
KATRINA SATAKI:

So, hello, everyone. It's a council meeting today, 21st January 2021, and that's ccNSO Council meeting number 169. I hope that soon we will meet face-to-face one day. Meanwhile, yes, we missed a lot, every one of you. I hope that you're doing fine, healthy, safe, and everything.

So, we have received one apology, Jordan. Maybe he will join, maybe not, but just in case he sends his apologies. But he has sent a summary from a council workshop. I will talk about that a little bit later.

So, for today, we wanted to have some experiments, something for the future council meetings and future council workshop. I hope we'll have time for that at the end of the meeting. So, that's a little teaser.

I also would like to welcome Sebastien, who is the new GNSO Council liaison to the ccNSO Council, so hello, Sebastien. You're not exactly new to the ccNSO. So, I hope that you will enjoy your time spent with us and I just wish you to be the next chair of the GNSO Council because, apparently, that's what happens with GNSO liaisons to the ccNSO Council. So, okay.

With that, let's move forward: action items and to-dos. Several are still ongoing. Some are completed, as you can see on your screens. If there are no questions on action items then let's move forward with in-depth discussion on other substantial topics.

So, we've had inter-meeting decisions. Actually, two inter-meeting decisions. Appointed one volunteer to serve as mentor in the Fellowship Program and one volunteer to serve on the Fellowship Program Selection

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Committee. So, congratulations to those who have been selected. Good luck. Thanks a lot to everyone who stepped forward and volunteered to do the job. Our next one, ccPDP3. Is Steven already on the call? No, maybe I don't see.

BART BOSWINKEL: It doesn't look like it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, it doesn't look like it. Bart, may I ask you to provide a summary?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. PDP Working Group won on the retirement. They are finalizing the final paper, as it's called, and then they will submit it to the issue manager, who will then publish it for public comment together with the question, for the broader community, whether to separate part one and two. This was discussed already with the people attending ICANN69 and with you at the time.

So hopefully, next week, the working group will finalize the final paper. No changes to the policy, etc. This is just editorials and, yeah, a few refinements, I would say, adding a little bit more language here and there. That's it with respect to part one. Any questions around part one? If not then I'll move on into part two as we, as well, review mechanisms. The working group to date has, effectively, concluded their work on the decisions that should be subject to a review mechanism.

So, identifying these decisions and also some of whether other alternative mechanisms do apply, etc. So, I would say that's Phase 1. They have started focusing on Phase 2, so that's more getting ready to describe the process in detail, including the procedure or the review procedure, as well.

Yesterday, they started the first plenary work on that, so that was an interesting exercise. ICANN Legal is invited to participate in that discussion, as well. And the intention is to first check whether the existing processes/procedures could be used or are worthwhile to at least look at the first procedures—to the existing procedures like the IRP—to check whether, even with a few smalls tweaks, they could be used as a review mechanism. So, that's where we're at with the Review Mechanism Working Group. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, thank you very much, Bart. Any questions on ccPDP3? Any comments? Okay. If not then, Bart, while you're in the reporting mode, IDN ccPDP4?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah. Thank you, Again. The working group is moving along, I would say, steadily and with a reasonable pace. They have concluded, I would say the basic principles underlying the IDN and reviewing and updating the principles, which will be used to guide the development of the policy but also, later on, the interpretation. So, that's one.

They started to look at the criteria and reviewing the criteria. Some will be in what is called “second reading” and others will be reviewed for the first time next week. Next week, they also will start with a call for volunteers for one of the sub-working groups, which will be on the variant management.

Hopefully, that group will start early March, so just before ICANN70, so that will be quite intense because one week there will be the full working group just working through the reviewing and updating the current proposals and the other week, so the alternate week, will be the variant management group, starting to develop policy with respect to variant management. They will liaise closely with the GNSO effort. That’s all with respect to the ccPDP4. Back to you, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Thank you. I don’t know if [we shared] that with the council. Now I don’t remember. But they have received information from the GNSO Council. They have appointed their liaison to the ccPDP4 because, as you remember, according to the board’s request, we coordinate our activities, including in variant management.

BART BOSWINKEL: Katrina, may I add a few?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, sure.

BART BOSWINKEL: What is interesting and very helpful in that sense is the person who is being appointed by the GNSO is already on the working group. So, he's wearing double hat and the working group. So, yesterday, we discussed with the chair and vice-chair whether they should invite somebody from the working group to liaise with the GNSO Working Group as well, and drafting team. So, you're not too dependent on one person but you have at least, say, one liaison formally appointed through the working group and the other one through the GNSO and their policy effort. Thanks.

KATHY SCHNITT: Yeah, thank you. So, everything seems going very well, there. Okay. Next agenda item, if there are no questions, and I see none. Next one is about selecting members for the Community Representatives Group. That's the group that will select a standing panel for this independent review process.

As I already mentioned last time, we have only one, but a very, very strong, candidate here who seeks endorsement from the ccNSO. That is David McAuley. As you know, he is a very active member who is working in this ... Oh, what was the name of the group? Implementation team. He knows everything about this IRP and about the process so, really, a very strong candidate, and I am happy to see that he has volunteered.

And so, David McAuley of Verisign CC. So, you see a decision in front of you, so we appoint David to serve on this community representative group. Anyone would like to move? Okay. I saw Pablo and Alejandro. Maybe I don't see everyone on my screen. I will make it a little bit bigger. Okay, thank you. Yeah. And as Giovanni noted in chat, David is also now

an SOPC member, really a very active contributor, including to the Guidelines Review Committee.

So, any questions/any comments on this? No questions? Then let's move to voting. Is anyone against? Is anyone abstaining? No. With that, everyone is in favor, so thank you very much and thanks, David, for stepping forward. Good luck with all the work on selecting a good standing panel. Okay. Next one is an update on the review and implementation dashboard. Again, Bart, may I ask you to walk us through?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes. I've circulated the updated version of the dashboard and it's more in preparation, effectively, of the next agenda item. Please note that the recommendation on the working group chair and vice-chair nomination is now included, as well. It is in its implementation phase, as you could have seen from this agenda. I think, yeah, although there is not a focused effort on implementation, as you could see from there, from the dashboard, it is gradually moving on.

I think, as you can see in the letter itself, as well, in a way, we are ahead of the scheme by having already implemented some of these recommendations coming out of the review and also, through the work that you and the community have done, already implemented some of the recommendations from Work Stream 2 Accountability, and some of them are, yeah, in the phase of implementation. So, that was the reason for including it. I don't know if there are any questions. Back to you, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, thank you very much. Any questions? If no, let's move forward. That's a draft response to board, so always see letter. Last time, we discussed the letter; now, we have a draft response. I know that some of you have already looked at the draft. Thank you, Alejandro, for your suggestions. For others, please do not comment on the Word Doc. We will have a Google Doc so that it makes things more efficient. Kim, do you have it open? I can really quickly walk you through the document. Okay, thank you.

We had—you know, you remember—those questions from OEC. In our response, we have several sections in the response. First, we talk about those recommendations which have already been fully implemented, also with reference to this implementation, then list the recommendations which are in process of implementation, then we look at those recommendations which we believe should not be implemented, at least not as proposed.

And then, we have some that are directed at ICANN and we have absolutely no control over those recommendations. And then, last one, last section, we provide an explanation why implementation of one specific recommendation should be deferred to the next review, if any.

So, here are all the recommendations, all our responses. I remember some councilors wanted to be nasty in our response. This is not a very nasty response, this is a very nice response. Although, in one part, it gets a little nastier, and that's a response to Recommendation 2(b).

That's where the reviewer recommended to have a one-third quota for newcomers in all our working groups and committees, which mathematically speaking is absurd because the number of members in our working groups and committees is not limited, or at least currently none have any limits.

Therefore, mathematically speaking, one-third quota is actually meaningless because we can have as many members as we want. So here, perhaps, we get a little bit nastier. Maybe even nastier than necessary. But all in all, I think this is a very precise and very concise, polite, and really constructive response to their letter.

So, if you have any questions or any suggestions, now you can share your views. If not, again, as I said, we will have it as a Google Doc, and then everyone will be able to suggest your wording and be nastier or, on the contrary, be more polite and nice in our response. Okay. Any comments and questions now? If no then, okay, we'll share a link to a Google Doc after the call and you can express all your happiness or unhappiness with this letter. Okay, Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Yeah, Katrina. Thank you. Apart from being nasty or nice, what would be the next steps once we have sent the response? Because there are some recommendations we write, in our view, that have been addressed. I would be slightly firmer on that, saying "addressed," full stop, without saying our view, so that you say, "Already, that's a closed chapter." At the same time, with what it's going to be with the recommendations, they are having room for a next step.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. So, in terms of the process, now the OEC is supposed to give recommendations to the board, and then the board should, I don't know, go forward with a closed, second ccNSO review and to just move into implementation or, I don't know, order ICANN Org to move forward with implementation. But otherwise, I think that's just implementation phase. Yes, Bart, you know more about the process?

BART BOSWINKEL: Not really, but what I know from other reviews, and heard from other reviews, is this should end up in an implementation plan from ICANN Org. So in that sense, I fully understand and agree with you, Giovanni, that, say, in the opinion of the council and, probably, RWP, some of the recommendations have been completed—I would say not even addressed but implementation is completed, so no further action needed. I think that's full-stop and "don't get back to us." I think that's the message you want to circulate.

The other one is where ICANN Org or the review planning department should come up with an implementation plan. However, as you can see, it is rather fluid. Some of the recommendations that need to be implemented still will be implemented in, maybe, two or three weeks. So, maybe we should state that and stress this point, as well.

So, when ICANN Org comes up with an implementation plan, then there is, again, a discussion around the implementation plan, and then it needs to be implemented. That's the way it normally goes. However, as you will have noted, the ccNSO, especially for the GIC, has already started

implementation, and some of these recommendations were already implemented by ICANN Org itself by, for example, the bylaw change.

So, in that sense, it's very weird that it's still part-and-parcel of the discussions. So, in that sense, say, from that perspective, I would say it's an ongoing story. But I think what is important for now is that the discussion with the OEC about whether the ccNSO accepts or doesn't accept recommendations will be closed, and that is, I think, the underlying issue around this one.

And for those recommendations that have already been implemented or will be implemented in the next, I would say, month, say "no further discussion is needed" so we can really focus on those recommendations that still need to be implemented. One of the major ones is probably the ccNSO website, and that's probably the most costly one and the most difficult one to implement. So I think, if we can narrow-down and funnel it through, focus on the ccNSO website, that would be great. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, thank you. Additional update, here: tomorrow, we'll have a discussion on the ccNSO website. I hope that I will have a clearer timeline for that so I will, as soon as I know more, share this information with you. Okay. Thank you. Any further comments? If not, let's move forward. Thanks. That is an update on our documents.

So, you probably saw two documents that we have shared with you as short information about the discussion on rules of the ccNSO. The document is the rules of the ccNSO from 2004. Well, the Guidelines

Review Committee continues discussions on how to move forward with that.

We started working on identifying the issues that we think either there should be covered or not covered in that particular document, the new version of the rules of the ccNSO. And as I said, at the end of today's meeting, we'll talk a little bit more about the process and how we would hope to get councilors more involved in discussions around this topic.

Second, second document, is that consolidated appointment and selection procedures. As you know, we have to appoint people to different working groups, committees, and different review teams, and so on, and, for each, we normally have a separate guideline.

Sometimes, we also have to appoint someone to a committee that is nowhere in our guidelines. That's why the Guidelines Review Committee wanted to have this uniform ... Not uniform but guideline for selecting members to those groups for which we do not have a separate guideline, if you follow the logic here. So, just to make sure that we have some basic procedure.

But then, it evolved and we decided to have one ... The process is the same for all appointments except ... And the exceptions are mentioned in this draft guideline. But we tried to put all those specific requirements, specifics around different groups, into a specific part of the guideline and then have ... And this is described as a general procedure for applying, for calls for volunteers, for how council selects and reviews all of those applications, and so on.

So basically, the idea is to have one guideline just to make sure that we do not get lost in those tiny differences that we used to have in all those many, many guidelines. So now, we're looking for feedback from you. The next step would be to send it to the community for feedback from there. Yes, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Katrina. Hi, everyone. I just wanted to add something that I already sent in an e-mail, but just to discuss it here if possible, to include a check on the basic requirements that are asked to the volunteers and, if possible, that the process manager can filter out those who sent all the things that were required versus the ones that didn't. So, they do not pass this checklist, then they should not be considered by the council to be elected. I believe that, if people cannot meet that basic requirement as to send all these things, then they are automatically disqualified.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you. Thanks, Alejandra. Thanks for this. Okay, I see Bart has a comment. Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: More a question for Alejandra, and this is more, say, from a secretariat point of view. What you are referring to is just whether or not a required document is included, not whether it ... Just to be on the safe side, I think staff should not be put in a position to check whether a document meets a certain standard or whether everything that is required within the document is included. That's something for council.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Exactly.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think we are only in a position to check whether a document is included or not.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Exactly. That's exactly my point. No "no further" and [no, this is] [inaudible] [required], for example. You should have a letter from your ccTLD that says that you will spend the time required. That should be either one document or included somewhere. You are required to include your resume. That should be included. You are required to say your interest in applying. That should be ... Just a checklist, not to see whether the resume actually meets the requirements of the position but that it is included. It's just a document.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Do you also want us to, say, provide feedback to the applicant, say if somebody applies or sends in ... Is somebody interested? Should we reach out if the documents are not completed up until the end of the process or leave it as it is? So, be active to make it as complete as possible or be just on a receiving end and, if people forget, so be it?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I think people might make a mistake in not having the document attached, as in they thought they had all five documents and they missed one. So, if the secretariat receives this e-mail they can say, "Okay, we see that you submitted four out of five of the requirements. You are missing this one. Please submit it before the deadline, of course, because that deadline will not move." At least, it was like a good-faith thing to say we are not just disqualifying you because you missed something but just letting you know, okay, you are missing this, and if you do not meet this requirement you will not be considered for the position, or something. I think that is fair.

BART BOSWINKEL: Oh, that's only fair, but I just wanted to make sure that we're on the same page [in that brief] with council. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you. I also agree that, definitely, need to reach out and do everything possible to make sure that it's not a mistake but people really submit all the necessary documents. At the same time, I would like to add that maybe we shouldn't get too bureaucratic and ask four or five documents. We should be more conservative in our requirements.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It was an example.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. I know, I know.

BART BOSWINKEL: Katrina, even when there is just one or two documents, people do not send the second document.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, I know, I know. Well, actually, I think Alejandra raised this in light of our recent appointment when one of the candidates did not submit documents. So, for many councilors, it was impossible to actually make an informed decision whether to support or not support the candidacy and that's the reason, perhaps, for raising this issue. And yeah, sometimes, unfortunately, it is an issue. You can't make an informed decision. Okay, thank you. Duly noted.

Next one, next document. No, no, no, don't scroll. That's another document that we have shared with you and ask you to look at it. That's the procedure for appointing working group chairs and vice-chairs for working groups. As you may remember, we discussed several meetings ago that the process was clear—at least, we thought it was clear—until we got too many newcomers on working groups, and then it turned out that the process is not clear and we need to make steps to formalize the process and make it clearer to those who have never been in our working groups or committees.

So, that's another document. And again, just like in case of a consolidated selection procedure, first we await feedback from you, then we send it to the community for feedback from them. Any questions/comments on this one? If not, let's move forward. Again, that's something that's ... Sometimes we refer to it as "out-in committee" but, basically, that's OI

Standing Committee, Outreach and Involvement Standing Committee.
Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: I wanted to hand it over to Joke. She's done most of the preparations for it. So Joke, the floor is yours.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Yep. Thank you very much. So, this committee that was really established as a Standing Committee due to its permanent nature, the aim of the committee is to ensure a continued and ongoing coordination regarding both the existing and potentially new outreach and involvement efforts, both by the ccNSO and by ICANN Org, targeted at the ccTLD community, and also to increase the awareness of those initiatives.

In this draft document which I circulated via e-mail, including also a link to a Google Doc, there is an overview of the scope and the composition of this committee and its working methods, so it would be very much appreciated if there are any comments or suggestions on how to further improve it. If you could please make those edits in the Google Doc? Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Please also note that we refer to this committee in several instances in our draft response to OEC because it's one of the things that we are implementing to improve the work of the ccNSO. Okay. Any questions/any comments on this one? No? Let's move forward, then.

That's an update on ccNSO statement procedure regarding the amendment of Article 10 of ICANN bylaws. Ai Chin, may I ask you to ...?

AI CHIN LU:

Okay. Hello, everyone. Yeah, I think that for this issue we had a draft team meeting yesterday. According to the ccNSO Council members' feedback, we revised a cover letter. And the next step, we will send out a related documentation to ccNSO members for comments. Joke, would you like to help me to add some more?

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Hello, Ai Chin. Yes, happy to do so. As you correctly mentioned, this document, the proposed draft will be sent to the ccNSO members' mailing list later today. We will mention that we seek input from the ccTLDs and also feedback on the proposed draft. The drafting team will then take this feedback into consideration before resubmitting it to council for a potential final adoption of the response by the ccNSO. The close day for comments by the membership is the 1st of February and the drafting team is scheduled to meet on the 3rd, so you can expect input from the drafting team shortly after that date.

There are two elements that I would like to bring to your attention already, now. Once the draft is ready, the drafting team will also make a note to council about the need to address, in future, two topics. One is the impact of the bylaw changes on the existing ccNSO guidelines, so there is a need to review the guidelines. Secondly, there are also consequences for those organizations, those ccTLD managers, that have

multiple memberships in the ccNSO and the impact on their voting rights.

Thank you.

AI CHIN LU:

Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, thank you very much. Thank you, Ai Chin, and thanks a lot to the drafting team for good work. Very efficient. So, thank you. If there are no further questions—and I see none—let's move forward. That's an update on our ICANN70 and related sessions. Alejandra, would you like to take from here, or you want me to have some intro?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

As you wish. I can start and then, if I miss something, maybe we could flip it?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Please, please go on.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay. Let me see if I can do this properly. There we go. I hope you can see my presentation now. Yes?

KIMBERLY CARLSON:

Hi, Alejandra. It looks good.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you. So, as you remember, last time there was a discussion regarding the strategy for the ICANN70 meeting and this is a summary of the conversation that was between the planning team and the SO and ACs for the overall ICANN70 session. So, it is important to improve virtual meetings first, then start talking about the overall meeting strategy and face-to-face meetings as something that was related.

And also, it was not a good idea to move sessions throughout the year, sessions that happen in ICANN meetings. And also, the unified online calendar was supported but, still, not to move the sessions throughout the year. So, those were like the general overview.

And for ICANN70, it was important that the block schedule was defined so that everyone could plan accordingly and that a shorter meeting, a four-day meeting, was preferred, rather than extending over two or three weeks. Comparing with the first draft of the block schedule, there was a request to allow more time for communities to meet and not to limit it only to plenary sessions.

Also, the networking slots should be fewer and clearly defined in purpose and what to expect there. The plenary sessions were reduced to two and, the public forums, both events should not be conflicted. It was suggested that plenary sessions and networking slots were to be spread in different time zones so that participation from different regions could be possible.

There is a question if the meetings with the ICANN Board should happen during ICANN70 or not. So, that's something to please keep in mind that we need to know. And this is the current revised draft block schedule,

and I'll walk you through it really quick. So, now, it is four days from March 22nd to March 25th. The time zone will be Cancún, UTC -05:00.

We have five blocks that will go. The first and last are 60 minutes and the ones in between are 90 minutes with 30-minute breaks in between. These are the general planning for those days. So, on Thursday, there is tech day. The DNSSEC workshop was thought to be on the same day but now it is moved to Wednesday, as it usually is.

Then on day two, usually, the board meets with the SO and ACs. Those continue, also, on Wednesday. There is the GAC communiqué, the GNSO Council session, and then there are public forums and wrap-ups in the last day. Those are like general things to consider when drafting the general block schedule. The networking slots were moved to the breaks and they are distributed in the different breaks so that, again, the time zone is different for each of them. Well, not the time zone, the time [that the] time zone participants can join.

There will be two plenaries and those are the blocks that they are scheduled. They need to be in the 90-minute block part. Speaking of plenaries, these are the proposed topics so far. So, we have registry voluntary commitments, practicality and enforceability, suggested from At-Large. Also, "applicant support; what does success look like?" from At-Large, too. There is one from the Business Constituency regarding regulatory updates.

And a last-minute one is "technical Internet governance and Internet governance: differentiation between the two concepts." That is from the NCSG. Please, if you have any comments, or preference, or none, it will

be really helpful for the NPC to provide feedback regarding these because there are two slots and then we will be asked to vote on which plenary topics are the best to be included.

So, please let the NPC know, or me know, what are your preferences. This presentation will be available to you later. Also, ICANN Org is testing better user experience regarding the Zoom and virtual meetings. So, there will be some better integration of interpretation to provide more easiness to have it, as you remember in the previous meeting.

You needed to have two devices to be able to get interpretation where it is provided. Now, they are trying to take that extra device off the question and also to provide live, real-time transcription in English. So, those are some improvements they are making. And this is, now ... I'll walk you a bit through to what the planning for ccNSO session is.

Before ICANN70, there will be two ccTLD news sessions, as we have done before. One will be at 19:00 UTC and the other at 11:00 UTC. These are two different sessions. It's not the same session repeated but two different parts. There will be, also, a community webinar, this one is the same content, one at 19:00 UTC and one at 11:00 UTC, to reach out to the community, and to promote the work of the ccNSO, and to invite them to ICANN70. And at the end of March we have, well, ICANN70.

So, for the ccNSO members' meeting, the following sessions are being planned. One is the governance session that is a follow-up from ICANN69. There is also a session of ccTLDs and the future, that the plan is to see how can the ccTLDs be resilient to the changing of circumstances, because people expect us to be always online and available. So, how can

ccTLDs be resilient and what the future can bring. And also, to have a Q&A with the ccTLD-related ICANN Board members. More information will be available soon in the link in the Wiki.

I take this opportunity to make a call for volunteers. We still need volunteers for the ccTLD news session. So please, if you know someone that is doing something interesting and it will be good that everyone knows what they are doing, please reach out to them and tell them that the call is open until the 10th of February. I'm not sure how many presentations we have received so far but I know that we need more.

So, please reach out to your colleagues or let us know who to contact. Also, the meetings' program committee is seeking for participants if anyone is interested in joining the NPC. Yesterday, Barbara, the chair of the NPC, hosted a webinar for interested parties. If you are interested or know someone who might be interested, there is a link for more information there. That is it. So, I'll go back and, if you have any questions, please let me know.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, thank you. So, are there any questions? Any suggestions, maybe even guidance for NPC and those who work with other SO/ACs on the planning of the big ICANN ... Which of the topics would you like to support for plenaries and other things? Oh, I see that Nick's hand is up. Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Yeah, just a question, really, an observation on the suggestions made already for the plenary sessions. A lot of these are really nothing of much

interest to the CC community, so they tend to be quite gTLD-specific, like these public interest commitments or applicant support, I guess, for new gTLDs.

So, I suppose it would be useful for the NPC to understand the council's view about the extent to which we just don't support any gTLD plenary sessions because ... I mean, it's a bit hard to ask our members to engage in a plenary session where, really, there is absolutely zero relevance to the CC.

So, perhaps a compromise is that we should have, maybe, one gTLD-focused session, but at least one of the plenary sessions should not be focused on gTLDs because if they are both focused on gTLDs then you're effectively excluding the CC community, I guess. So, we need to just, maybe, focus on one area of interest to us and leave one area, perhaps, for the gTLDs.

So, I would have thought the regulatory area around NIS, etc. ... Well I guess, from a European perspective, that's of high interest to us, but it didn't seem like a huge amount of choice. But if you're interested in an international cross-community session, not really specifically focused on gTLDs, there is not a huge amount of choice for us in terms of support there. That's my comment.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah. Thank you, Nick. Please note that these topics are proposed by SO/ACs. If we do not propose topics that are of interest to ccTLDs, then you just end up with what the others propose. That's one thing. Another thing is that ALAC, many others like GAC, they also are interested in

gTLDs. So, if ccTLDs are not interested, it does not mean that all other communities except for GNSO are not interested. So, this is more complex than that. Yeah, please. Nick, you want to further comment.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. It was a good point and maybe we should be more proactive, I guess, as a lesson to suggest our own topics. It's up to us, I suppose, to be proactive in suggesting topics which we think are interesting for us but also would be interesting to the wider community. I suppose my heart sort of sank a bit when I looked at the suggested topics from the other parts of the community because they weren't ... I'm not very enthusiastic about any of these, to be honest.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you. Alejandra, you wanted to comment, too?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Not specifically on the plenary session topics. I was more on the next questions that I wanted to ask for the council as in whether we should or not have a meeting with the board, but I didn't want to go over what you were going to say, but that was like I was, "Should I? Shouldn't I?"

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Just a little bit, a word, of caution for Nick. Once you start proposing sessions, be very aware it takes a lot of effort to organize them properly. To date, I think we've done ... So, the ccNSO has organized a few sessions. I think they were pretty successful. The last one was DNS in IOT.

But it took a small group of people, especially presenters, etc., and people in the background who organize them, a lot of effort to make it work, especially in the environment we're currently having for ICANN meetings. So, the more you put effort or the more topics you propose, you may end up with something that we had in Johannesburg. I think the ccNSO organized three plenary sessions. I still recall the almost ... I was knocked on my head by Katrina. I didn't spend too much time or not enough time on ccNSO-related matters. It is very, very time-consuming. Just a word of caution.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you, Bart. I didn't knock so hard. Margarita.

MARGARITA VALDES: Alejandra, I would like to know, in the session that is with the At-Large, when you say "from At-Large," it's something that is needed or required from the At-Large, or is our idea in order to connect with the At-Large interests?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, it is a proposal that was made from them. So, they are the ones proposing that topic for the plenary session.

MARGARITA VALDES: Okay, perfect. Yes. Well, I have a lot of friends from At-Large and, normally, sometimes I need to explain them, for example, in the case of they are a little far from the CC issues or CC uses, for example. It's very helpful for them to understand better the ccNSO environment and so on. So, I think it's a good idea.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Katrina. A question I had was around the last item, there, from the NCSG, which was technical Internet governance versus Internet governance. Maybe I haven't been paying attention or noticed what they were doing here but do you have a sense of how they are differentiating it? Because I think that's potentially a very interesting one for us, particularly given all of the changes in regulatory and legislative frameworks and activity that we're seeing around the world.

When I'm thinking about this, I'm thinking of, in a sense, the seven-layer stack and the later that we occupy down in layer three, but all the activity really happening on layer seven, and yet many regulators and policy-makers trying to drive the layer-three folks, us, to do the work of the layer-seven problems.

To me, this is quite an interesting subject that is very, very relevant to us, or to many of us, as regulation and legislation evolves. I'm just wondering if you could give just a quick insight on where they are going with it? And maybe there is an opportunity for us to participate in a more meaningful way.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think we haven't seen a full description of those topics yet. I think, now, it's time when everyone can submit their topics/ideas, but, any in-depth papers on what they mean and how they see the session, we haven't seen that yet. We only have seen those proposals. These are the topics they have proposed and nothing more concrete, yet.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thanks. It might be something we want to just keep an eye on, then.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, sure. Absolutely.

BYRON HOLLAND: That one is very relevant to us. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: It is, thank you. Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Just all these plenaries are, then, when they are proposed, and then the topics are selected. Afterward, ICANN opens the organization of these sessions to all the communities. So, if we are interested in participating in that specific topic, we can. So, when the time comes, I can certainly forward the e-mail to you, Byron, in particular, or to the council so you know that we can participate in organizing the session.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. I see that Margarita and Byron still have their hands up. Are those new or old hands? I assume they are old ones. Definitely, we keep an eye on developments and, as soon as we know anything, as soon as we are asked to vote on the topics which we prefer, we will reach out. Okay.

So, I see there are discussions in chat and some good input from Peter and others on networking sessions and specifics on virtual meetings and getting away from the screen. Some things that we need to discuss and understand, whether we as the ccNSO Council wants to meet with the board, with the GAC, and ...

GNSO Council has already reached out. They would like to meet and discuss several things. So, we're thinking about topics for discussion. But yeah, we have been asked whether we want to meet with the board. I think, in this case, the primary thing is whether we have anything to discuss with the board. If yes then, definitely, let's go for the meeting. If not, I'm not sure that there is a point on scheduling a meeting and then trying hard to come up with topics for discussion.

Therefore, we really need input from you. Can you think of any topics that we would need to discuss with the board or the GAC? Maybe we should target GAC within our webinar on our ccPDPs rather than have a bilateral meeting. So, any feedback on that? Because we really need to understand that and we need to move fast/schedule meetings if we believe we need ones.

So, any comment on that? Okay. Let's do it that way. Right after this call, we will send out these two comments, whether we want to meet and what would be topics for discussion, but really, with a very short time for a response, we need to move really fast with this one. Okay? Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Also, within that e-mail, maybe we can ask you also to let us know if there is something specific that you want us to address with Göran, since we will have a call with him soon. Right now, the only topic that we had in mind is the website, and now there will be a meeting about that. So maybe, if you have any other topics that you would like us to discuss with him, that will be very nice. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, good. Let's ask that. Alejandra, please lower your hand. Thank you. Okay. Let's move forward, then. Council prep meeting. Let's start with council workshop, actually. Thanks a lot to Jordan for the brief summary of our last council workshop. I think that's a very good one.

And I think, in that paper, he also volunteered to propose some next steps, some edits. I think we should accept his noble and generous offer.

Let's not forget what we discussed but let's move ... Maybe not so fast but, at least, slowly and steadily move forward with some good potential changes/improvements in our efficiency. What we need to discuss. Yeah.

Apparently, our proposal for the next council workshop would be Tuesday, 16th of March, noon UTC. Great. If that date definitely does not work for any one of us, any of you, that you are sure that you want to participate, please suggest your date. If not, maybe we can confirm this date.

Then, yeah, what to do in the upcoming workshop. There are several suggestions for that. Yeah, we definitely need to think about the role of chair/vice-chairs. One of the things that we really would like to start discussing is how to get more councilors involved and how to help councilors to be more active, just to make sure that we can distribute the workload more evenly. And of course, work plan. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Just with respect to the time, I think it might be worth that we send out a Doodle because this is tentative, say, starting tomorrow, so you know at least ... Because there will be a lot of meetings. I could imagine that some people would not be able to attend and you want to have the majority of people, or the largest number of people, on the workshop. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yep, that's absolutely true. We need as many people as possible. Actually, prior to this workshop, we will have an onboarding session with our

newcomers, our new councilors. So, I hope that they will also join this council workshop. Okay. And then we also have, tentatively scheduled, a council prep meeting. That's for Thursday, 18th of March, 18:00 UTC. Okay. We will discuss that. We will still have a little time to think and plan for our workshops. Okay. Quick update from ECA. As far as I know, there is absolutely nothing happening there. They are waiting for budgets and plans. CSC. Anything from you, Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, the only update is that IANA, this time, didn't do a perfect score. They missed one SLA but it was for fairly nothing. It was due to the Christmas season and it was fully explained and nothing to worry about, but this time it is not excellent, it's satisfactory, and that's that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, and thanks to IANA. Hopefully, they will do better next time. Okay. Any updates from anyone on the council, or secretariat, or regional organizations? Okay. I do not see any hands up. Okay. Thanks. Update from—

BART BOSWINKEL: Giovanni has his hand up.

KATRINA SATAKI: Oh, Giovanni. Yeah. Please, Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I'm very happy I have become invisible. So, we had just started with the SOPC the work to produce the comments on the ICANN fiscal year 22 and fiscal year 22-26 operating plan and budget. We had a call two days ago with the SOPC membership and, next week, we have a call with the GNSO-equivalent.

We will produce our comments by the deadline, which is the 15th of February, and we will share it, also, with the council and the ccNSO community. It is, as I say and as I define it, quite a monumental work, a monumental document, because it's over 300 pages to check, but we'll make it. There has been, already, quite a lot of work done by the members of the committee, so thanks a lot to all of them. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you very much, Giovanni. Internet Governance Liaison Committee, Joke, anything new there?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Yep, there was a call for volunteers, currently ongoing, for the IGLC, just as the NPC also looks for new members, potential members. Pierre Bonis is chair of this committee and he will host a webinar next week, where he will explain a bit more about the work of the committee and how to join the committee.

But there's another thing that I would like to mention, as well. At ICANN69, it was the Hamburg meeting. The IGLC explored or started to explore the topic of digital sovereignty, which is a very popular topic. It touches everyone. The IGLC would very much appreciate being able to

have a session at ICANN70, the Cancún meeting in March, because this session was well-received.

IGLC's previous meeting was well-attended, as well. In order to further explore this topic as an added value for the ccTLD managers, the group suggests to start defining various categories of digital sovereignty and provide some examples to provide the ccTLDs with further information and increase the awareness of the topic.

Target audience of the session are ccTLD managers, but not only. From previous experience, the group noticed that interaction with other SO/ACs has proven to be very valuable, hence this request to organize the session as part of the ICANN70 public agenda. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, thank you very much, Joke. That's good. Any other updates? I see none. We'll have written updates from liaisons then, as you can see, upcoming meetings, February 18th 20:00 UTC and then March will have a face-to-face, so to speak, meeting. Is there any other business?

If not, then let me introduce you to this new idea that we had, how it would help us to get more involved. As you may know, ICANN has approved Jamboard for the use [inaudible] ICANN and we immediately jumped on this opportunity. We already started ... Yeah, I see that Giovanni needs to leave for another call. Thank you very much for being with us. Yeah. Talk to you later. Ciao.

Okay. So, Jamboard. We have already tried this with GRC and, as far as I know, ccPDP and the review mechanism also tried that yesterday. So, the

idea here is that we'll all have a link to this Jamboard and everybody can participate in writing Post-Its and write these notes. So, you can click, choose a color for your sticky note, write something, and just press save, and have this sticky note. So, you can stick it anywhere on the whiteboard.

That's what we did at GRC. So, we had two groups. On the top of this screen, you can see, here, slides. There are several slides. So, each group can have a different slide, so they just, for example, group number two goes to slide number two, group number three goes to slide number three.

And actually, that group discusses and, as they discuss, they write those Post-Its and they stick them on this whiteboard. They can move those sticky notes around. They can add pictures. They can add drawings and, actually, texts, as well. Oh, you can see here we had text and everything.

So this, basically, helps us to simulate our face-to-face discussions. Remember when we had those sticky notes, everybody writes something and you can stick it somewhere on a wall? Okay. Now, I will ask Kim to post a link into the chat window so you can all go.

Basically, you need the browser to access this Jamboard. You'll go into a browser window and, as it has proved, the trickiest part is to get back to the Zoom window afterward. Somehow, sometimes, it's a challenge because that Zoom window seems to get lost, but it is possible to get back. So now, you all can go and, basically, understand what it's all about. Don't mix all those sticky notes, please, too much. It's just for you to try

because this is something that the GRC has worked on and we will continue working on, on that, at our next meeting.

Therefore, do not change text or position of these sticky notes. It's just for you to get acquainted with the tool and think how we can use this tool next time during council calls and, most definitely, during council workshops. We will use this during council workshops. So, get familiar with the tool, play with the tool, and get ready for it at our next council call. Any questions? Any immediate feedback? For example, you can say how great it is to have a tool like that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Yes, actually, it is. It looks like fun. We are going to get some progress with it, so good idea.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Okay, good. Thank you. Yeah, okay. Kim will circulate the link to us, sandbox, so that we can play with it. I just wanted to show you a real outcome of the real discussion and how we used it in a real-life environment. But you will have a sandbox so you can play with it. Okay. Was that, I think ...?

Yeah, it is, absolutely. It's very easy to use. It's definitely not nuclear physics, so everybody can do that. You can use different colors. Again, as I said, you can add pictures, and shapes, and everything. Yes, absolutely, that would help us to get this feeling, at least try to simulate, this face-to-face interaction. Okay.

We will send you, again, some Doodle polls. We'll send you some questions regarding bilateral meetings, so please propose topics. And we will, as Peter put it, subject ourselves to Google's influence. It was Google Docs. Yeah, we'll send you a link to Google Docs and, of course, links to the sandbox so you can play with Jamboard.

Okay. If there are no further questions, let me say something I forgot to mention in the very beginning of the call. Happy New Year! This is the first council meeting of the year, so I hope this year will be, let's say, a better one, and less messy, and maybe we won't meet face-to-face this year but we will definitely meet in 2022. I'm looking forward to that moment and I really hope ... Well, it can't come soon enough. Okay. With that, thank you very much. See you all on the mailing list and Google Docs. Thanks. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]