of the councils to date with respect to the discussions you had about the nomination. In that sense, in a previous session, it could have been not in a closed session either. But because everybody wanted to have this as a closed session, that's why the suggestion was to put this as a closed meeting. Please note this was already circulated more than a week ago for this particular meeting. At the time, we didn't have any responses. That's why we continued on that path.

But I think, Byron, as you are on the call, it's up to you whether you, for that reason, want to open the meeting and make it public. At the same time, Byron, you will still be chairing that part of the session, as you are

the designated Chair for that part of the session because Katrina, as she is conflicted, is not part of the decision-making.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'd just like ask Stephen one question for clarification before we move on to the other question that's being asked. Are you objecting to the fact that it's confidential, or are you objecting to any of the substance?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No objection to the substance. My objection is we owe it to our community to do something like this in public so that they are aware of it, it's recorded, and it's documented. I have no issue with elevating Katrina to Board Seat 12. I have no issue with any of the three items that are in that agenda for the extraordinary meeting. I just think it's terrible optics to do something like this in a private meeting. To me, it's just completely unacceptable that we would do this, that we would elevate a member of our community to a Board seat in private. It just really grates me. I wrote to the list when I realized what was going on. I was kind of surprised not to see any comment back. But, be that as it may, I'm raising my objections now because I will not participate in this if it's a private session. It just is so wrong in my view.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Stephen.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. So we got that—sorry, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, please go on. I just see other hands up.

BYRON HOLLAND: No, I'm going to defer to you. You're the Chair of the meeting with this agenda.

KATRINA SATAKI: We have Jordan. Let's hear everyone who wants—

BYRON HOLLAND: I guess my question to the group then, just as a question … I think this is probably more as a holdover of previous discussions than … It's more that than anything else.

                          Is there any objection to having it just as the last part of the regular meeting, albeit chaired by somebody other than the Chair of the ccNSO? Is there any objection to doing that?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: None from me. I strongly believe that's how we should proceed. Thank you, Byron.

[ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:]   I'm fine with that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Are there any objections to it?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Certainly not.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Pablo, perhaps.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: No objection [from me] is what I meant by that. It seemed to be fairly obvious that we could—

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: I said no, meaning that there are no objections.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. So we continue with the normal agenda and, when we come to the end, I'll leave you with Byron. And you just continue—

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: But don't leave.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, I'm not going to vote anyway.

EN

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Don't leave. [You're just hanging out with the Chair.]

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. I'll just sit in and be quiet. Very unusual role for me, but I'll do my best.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Great. Thank you, guys. Thank you. I really appreciate this.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thanks. Let's continue. I see no objections, so let's continue. So welcome, everyone. We have received one apology, from Giovanni. Any other apologies? Maybe closer to the meeting? Secretariat?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Katrina, I haven't received any additional apologies.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. So we have one apology. Thank you. Let's move forward then. So minutes have been circulated. You still have time to read them through and comment if you wish to do so.

                       Action items. Some are completed. Some are still in progress—for example, the one about the way we interpret majority as plurality. Probably it won't be included in the nomination report, but we need it maybe to send to the Guidelines Review Committee so that they add it to the relevant guideline.

Nick, any progress on that? Sorry, we're too busy working with the meeting strategy things, so we did not send you any draft. But …

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Sorry. This certainly slipped my mind until I saw it in the notes here.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's fine. No need to—

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: [And I thought, "Where the hell was this going?"]

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, but you know what they say—it's better not to bring your debts into the next year. So better do it this year.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Understood.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, no. It's okay to—

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Is that a Latvian saying?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, it is. When you're—

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: We do the opposite. We just stack up more debt and carry it over. But the point is well taken. I guess, for future reference—this is an interesting point … I guess, after the meeting—I don't remember the time of day it was—if there's an action like this, it's to call out—thanks, Stephen—some of the more specific ones just afterwards. Otherwise, time passes and we get distracted on other stuff.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, sure. No, absolutely. We wanted to do it, but as I said, we just carried away with other stuff. So it's a shared burden, shared responsibility.

                           Okay. Let's move forward. I don't know [of] further comments on action items. We had some inter-meeting decisions. It says October but meant November. So we approved description for NomCom appointee. We also approved membership to the drafting team work on this ccNSO response. And we also adopted the election report.

                           Okay. Agenda Item #4. It's appointment of new members to SOPC. You see those members. So they stepped forward in response to the call for new members. So we have Madison Wang from .cn and Nicholas Lisse from .na—he has been an observer, so very good he's been promoted—David McAuley from .cc, and James Shady from .au.

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

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll move.

KATRINA SATAKI: Stephen moved. Jordan seconded. Thank you. Okay. Any comments? Any questions?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: New victims.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, exactly. [We'll] be able to move forward faster and more efficiently.

Okay. Any—okay, I see no other questions or comments, so let's have a vote. Anyone against?

Anyone abstain?

Okay. All four approved. Secretariat, please inform the new members. Thank you. So congratulations and thanks for stepping forward.

STEPHAN DEERHAKE: Yes.

EN

KATRINA SATAKI:	Next agenda item: ccPDP 3 (Part 1: Retirement) update. Stephen, anything from you?
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	Yeah. We have a final, final draft which we're going to have to convene the group for—get the band back together, so to speak—to do a final walkthrough. The Chair, myself, and the Vice Chair, Eberhard, are reading through it one last time before we throw it back at the group. So we expect to get that out, I hope, by year-end. And I can then submit it formally to the issue manager, and the issue manager—i.e., Bart—does whatever he needs to do to push that forward.
	With regards to the review mechanism, we had a call yesterday. We pretty much finalized the spreadsheet we've been working on in terms of what constitutes something that's reviewable. So we're close to closure on that, and I expect to see us starting to draft actual language. We need to get ICANN Legal involved, probably in the January timeframe, to get them to walk us through what they're willing to put up with from us with regards to the review mechanism because they do not want to see another independent-review-process-type mechanism put in place.
	Bart, you can correct me on any of those two things if I was wrong. Thank you.
BART BOSWINKEL:	Nothing to add, Stephen.

EN

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: All right. That's it from me then. Back you to you, Katrina. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Thanks—

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe, in addition—this is more a positive message—I think, if you look at it—that's why it's so interesting that we could close the spreadsheet—you got the, I would say, parameters right now, or the working group, so the working group will now look more into the process itself, which is hard work. But the difficult part—and it's detailed work—on which decisions need to be subject to review, etc., is done. So I think that's a major win. Now it's just hard work, etc., and detailed discussions. But the real hard work is over. And it was done in very good spirit, thanks to—

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I concur. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Thanks. That sounds encouraging. I hope that we can start getting more people or members involved so that they're the ones who will have to vote on Part 1. So we need to start telling them about the next steps and everything. But, okay, that's up to the group— how you're going to organize it.

EN

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: If you want to, I can talk to that. It's fairly simple. As soon as I have received, formally in my capacity as issue manager, the final report—I expect to, I hope, by end of January—I'll open a public comment to discuss following the council resolution during ICANN69 to formally introduce the proposal and to check whether there are any objections to the separation of Part 1 and 2. Based on the feedback I receive—I don't expect much or any substantive ones, especially not on the proposed policy itself—I'll produce a final report, which will then go through decision-making. The intention is still to do this before ICANN70.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Any questions? I saw there was one from Jordan in the chat. "No new IRP for review mechanism?"

JORDAN CARTER: I don't know if it was a very good question, Katrina, but it was just that my Internet connection on my phone died when Stephen was giving an update about the review mechanism. So I'm assuming what was said was that we're not going to set up an entirely separate IRP-style process to be the review mechanism.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No.

JORDAN CARTER: If I'm wrong on that assumption, please tell me.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, it's not our intention to do something like that because the IRP is not working well—let's put it that way—and we don't want to impose a similar structure and we have to consult with ICANN Legal to figure out what they're comfortable with and then figure out what we're comfortable with and come to some accommodation.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Next agenda item then, if there are no further questions. So IDN ccPDP 4 update. I believe Bart will provide an update.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Thank you. I don't know to what extent you're familiar with the structure of your original overall policy, but, effectively, the part on the selection of IDN ccTLDs contains three basic chapters. One is the overall principles, which will guide both the interpretation of the policy going forward and also drive the criteria, etc., and a discussion around the criteria. The second part is the criteria itself—criteria for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. And the third part is the processes and procedures around how to, for example, verify the selection criteria.

The working group has completed its work on the principles. So that was post-ICANN69. So that went very well. In moving forward, they got accustomed to their working method and have now started with the criteria. We will continue. One of the subgroups will start, hopefully by the end of January, the one on either variant management or on the selection of IDN ccTLDs. So it's making gradual progress, and I think it's done in a very good working atmosphere, thanks to the Chairs and the Vice Chair. Back you, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. That's excellent. Great to hear that things are moving forward [on] that ccPDP 2.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe Javier can add. I can't raise my hand. Javier and Ai Chin are also in that group, so maybe they can speak to the progress, etc., as well. That makes it easier. And you have different [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Javier, any comments from you?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Nothing to add. I'm very happy with the way conversations are going. No questions are left unanswered. So I'm learning the ropes there, and I think it's a very good process.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Ai Chin, anything from you?

AI CHIN LU: No. I think, so far, so good. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Good. Thank you. Okay, good. Next agenda item. That's about selecting members to the Community Representatives Group, which will select the Independent Review Process Standing Panel. So, as you may remember, ICANN Org issued a call for volunteers. As far as I know, there haven't been many candidates so far. Last time I heard there was only one asking for an endorsement from the ccNSO, and that's a really excellent candidate. Very glad to have him on board. But, in any case, we're waiting for final details on all the candidates, if there are any new candidates—those details being forwarded to us. So, as soon as we receive them, we will move forward with reviewing the candidates.

Any questions on that?

Nope. Good. Let's move to the next agenda item. That's the hot topic. No, that's about the ccNSO meeting strategy on ICANN70. [inaudible] there was this updated meeting strategy document circulated among the SO/ACs. MPC reviewed and discussed the document last Thursday— a week ago—and it was decided to hold two community webinars to explain the content of the document, explain all the proposed enhancements, and collect some feedback from the community.

So we had two webinars. So thanks a lot to the Secretariat, who prepared slides and carried out a thorough analysis of the document

and all implications to the ccNSO. So that was done at really great speed because we have no time. We have to provide feedback by tomorrow. I know that many of you participated in those webinars and provided your opinion. That's excellent. Thank you very much.

So the draft is ready. I sent you a link to the Google Doc. Please have a look if you haven't had time to do it. Please have a look and add your comments, suggestions, or corrections to the document so that we can finalize and send it back to ICANN Org tomorrow.

Are there any comments? Anyone would like to ask something or to comment?

Yes, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Full support for the document as written. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any others?

Okay. Maybe let's have a look at the document. Kim, can you please go to the Google Doc? Last time I looked, we already had some corrections/suggestions.

Okay, good. So it starts with some general overview or executive summary of what we're trying to say. Then the document consists of two major parts. One is short-term implications or impact on ccNSO and the community as we see it. So here we talk about … Well, first of all,

currently we still don't know about ICANN70. The Board hasn't decided whether to hold as a face-to-face or virtually. Of course, we all suspect that this is going to be another virtual meeting, but formally there's no decision yet. So this enhancement will be forwarded to the Board, and the Board will decide somewhere in January.

So what we see here in the short-term is we see the fact that there's still no clarity about ICANN70—it has impact on our work. We see that—it has been stated many times before—it requires a lot more time and effort to organize and to prepare for virtual meetings because we do all those prep meetings, we have dry runs—several dry runs—for each session, and, if we have to do it quickly in a very short time, it's an additional strain on our volunteers.

Okay. So what else do we have here? Please scroll down. So we look at each of those suggested enhancements and provide comments on how we see it and how it might affect ccNSO. Wherever we support the enhancements, we state that. Where we saw that the community had some reservations or at least were not entirely happy with the proposed way forward, we tried to state that, too.

And then, of course, we have long-term goals, which are also not entirely clear here. Our working groups already meet throughout the year, regardless of ICANN meetings. Of course, when we used to meet face-to-face, we organized our work differently. Nevertheless, when we tried to adapt to this virtual meeting, the ccNSO chose an approach not to try to replicate a face-to-face meeting in a virtual environment. So we tried to adapt and see where we can be more efficient and how to make those virtual meetings work.

Here, with the proposal to have those SO/AC work sessions spread throughout the year, the impact is not entirely clear. So why would we have ICANN meetings? Why would ccTLDs attend ICANN-wide sessions if there are no ccNSO sessions happening? So that was one of the comments we received from the community.

As of regional face-to-face meetings, we've stated that many times before. Here, we reiterate it again. So that is not working for ccNSO because ccNSO is a global platform and, for regional meetings, we have regional organizations. So we are not willing to step on their toes. So, again, it's not entirely clear how this might work.

Okay. So that's what I very, very briefly tried to explain—what we have in the document—but, again, you can read it. It's there.

Any comments? Bart, anything else you'd like to stress here?

BART BOSWINKEL: No, not really. I think you captured it well. What we suggested as well is to include a summary in the annex of the consultations—of the two webinar consultations but also the online consultations—to provide more background, effectively to make very clear this is not just the ccNSO Council, although this will be a document from the ccNSO Council, but there was a consultation as extensive as possible within this short timeframe because, if you will would look at the introduction, there are some comments about the procedural or the way this process is done and mixing up the long-term and short-term goals of the paper because I think it's very clear that there needs to be a long-term strategy going back to face-to-face meetings and how the community

and ICANN Org and the Board want to deal with it. But at the same time, applying it already to ICANN70 is putting a lot of pressure on both the community and ICANN Org, and especially on the community already. As you can see, that leads into the arguments about the time needed just to organize sessions. It is assumed, by mid-January, there will be a decision. That will imply there are only two months to, first of all, define sessions and then find presenters, session Chairs, etc., and then really properly organize it.

I don't know if you've been involved in organizing sessions in a virtual environment. It is hard work. I think the governance session took five to six prep meetings, at times twice a week. The post-COVID session took about five to six prep meetings as well and, again, some dry runs. So you definitely need time to prepare. That's all. Back to you, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Bart. So any comments or questions from you guys?

Nope. Nothing. Okay, good. So we still have time. Please have a look at the document. Propose your changes if you see anything that needs to be changed. Thanks.

Let's move forward then. Update: ccNSO review. As you saw, we have received a letter from the ICANN Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee with some questions—questions regarding the recommendations; those recommendations that we supported and those where we agreed with the issue but did not support the way it was proposed to tackle the issue. So we have those questions. I don't

know if you had time to read that one. Well, we need to work on it, apparently.

Yes, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. I read the letter from Avri, and I have to say the tone of it was a little odd to me as a native English speaker. I'm not quite sure how we ought to respond to it. I think we may be getting into a place where we might have to draw a line in the sand and say, "Look, this is what we're going to do. This is what we're not going to do." But I'd be curious to hear what other council members have to say about it. It just struck me as a bit odd in terms of its tone. I don't know how it struck you, but that's how it struck me. Thank you.

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

Well, the way I see it is it's just really trying to understand. After our presentation, when [Biyi] and I went to meet with them and presented, they had some questions/some discussions. I hope that's questions they need to clarify some aspects of.

Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. To me, it was a little bit of a surprise since we have explained these things many times. So maybe what they needed is a

little bit more detail to what we already explained. To me, it was a little bit of a surprise because we've gone through these over and over again.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Jordan?

Jordan, I know you're excited to be—

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah. Sorry. My participants list was covering my unmute button. Disaster.

When I read the letter, I felt a bit like I was at school and my teacher had sent a note to my mum. It just had a slightly tone about it that I picked up. And it does feel like it's asking questions that we've already answered in a kind of curious way. So I wonder if it's best if someone asks Avri what they're really getting at and find that out before we decide what to do about it. I don't think we should do anything about it this year.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Reading between the lines, as it were, they don't think we've done a very good job responding to the review, and they would like fuller explanations as to why it is we've not 100% accepted all of the recommendations, I guess. So I agreed with everybody else. It's like a

grumpy sort of letter. It's like, "We've done the review, paid a lot of money to these expensive consultants, and you haven't accepted the recommendations and you haven't given us good enough reasons as to why it is that you're not doing it. We're putting down a marker, perhaps, for the future that we do expect the recommendations to be adopted in full unless there's a very good reason not to." I guess it's the moving of the dial there. But as far as I'm concerned, we don't have to accept the recommendations. [We spent] flippin' ages going through them all.

So, frankly, they can stick it if that's what we think. But maybe a more diplomatic approach could be useful and maybe a quiet word to just say, "Is there anything specifically that you didn't like about our approach? Because we did try and do it diligently. We promise," as Jordan's mum would say.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Well, yes, we had everything filled in and explained, but maybe they're asking about progress and we can stick it or we can just be polite, our usual polite ccNSO people, and just explain and use the same things that we already wrote in whatever was the name of that document we had to write and maybe make it clearer in some parts. That wasn't—

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: But, from memory, they gave us the template to fill in, right? So it was kind of dictated to. So I thought we had done our instructions to the letter, so I'm a bit surprised that they think it's inadequate. I think the

presumption is therefore, because we filled in their own template, it must be that they think we should have adopted more of the recommendations. That's what I think. But that's totally up to us, as to my understanding.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, it is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maybe we reply, "Hey, could you make a better template?"

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: But also there was some of them where, as I remember, things were all dependent on ICANN, like the website-type functionality and the translations and stuff like that. Anyway …

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, I don't understand why we should explain those recommendations that are for ICANN Org to implement. It wasn't entirely clear to me, either. Well, if they do not understand what we've done, what we are, we explain it once more. Then it just has to go down.

Okay. Jordan's comment in the chat: "In some cases, too, they are asking for information about resource planning, which is something they need to do. Not us." Fair point. So we can—oh, okay. We'll draft— we don't need to hurry—something. Then the rudest of us will have the opportunity to work on the document.

Okay. No, I don't think there's a need at this moment, but apparently they had some discussion within the committee. For them, probably it wasn't just black and white and there were some things they did not understand. But—

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: But I wonder if that was recorded and maybe we should go back and try to track down—

KATRINA SATAKI: No, I think it's not recorded.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay.

KATRINA SATAKI: I'm not even sure our part was recorded, I think, when [Biyi] and I presented.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Oh, okay. All right. Sorry. Just a thought.

KATRINA SATAKI: So, no, I think it wasn't. Yeah, I don't think we have to spend too much time on this one, but we'll draft something and then see how we move forward.

Okay. Next one: update on the ccNSO statement procedure regarding the amendment of Article 10 of the ICANN bylaws. So, Ai Chin, would you like to comment on this one? Anything that you'd like to share with us? Or everything goes according to plan and there's nothing to report yet? So how are things?

AI CHIN LU: Hello, everyone. I'll just keep it short. Let me recap a little bit about the current status of the drafting. To date, Drafting met twice. One was on December 7th. The other was December 16th. We mostly got through the documents and reached consensus about some of the points.

Regarding the timeline, I think the everybody has already received the e-mail from Joke. Yeah, the original timeline previously sent to the council was adjusted slightly.

So I will not go detailed for the timeline and only mention some important points. The council will receive the proposed draft early next week. The deadline for council input will be the 19th of January. The [later] statement is expected to be adopted by council around the middle of February following community consultation. So that's all of my update.

So, Bart, do you want to add something?

BART BOSWINKEL: No, thank you. I think what you said really captures progress to date. Maybe one more thing is that the drafting team has been very diligent. We've met already twice and we will meet again on the 21st.

EN

KATRINA SATAKI:	Okay. Thank you very much. Thanks. So we'll be ready by mid-February. That's good.
	Okay. Next agenda item: update on ECA. Anything from you, Stephen?
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	No. Things have been pretty quiet. We are going to start cranking up with regards to the PTI budget approval once that comes out of the Board. Hopefully, we'll have an excuse to write a letter to JJ about Board Seat 12 soon. But other than that, things are pretty quiet. But we'll start cranking up in the January/February timeframe.
KATRINA SATAKI:	Okay, good. Thank you. Thank you very much. CSC. Alejandra?
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Well, the report is that everything is 100% met on the SLA, so it has been a boring month and we like it.
KATRINA SATAKI:	Yeah, boring is good. Or at least at CSC. Excellent. Thank you.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	It is.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It's very good, and I would like to point that I did an emergency root zone change over the week, and they came through. So they continue to perform well.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, good. Thank you. Any updates from anyone?

No updates? Okay. Then we have some written updates from working groups. Those who want to share their updates, it would be good to share news now. So SOPC, I believe, is also waiting for new documents, and now they're going to have four new members. So they'll be even more efficient.

So any other comments? Any other news from SOPC?

No? Okay. Then let's move to the next one: GRC, Guidelines Review Committee. We have reviewed our workplan. We are looking into the ways to try to consolidate the guidelines to make sure that we have something easier to read and not so many things that differ by some tiny details. For example, we'll try to come up with one guideline that has all appointments done by the ccNSO Council—so different cross-community working groups, as liaisons to different groups, like RZERC or anything; any appointments when we have calls for volunteers and we have a list of candidates so that we have some uniform selection procedure for all cases. That's one thing.

Another thing is we also discussed results from the governance session. I was thinking about how we move forward with our discussion on the

rules of the ccNSO, how we're going to work with the community and get feedback from the community.

MPC. Anyone would like to—Alejandra, it may be you. Would you like to share news from MPC?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, other than the webinars that we already discussed? Well, no. Nothing else. We need to wait for what will happen with ICANN70.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, exactly. So thank you. Let's wait. This time, this is going to be tough if we have to do everything within a two-months' timeframe. This is not going to be easy or our volunteers.

Okay. Internet Governance Liaison Committee. Joke, maybe you could share any news if there is any.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Happy to provide a short update. Maybe also quickly, regarding the MPC, this group will seek new volunteers, both the MPC and the IGLC, and a call for additional volunteers will be published in January. Also, the MPC will be seeking presenters for the ccTLD news sessions. So the committee is planning to have, again, two sets of virtual ccTLD news sessions at the start of March.

With both groups—both the MCP and the IGLC—the respective Chairs will be holding a webinar for interested parties to join, and that will be

in combination with the call for volunteers that will be launched in January. So those interested in joining the groups will be able to hear more from the respective Chairs about the work of the committees and what it means to join the group.

For the IGLC, there will also be a short consultation regarding the future topics to be addressed by the group. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Okay. If no questions regarding updates from working groups, let's move to the next. Okay, we have written updates from liaisons.

Next meetings. Okay, here we have a proposed list for meetings until May, meetings starting from June. That's something that will be discussed and agreed upon under the new Chair. You really should start thinking about it.

And council workshop. The date is still not clear, although we have some ideas of how to make this session even more interactive than we had in the past. We're still waiting on Jordan for a summary on that one. Also, please do not leave it for 2021. Let's share it with others this year.

Okay. As you remember, the first face-to-face meeting—we used to have before 2020—we have to agree on roles and responsibilities and we have to divide the workload/distribute the workload among ourselves. And we have to start thinking about the workplan for the next year[s]. So this is something that we could discuss if there are other ideas, somehow, for what else we need to discuss during the council

workshop. Please share your thoughts, your ideas, with the council. Okay. If you have any preferences for dates, also, please let everyone know.

Any other business?

No? Nothing? Nothing. With that, let me close the regular meeting, and I will shut up. But before I shut up, I would like to wish all of you who celebrate it, Merry Christmas, and, of course, a happy, Happy New Year to everyone. I'm sure it's not hard to beat 2020 and be happier, to have happier year.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: May 2021 be better.

KATRINA SATAKI: It must be. As I said, it's not going to be hard. It definitely must be better. So enjoy the season's holidays and have a lot of fun—as much as possible, anyway.

So bye-bye. I'm here. I'm shutting up. Byron, the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Katrina.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, I'm not sure if is say thank you, Katrina, for handing me the floor here. So, first, I think we should agree that there should be an

amendment, just to the agenda itself, if you go back up, that we're not closing the regular meeting. So we should amend the agenda to reflect the fact that we're just changing who is chairing the meeting as opposed to closing the regular meeting.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Are there any objections to that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: None.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good point.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. If we could move back to then top of the next page, we should adjust the following: "This meeting is closed." And we probably should

just delete that line entirely but reflect that it is being chaired by somebody else—in this case, me. So we should leave it staff to adjust that, just to reflect that all that has happened is that the chairmanship has been handed from Katrina to myself.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, and I'll do this right after this meeting and circulate it again so it can be published today.

BYRON HOLLAND: Perfect. Great. Thank you very much. Okay. So, without further ado, obviously we are coming close to what is hopefully the end of what has been a very long and winding process to get us to this point. I'm sure there's going to be more discussion, but there are, as you have seen from the agenda, three basic components to this part of the agenda— first and foremost, adopting the nomination report. There are a number of elements here. Sorry, I just lost the agenda. I'm sharing the screen. Okay, thank you. And there is a resolution for us to adopt or not at the end of this. Everybody has seen Joke's report, and I wanted to offer the opportunity for her to provide any detail that she saw fit beyond what is written here and then for us to, of course, have the opportunity to have discussion and questions.

Joke, before you get going, I thought it was worth highlighting, of course, the key issue that we have been addressing over the last number of months. Really, that's number two or little double-I and the notion that Nigel Roberts had requested to exclude Soulemayne, Alejandra, Pablo, and well as Katrina, who is running for the seat, from

any decision-making regarding the Board Seat 12 nomination process. Clearly, Katrina should be excluded, given that she was running for it, but the others, as we know after much discussion and feedback from ICANN Legal, should not have been excluded.

I just wanted to highlight, really, the final couple of lines in little double-ii, which is that the council could not determine a conflict of interest for the ccNSO councilors, (Soulemayne, Alejandra, and Pablo) and I think, at the end of the day, while this was, to be frank, a somewhat painful process for all of us, that is the essence here. There is no conflict after much discussion and feedback from ICANN Legal. So I just wanted to make sure that was on the record for anybody who has only listened to this in this recording in the future.

So I'm going to also read the decision for the record, and then we will move to discussion. So the decision is for the ccNSO to adopt the nomination report, including the advice on how to resolve the issues identified by the nomination manager and request the GRC to review and propose an update of the guidelines of ccNSO nomination process for Board Seats 11 and 12, if considered necessary to address Issues i through iii, identified by the nomination manager accordingly and prior to the anticipated upcoming nomination process. The ccNSO Council notes that Issue iv identified is being addressed as part of the ongoing GRC work with respect to the role of the ccNSO as the decisional participant. The council notes and concurs with the observations of the nominations manager, and the ccNSO Council thanks Joke for her work as nomination manager and her hard work during this time.

Now I'd like to open the floor to discussion on this. Does anybody have any questions for clarification or comments, including Joke, if she would like to say anything before we get going?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you very much, Byron. There are no additions from my end. So, in the document that is currently being displayed, there is a copy-paste from the executive summary from the Board nomination report, and those elements—small i until small iv—cover the main highlights of the events that occurred in this nomination process. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Great. And thank you very much for all the work you've done in this election process, which is no doubt more than you're anticipating.

So, with that, any questions, comments, or discussion on this proposed resolution?

BART BOSWINKEL: Byron, Stephen raised his hand.

BYRON HOLLAND: Stephen, go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Byron, thank you, and thank you for chairing this part of the meeting. No issue with anything. My only question is, to my knowledge, we never

actually saw the question you put to ICANN Legal. We saw the response back from ICANN Legal. But, to my knowledge, unless I overlooked it, we never saw what you actually asked them, and I would appreciate seeing that on the council list. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure. I have no objection to that. Happy to share the question and also the answer after this meeting.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It's just part of the record. That's all. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. No problem with that. Jordan, your hand is up.

JORDAN CARTER: If we can just scroll, Kim, to the previous page—the preamble stuff … A bit further up. I think that Point ii—double whatever—.2 [inaudible] is more or less fine. I think it has the right tone. But I'm just wondering if it might be worth adding a few words that say something like, "By virtue of them acting as nominators or seconders," because, at the moment, there's just this thing that says that there was potentially a conflict of interest or one asserted but it doesn't way why. I just wondered if that would be worth adding. But if it's too complicated, it's not a big deal.

BYRON HOLLAND: So are you proposing a friendly amendment?

JORDAN CARTER: I might be—

BART BOSWINKEL: Byron, I can't put my hand up. May I react, please?

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure.

BART BOSWINKEL: Jordan, be aware that, in the original e-mail that was forwarded to you (so with the exclusion of Pablo, Soulemayne, Alejandra, and Katrina), you all received your original e-mail from Nigel, and it doesn't include any specifics. So it was assumed this was the case—that it was because they nominated Nigel and Katrina. Soulemayne nominated Nigel, and Katrina and Alejandra and Pablo nominated and seconded Katrina. That was the reason, but that was the assumption. But it was not included in Nigel's e-mail.

JORDAN CARTER: So you didn't say what the reason was, so we shouldn't try and say what we assume the reason was? That's what you're saying?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. I'm happy with that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any other questions or discussion on this particular resolution?

So I don't hear any. I don't see any hands up. I'm looking right now. We're coming to a closure of this, so I want to make sure that anybody who has any further comments or questions gets the opportunity.

But seeing or hearing none now, I'll call for a vote on this decision that's in front of you on the screen as I read out before. And I'll start in the negative. Is there anybody against this?

Seeing or hearing nobody against this resolution, are there any abstentions to this resolution?

Okay. Seeing or hearing no abstentions either, it's adopted unanimously. Thank you very much, everybody. I know that this has been a challenging conversation.

So let's move on to Item #2: the nomination for Katrina Sataki for Board Seat 12, also for a decision. The draft resolution—thank you for moving down—is below us. I'm going to read it into the record. The resolution is in accordance with Section 13.3i, the ICANN bylaws. The ccNSO Council formerly nominates Katrina Sataki, .lv, E.U. region, to be designated by the Empowered Community Administrative Committee to fill ICANN Board Seat #12, starting at the end of ICANN's annual general meeting in 2021 for a term of three years. The ccNSO Council requests its specially designated Chair, Byron Holland, to inform the Empowered Community administration, ICANN Secretary, and Chair of the ICANN

Board of the nomination of Katrina as soon as this resolution becomes effective, at which time the nomination process is formally closed as well. The council congratulates Katrina and wholeheartedly thanks Nigel Roberts for standing as a candidate.

That is the resolution. Is there any discussion or comment on this resolution?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: The last line there that you read—"as a candidate"—has no "a." It says "as candidate" in the actual text. Maybe it should be fixed in the text.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you for that.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, you're absolutely right. Thank you for that. And I would ask staff to make that minor change. Good catch.

Any other comments or questions?

Seeing or hearing none, I'll ask for the vote. Is anybody against this resolution?

I see or hear nobody against. Anybody wish to abstain from this vote?

Seeing or hearing none, it's unanimously passed. Congratulations, Katrina.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Byron, may I suggest that we all unmute and give her a big round of applause?

BYRON HOLLAND: I think that's an excellent idea. Thank you. [All right], Katrina. Well done.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hear, hear.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Congratulations.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much [inaudible] work in front of me—you and everyone. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Congratulations.

BYRON HOLLAND: Congratulations, and we are obviously confident in your ability to do all that work on our behalf.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much for your trust. Thank you. I'll do my best.

BYRON HOLLAND: And on to #3. If we could just slide up a little further. Thank you. So Agenda Item #3 in this section of the ccNSO Council meeting is a request for the GRC to further develop conflict-of-interest guidelines. And there is a resolution which I will read for the record. The ccNSO Council requests the ccNSO Guideline Review Committee to develop and propose internal procedures pertaining to perceived and/or possible conflicts of interest, taking into account general principles of fairness and accountability. The GRC is strongly recommended to look at and build on ICANN's conflict-of-interest policy of 2018 and consult ICANN in the process. The Secretariat is requested to inform the GRC on behalf of council and publish this resolution as soon as possible.

So that is the resolution that we will be voting on. Are there any questions or comments?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Byron, you need a nominator and a seconder.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It's also true with [inaudible] resolution.

BYRON HOLLAND: To make the motion before discussion. Would anybody like to make the motion before discussion?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I will.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I will put it forward. Alejandra did.

BYRON HOLLAND: Alejandra first and Stephen second. Thank you. Now we'll open it for discussion.

[I guess] my chairing skills are a little rusty. So I'll open the floor for discussion or questions.

JORDAN CARTER: Byron, just a discussion point. I support the resolution.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Jordan.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I do, too.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any other comments? I would like to make a comment, but I want to make sure everybody else has the opportunity first.

Okay. I did just want to highlight one component of the backgrounder piece. It's in the second paragraph, near the last few lines. I think it's worth noting. And it's important, I think, probably for all of us, and certainly for me, to note. I'm just going to read directly here because I think this captures it. This issue—the way it was handled was—and I quote, "The result from a gap or lack of detail in internally ccNSO procedures and had in no way to do with any action or lack thereof of the aforementioned members of the council who, of course, are Soulemayne, Pablo, and Alejandra. To avoid future issues, this gap or lack of detail should be addressed as soon as possible.

When I read this, I think that the situation that we have found ourselves in has been unfortunate and certainly a learning experience for all of us. We're going to be better coming out of the back end of this because we will have better conflict-of-interest rules and procedures. I'm confident. But I think it was important to really make note of the words that I have just read out in the backgrounder here.

Okay. With that, we will go to a vote since I see no further hands up or no further comments. So, again, in the negative, are there any votes against this resolution?

Is anybody going to abstain from this resolution?

Seeing or hearing no votes against or no abstentions, this resolution is unanimously passed. Okay, thank you very much, everybody. This has been a long journey.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We're not done. We need to go back to #2 because it was not actually proposed in—

BYRON HOLLAND: Before we go there, Jordan, you have your hand up.

JORDAN CARTER: I was going to say the same thing, just because of the sensitivity of the resolution. So if we could get a mover and a seconder for 1 and 2 of this, that would be good.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. My apologies. So—

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I know your skills are rusty. It's okay. Well, it's fine. Katrina gets another round of applause [as a result.]

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. Can I get a mover and a seconder [inaudible] resolution?

MARGARITA VALDES: Moving.

BYRON HOLLAND: Margarita and Pablo for #1--mover and seconder, respectively.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Perfect.

BYRON HOLLAND: And mover and seconder for Agenda Item #2: Jordan—moving. Seconder?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll second.

MARGARITA VALDES: Me.

BYRON HOLLAND: Stephen [inaudible]

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: [I'll give way to] I think Margarita.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Jordan and Stephen for that one.

Okay. Thank you very much, everybody.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: And another round of applause.

BYRON HOLLAND: It's behind us. It's behind us. Okay. And, with that—

UNIDENIFIED MALE: And, Byron, I think we also need to give a round of applause to Stephen for being a very good process keeper.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: That is true. He has done that. He has certainly kept the feet to the fire.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Well, that's why I sit on the ECA.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. Now I'll let you turn your attention to them.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Oh, yes. Thank you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: With that, I guess I will bring this ccNSO open meeting to a close. So thank you very much, everybody. I guess we need somebody to make the motion to close the meeting formally. Who wants to do that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: [I will].

BYRON HOLLAND: All right. Margarita, first. Pablo, second. First and second. Okay. Meeting adjourned. Thank you very much, everybody. For those celebrating a holiday, have a great holiday. For everybody else, see you—

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Bye! Happy holidays!

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]