KATRINA SATAKI:	Hello, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening from all corners of the world. In some parts, it's sunny and in some parts, it's snowy and cold. But we're here today. Our council meeting, 18 February 2021 at 20.00 UTC. I'm very pleased to welcome some of our new incoming councilors that are joining us today, just to see how we're doing. So please, dear old councilors, behave, and show best side of our meetings.
	Today, I hope we will go rather quickly through all the things that we have on our agenda, and we will have enough time at the end for this exercise that we discussed last time when we tried to think about all the issues and all the things we want to include in the new rules of the ccNSO 2.0 and all the things that we think we do not need to include. So that's if we have enough time—we reckon that we need at least 30 minutes for that. So I hope that we will have it.
	Okay, welcome and roll call. So, could you give an update? Jordan is here, so Jordan doesn't count as an apology. [I have] received any other apologies.
[KIM CARLSON:]	Yeah, happy to see Biyi just joined as well. We have apologies from Margarita, Marie-Noemi, and Abdalla, in addition to Maarten and Sebastien who are attending the GNSO council call currently.

KATRINA SATAKI:	Those are our liaison to the GNSO council, Maarten, and Sebastien is the liaison of GNSO council to the ccNSO council. And so they're joining GNSO council call today. Okay, good. Thanks, Kim. Next agenda item, minutes from our January meeting have been distributed. Please read them and see if you have any comments, any changes.
	Let's go quickly through the action items and to-dos from previous meetings. They all seem to have been completed. We will have some comments as we go. Yeah, the first one is still ongoing. Plurality. How do we define plurality?
	Inter-meeting decisions since our January call. We approved terms of reference for OISC. We're going to talk about that in a minute. We decided how we go forward with a meeting with the Board, we'll talk about that too. We appointed members to IGLC and MPC, and we also agreed on who will serve on members' community excellence award committee until March when we appoint new people. But if they start their work, so they will have this opportunity to complete the selection process. We won't change our representatives in the middle of the process.
	Okay, ccPDP 3, part one, retirement update. Stephen, are you ready?
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	Thank you, Katrina. One down, one to go. We finalized the text for the retirement policy, and it's been kicked back to the issues manager. It's supposed to go out for yet another public comment. I don't see Bart on the call.

BART BOSWINKEL: But I am.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Oh, he is. So you can correct me, Bart, as you did yesterday. Where do we stand? We're done.

BART BOSWINKEL: You are done, yeah. I hope you're done.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I hope we're done.

BART BOSWINKEL: What will happen next is the text will go out for public comment, including the question about the separation part one and two. So call it carveout, however you want to call it, because originally, the two PDPs, part one and part two, they were part of ccPDP 3, but as discussed during the last meeting, that was the Hamburg meeting I believe, the CCs present and the council thought it would be a good idea to try to separate the two and move forward with the decision making in the retirement process.

                        But in order to do that, we need to go through a public comment period, including on the final text of the retirement policy. So that's where we stand. So a public comment will happen, I'd hope to start to kick it off today, but it will be tomorrow ó—on Monday and it'll run until

the 2nd of April and then the decision making process will start. So that will mean if there is no serious concern from the community, it will first go to the council for support and approval, and then will go to the membership for support and approval.

And the issue with the members is part of the policy development process. There is a quorum rule. So at least 50% of the members need to vote. So there is a clear role for the current and incumbent councilors to reach out to their peers to engage them in the process and get them to vote. No matter how, as long as they vote. Thanks. That's all.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Bart. With regards to review mechanism, we had a meeting yesterday—we've had a couple meetings since council last met. We've had Sam Eisner from ICANN Legal pitch up not at yesterday's meeting but the meeting before that, so we've begun the engagement with ICANN Legal, which is going to be critical as we dive deeper into review mechanism and how we want to formulate that.

I thought we had a very good discussion yesterday and made some progress forward. We're going to have Sam back again probably not the next meeting but the meeting after that, and we do have a bit of a break because we're not meeting during ICANN. So we're trundling along there on the review mechanism is probably the best way to put it. And that's it from me, unless Bart has any additional comments he might want to add. Otherwise, back to you, Katrina.

BART BOSWINKEL: Nothing from me.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Any questions?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, any questions?

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, I see none. Thank you. Next agenda item, IDN ccPDP4. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. They're making gradual process based on the original text from ccPDP 2. This variant management sub-working group—so that was one of the three sub-working groups—has been convened. So that's members of the working group itself, and they will start their deliberations on the 2nd of March. So there will be a meeting every week, one of the full working group, and the alternate week, there will be a sub-working group meeting. The sub-working group will start on the look at the work to date from ICANN's IDN department and what has happened already in the GNSO with respect to SubPro given the request from the Board to coordinate the two policy efforts. So that's where it stands, and with respect to the full working group, they're making gradual progress. The good thing is they work from an already existing text, so it's refining and fine tuning the original text. They don't have to design and develop a new policy from scratch. That's a major difference. Thanks. Back to you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Any questions? No, seeing none. Okay, let's go to the next agenda item. We had to formally approve our response to Board's OEC. I hope you all had time to look at the final version. Thanks a lot to everyone who provided their comments and input.

Let's start—I will ask, who would like to move?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll move.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Now I saw two hands, Giovanni and Alejandra. Thank you very much. So let's use those hands to train our reactions. Okay, so, any questions? Anyone would like to raise anything regarding the latest version that had been shared with you? Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Hello, everyone. Just to see if you had the chance to see my e-mail regarding the ending of the letter. No? Maybe?

KATRINA SATAKI: I'm trying to remember. I know that I saw your suggestions in the document.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, but when the draft agenda was shared, I realized that it doesn't have an [end] in the letter itself. It just goes and it doesn't say like goodbye or take care or something.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I definitely saw it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So I sent a suggested text to add in at the end.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Any objections to say goodbye? [You don't want to hear from me anymore?]

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No.

KATRINA SATAKI: No objections. Okay. No objections, I see, in the chat too. Okay, good, so with that in mind, let's go to the voting. So you see draft resolution, so we approve it. Anyone against? Anyone abstains? No, it's a nice letter, very sweet, I would say. So, thank you very much. Approved.

Okay, next agenda item, again, another thing that's on our plate. As you remember, we approved the recommendations from IANA function review team last November, and one of the recommendations was to amend the IANA naming function contract, particularly, remove the

sentence that says the relevant policies under which the changes are made shall be noted within each monthly report. So there was no added value to reference the relevant policies or whatever.

So we approved that, and now—well, formally, according to the bylaws, these changes need to be approved by both ccNSO and GNSO councils. Who would like to move? No, reactions, please. Alejandra moved. We need a seconder.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: I second.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Javier. So we have a mover and seconder. Now, any questions, any comments on this? Anyone would like to amend something in the decision? If no questions, no comments—okay, good. Let's go to the voting. Anyone against? Anyone abstains? See none, so, approved. Thank you.

Next, that's agenda item eight, we're talking about OISC, that's the new standing committee that's [planning to establish] outreach [inaudible]. It will incorporate two of our current committees, the travel funding committee—not much work there at the moment—but apparently, when we resume our face-to-face meetings, they will review all the incoming requests for travel funding, and they also will take over the duties of this onboarding committee.

But in all other respects, its main function would be to oversee all the activities that are listed in the annex terms of reference and basically

work on the strategy, strategizing all our efforts. So they maybe won't do too much hands on things, but they will do more this oversight and see how we move forward. So we still need people who would do the actual work. But this committee, as you can see, its composition is quite telling so that they will see this strategy and everything, coordinate, basically.

Okay, but as you can see, requirements for membership are very interesting, and therefore, Joke, may I ask you to explain more about how we can proceed with populating this committee?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Yeah, happy to do so. So the suggestion is to send out a call for volunteers starting tomorrow, Friday, and the call for volunteers will close on Friday the 12th of March. So by then, everybody interested in joining the committee is kindly requested to step forward. There will be up to four ccNSO councilors invited to join the meeting. At least one of them should be a NomCom-appointed councilor, and then also the [MPC] chair will join together with possibly up to four representatives of the regional organizations. They are welcome to join as well. and up to three representatives from ccTLD managers.

So the call for volunteers that will be sent out tomorrow will also explain that if people are stepping forward, they should specify why they believe they are a good addition to the team and how they intend to contribute. So without these basic requirements being met, applications cannot be taken into consideration.

Once we have received all applications, council will review them based on the recently introduced general selection guideline, and afterwards when the members have been appointed, the first meeting of the group will be around the start of April. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Joke. We haven't approved the general selection guideline yet, which means that I'm not sure we can apply it to something that—the call which is going to be issued prior to approval of the guideline. Just some thought I just got—so maybe there are other thoughts on that.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Katrina, the process is the same as what council use for instance when selecting a mentor or the selection committee members for the fellowship program.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Sure. We all know the process, I'm just saying that maybe we should not refer to the guideline. But this is a procedural point. Okay, thank you. Before we go to discussions, questions and so on, anyone would like to move? Alejandra, thank you, and Laura, thank you, seconded. Excellent.

So, any questions, comments on this? Bart, yes, please.

EN

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe you said it at the start, but to avoid any misinterpretation and to clarify, the role of this community is not to replace any—with the exception of the two you mentioned, the travel funding and the onboarding, it is not to direct or instruct other groups, it is more to coordinate their efforts and to strategize. That's why it's such a broad committee, and to inform. So, not replacing any other work. And you'll see some of it with respect to the website whenever it will be changed, you could argue that's an outreach and involvement area, but that is an effort which is its own basis and own group. The only thing is they need to ensure that, say, what is happening for example in other outreach efforts is reflected in the [inaudible]. That's why it's so important, because as you've seen in the terms of reference, there are a lot of initiatives going on and there is no real coordination, and I would say almost prioritization among these efforts. So that's the role of this committee. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. So, any further discussions on this one? If not, then—so you see the decision. Let's go to voting. Anyone in favor?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Me. You've done it the other way.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. I'm checking if you're awake. Anyone in favor?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	Yes, here we go.
KATRINA SATAKI:	Okay, so I see yes, yes. I hope that everyone is in favor. Okay, good. Anyone against?
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	Now I have to make it go away.
KATRINA SATAKI:	It goes away automatically, and if you click it again, it—
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	Right, it went away automatically and I clicked it again. I'm sorry.
KATRINA SATAKI:	Yeah. So, anyone against? Apparently not. Anyone abstains? Okay. Good. Thank you very much. Let's move forward. Agenda item nine, we've been talking about this for several meetings. that's about our statement on the amendment of article 10, the ICANN Bylaws. Ai-Chin, may I ask you to provide a brief summary of the work?
AI-CHIN LU:	Yeah. I think from the draft resolution, the background is very clear, and we have already done the last drafting meeting. Yeah, I think that is very good. So, we have already submitted the cover letter and [relayed the document] to the ccNSO council, and I think today, we need to make

the decision. Adopting this letter. Yeah. Thank you. Or maybe Bart can add some information.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Bart, is there anything else you'd like to add?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, just one. I think your cover note, etc. speaks for itself. I think maybe one detail which is probably more a psychological thing is the suggestion to include ccTLD manager as a definition in the article 10, because it still talks about sponsoring organization, and the original text talked about sponsoring organization as well. So that's a small amendment.

But I want to draw your attention to the issues that have been identified by the drafting team going over the suggested changes and the request or the questions from ICANN Legal around the—yeah, and they list it as well. So that's why they separate it out in the draft resolution. They're not part of the note to ICANN Legal, but they were issues identified during the process. So that's all. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Okay, so before we move forward, anyone would like to move? Okay, Alejandra, thank you. Again, Laura, thanks a lot. Any questions, comments on the resolution? And in the resolution, so we support the response as proposed by the drafting team. We also ask secretariat to update our bylaw change repository according to these things that have been identified.

And yeah, we ask the chair to inform guidelines review committee and ask them to look at current guidelines and see where those guidelines need to be updated, and of course, at the end, we wholeheartedly thank the drafting team and the secretariat for their efforts and hard work on the ccNSO statement. It's not often that we go through a process like that. It's great to see it so expertly carried out. So, thanks very much. You see the decision. Let's move to voting. Anyone against? No one. Anyone abstains? No. It means that everyone is in favor. Thank you very much.

Okay, let's move to update on ICANN 70. Maybe I'll start by giving the floor to Alejandra, who'll walk us through. Okay, Alejandra, please.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Katrina. And just in case I forget anything, you can fill in, please. Kim, do you have the presentation? Thank you. So this is a brief update on the work on the MPC. Next slide, please. So remember that we talk about the proposed plenary topics. Well, this is how each SO and AC that voted, how the outcome looks like. So the top two are the governmental regulatory developments and community discussion, and also, the registry voluntary commitments, getting it right. Next slide, please.

There are only two slots for plenary topics, so these are the two topics that'll go to those plenary slots, and this is the general block schedule draft so far. So, nothing new there, except that [Biyi] requested moving the DNSSEC workshop from Monday to Wednesday. It's done. Next slide, please.

And this is how the ccNSO sessions will look like in our way to ICANN 70. I want to take the opportunity to remind everyone of the invitation that we have for a session [on the trends] on the 1st of March. It is important that if you want to participate, you fill out the form, because there's an amount of people allowed for the session.

Other than that, we have the ICANN prep week from the 8th to the 11th, where we have the ccTLD news, part one and two. Then what's new now is that we added sessions council-related, like for example, on the 16th, there's the council workshop. We will have a joint session with the GNSO on the 17th. And because of that, we need to move the community webinar a little further during the day because it clashed with our previous schedule, and we have the council prep on the 18th. Next slide, please.

So, this is what the ccTLD news part one and part two look like. On the 19th March at 19.00 UTC, [inaudible] will be chairing both sessions, and we have from .sv, .co, .bi and .au. And on Thursday at 11:00 UTC, again, [inaudible] will be chairing it, and we have the presentations from [.id, .rw, .ru and .be.] So I think it will be very exiting, these sessions, so hope you can make it to both of them. Next slide, please.

And this is how the ICANN 70 looks like for the ccNSO-related sessions. On Monday, we have Tech Day, then on Tuesday, the governance sessions, one plenary and the Q&A with the ccTLD-related Board members, and on Wednesday, we have the session of the ccTLDs and the future part one and two, and we end the ICANN week with working group meetings and the ccNSO council. And after the meeting, the MPC will meet on the Friday to see how the ICANN 70 meeting went and

what could be improved and what should remain. So please, as I request from the MPC, if you have any feedback you would like to give during the meeting, after the meeting, please let them know because they are always eager to know how to make this work for all of us. Next slide, please.

Here in the presentation, I will leave these links so you can have them in one space, and if you have any questions or you want to see how things are evolving, you have them on hand. And I believe that's the last topic if I'm not mistaken. Right, Kim? Yeah. So if you have any questions or if I missed anything, please let me know.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you very much. Maybe before we go to questions, I will give a brief update on all those bilateral meetings, what are the plans for that. As you remember, we discussed our meeting with the Board, and we agreed to go with our ccTLD-related Board members plus invite Maarten and León, chair and vice chair of the ICANN Board. It's done. Clearly, they are open for this experiment and see how it works. They're really interested in ensuring that our exchange is valuable, interesting and works for everyone. So as long as this session is open—and all our session are open—they are open to participate. So, good with that. Start thinking about questions.

Meeting with the GAC. As you remember, we discussed briefly that we are going to organize it again a webinar about ccPDP 3 and 4. We need to keep them informed. And that will take place after ICANN 70. We will move forward with that plan.

Speaking about our meeting with GNSO council, again, we asked you for topics and suggestions. Unfortunately, haven't received any, therefore we decided for another experiment and asked our liaisons. Unfortunately, they're not here today with us. As you remember, they are joining a GNSO council call.

So we asked our liaisons to discuss what would be possible topics of mutual interest. And I must say that this worked extremely well. They had a call, they discussed those topics and they have come up with, I think, a very interesting list of topics that we're going to discuss, and you saw the timeslot in Alejandra's presentation. We will share, of course, topics very soon, as soon as we have all the summary for the meeting.

Okay, so that's about it about those official sessions. Any questions to Alejandra or me? Okay, I don't see any. Thank you. Then of course, we'll have this council workshop. We will have to look at those roles and responsibilities of councilors. We will have to think about the workplan, ways to enhance collaboration in the council. Anything else? So if you have any ideas for our workshop, please let us know really quickly, because we are already starting planning for this workshop. And actually, please also know that we invited our five new incoming councilors. Hopefully, they will be able to join and meaningfully participate in setting the workplan that they are going to implement.

Okay, excellent. And council prep meeting. That's another one. Okay. Any questions now? No questions on these meetings? So if you have any ideas for a workshop or anything else, please share on the mailing list.

Agenda item 11, updates, ECA. Stephen, anything from you?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. We've had yet another change in membership on the part of the ASO. I believe this is their fifth or sixth representative, Oscar Robles who was recently appointed as the ASO representative to the ECA. Nothing has happened with the ECA correspondence-wise since I wrote a letter about someone named Katrina to go to Board seat 12, I believe it was. But we will be seeing an uptick in activity as the FY22-26 operating and financial plan and draft FY22 operating plan and budget continue to move forward. They recently closed for public comment, which means they're going to be in the Board's hands soon, which means they will come to the empowered community, including ccNSO, obviously, for a rejection action situation. I don't expect any controversy there, but we're gearing up for our busy cycle now through June, through the end of the fiscal year for ICANN.

Other than that, there's nothing to say. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. CSC, Alejandra, anyhting?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, for the January period, the IANA met 100% of the SLA, so everything is good, and that's that.

KATRINA SATAKI:	Thank you very much. Updates from chair, vice chair, councilors, RO, secretariat. I'll start with some update. First, I think it was last week, all days look same to me, but I think last week we had Alejandra, Pablo and I, we joined some ICANN Org people who work on the website and they showed us, demoed what they're doing for ICANN website, how they are improving all this document management and search capabilities and everything around the upcoming website, and we also discussed some basic things about the way—some features that they could provide for our website.
	We also—clearly, at least that's what I understood, that we will have some information from Google Analytics. They will also look at our documents and think how to structure them and how to present them on the website. But of course, we also will have to get involved and say what we want.
	Alejandra—is Pablo on the call? Alejandra, please.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Yes. I have a bit of an update. So the mentorship for the fellowship program has started, and I as the ccNSO current fellowship mentor can report that there is a group of five fellows and four alumni fellows in our team, and Jennifer is also joining us in the effort so she can catch up and then start at ICANN 72 when her term initiates and she gets acquainted with all the activities and all the things we do, even though she has already passed through the fellowship with me, but still, it's not the same being on one side than the other. So that's my update. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Another one from me. We've received notes from policy department on our call with Göran. It's one-on-one, or in our case three-on-one. So before I share them with you, I would like to, well, rant a little. As you know, the last process in preparation for ICANN 70, it was quite—now I'm struggling to find some nice words there, but apparently, we expressed our disappointment with the process. There was a survey and there were many responses to that survey, and then ICANN Org came up with the proposal how to proceed.

You'll remember we discussed it, we held two webinars and we came up with this document in which we shared position of the ccNSO. Actually, comments from other communities were very similar, and actually, they requested to change this document that came out of that survey. And during our one-on-one, Göran reacted quite—well, he said he was saddened by our comments—basically my comments—saying that something is wrong with the process, because now we're left with only few weeks to prepare for ICANN 70. Actually, yes, almost cried, which I enjoyed, to be honest. Yeah.

So yeah, and what he said, basically the message was—and apparently, that's what he said to other communities as well, is that we held survey, we prepared a proposal based on survey results, but you, SO/ACs—chairs—you broke the process and you changed that document that was based on survey results.

Well, we said you can't—we went back to our community and what we presented was our community position. I just wanted to explain this to you because what you'll see in the notes, we did not say that ccNSO and

EN

others broke the process. So yeah, it's just, let's put it, not entirely true. Okay, we'll share the notes after the call.

Any other updates from ROs, secretariat, other councilors? No updates? Okay, good. Updates from liaisons, written updates. Oh, no, sorry, before we go—working groups. SOPC, Giovanni, anything?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah, Katrina, thank you for giving me the floor, and yes, we have just submitted the SOPC comments on the ICANN fiscal year 22-26 operating and financial plan and fiscal year 22 operating and financial plan. We have been very nice. Not so nice with ICANN reiterating some of the comments we made in the past. And also, trying to get some clarification on some of the figures that we have been presented and also some of the operating initiatives and functional activities.

So yes, we look forward to receiving the feedback from ICANN and understand also that ICANN Finance wish to have a meeting to go through the comments together and eventually ask questions on the comments that we have produced. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Joke, anything from IGLC?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hi Katrina. The IGLC started preparing for the ICANN 70 session, which will be held on Thursday the 25th of March. The main topic of the session will be digital sovereignty. There will be an overview of the

efforts that the IGLC has done in order to categorize and come up with proposals. The main idea of the session is to share examples and to give food for thought to mainly ccTLD managers on the topic of digital sovereignty. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Regarding guidelines review committee, we'll keep working and discussing all the topics that could, should, should not be included in the rules of the ccNSO 2.0. We also started thinking about this governance session at ICANN 70. We don't have much time for that, but yeah, we had interesting discussions around this, so we tried to understand how community sees all those things that ccNSO governance and so on. We're working on that too. And now, as you can see, decided today, voted on some more additional work for GRC. So, thank you very much.

Okay, update from liaisons will follow. Meetings. next council meeting will be March 25 during ICANN 70, and then April, May, and then you will discuss about upcoming meetings. Maybe you will have to look at the rotational algorithm and decide what works for the new set of councilors.

Any Other Business. Again, I'd like to stress this [trends] exercise. Please, read the e-mail. We participated before in such an exercise. It was in—I remember the room, but as always, I forgot—I think it was in—okay, I will not speculate on that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Panama.

KATRINA SATAKI:	Panama, yes. I wanted to say Panama. No, actually, I didn't, I wanted to say Johannesburg, but then I realized it wasn't Johannesburg. Panama, right. Did it in Panama. It was a very interesting exercise and that's a real opportunity to participate in providing some feedback to ICANN [inaudible]. Not feedback, but input. That's more precise. So please sign up. Number of seats is limited, as Alejandra already stated, it's 30 people.

Another thing, I shared with you this e-mail from Keith Drazek about their activities in DNS abuse. So they invite us to participate in their discussions on DNS abuse. We have talked about that and we see where there are issues with the definition, the scope and so on. So I already saw some feedback from Margarita, Pablo, some others that yes, probably, these are very important discussions that we should participate. But the question is, how should we participate? Should we have our own ccNSO working group on DNS abuse so that they can coordinate, discuss it, and then participate in those meetings with the Business Constituency, or any other options, how can we work with—first, discuss it among ourselves, that's one thing. Another thing, how can we discuss it with other communities, how can we make sure that this important discussion does not happen without our active participation. So, anyone would like to share their thoughts?

Nick.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Hi everybody. Yes, it is an important discussion, and it's something that I think we have been a bit slow on, perhaps, and it's partly because, obviously, the ccNSO doesn't have a policy creation function for this sort of stuff, for the members of the CCs. We each have our own approach to abuse in terms of—exactly, there's questions, definitions, mitigation, and how do you even measure it, all of that stuff.

But certainly within Europe and the European region specifically, and specifically within CENTR—well, the lawyers within CENTR so I can speak to that very directly, we spend a lot of time talking about this, but normally from the perspective of how to avoid more regulation and how to prove competence and how to make sure our voices are heard in the right places so that we don't get hit with unnecessary or misguided regulation from Brussels primarily. But I guess in terms of how we participate, we could have a sort of talking group, but I don't know how useful that would be.

I suppose, given that we each create our own policies, I think there's two things, really. One is to educate the rest of the communities that actually, the CCs have very different policies, we don't follow ICANN policies, and we each do what is right for our respective national communities, and that comes back from culture and legal systems and structure. And the other thing would be to maybe try and showcase how good the ccTLDs are versus the gTLDs in terms of having proportionate and effective ways to mitigate abuse because we all know in this group that the ccTLDs are much better, of course, than the gTLDs, and it would be a perfect, I think, opportunity to prove it with some facts and figures and best practices which we can do because we don't have to follow the ICANN mandated policies on these sorts of things.

EN

So I don't know if that's a useful comment, but that's kind of just me thinking off the top of my head.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you. But you're not in favor of a group. Could it be, for example, ccNSO council liaison that particular group or whoever invites us—

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Maybe an open call for people who are interested, because not all of us are that interested. I don't think you should limit it to the liaisons and councils.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, but you know those volunteers would not, probably, educate or showcase—

NICK WENBAN SMITH: I think they would have to be told, the reason why we're asking for volunteers is to showcase and educate.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you, Nick. Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Katrina. Just kind of one other angle in addition to Nick. I thin kif we don't have a group and we don't have a sort of effort to explain to

the community how we do it differently, then we risk being enveloped under the ICANN umbrella in [inaudible] organizations like the European Union or some of other regulatory functions on a national level. So I think being able to highlight those differences from the contracted parties and making sure that by our silence, we don't get kind of lumped in by accident would be an important thing to do. I think starting with an open call and seeing if there was interest in having some kind of an informal group might be a way to go. I don't think we need to look straight into having a working group or a committee on this or anything.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Jordan. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I just want to echo Jordan's comments. We don't need a working group per se, but we also need to make certain that we, as Jordan said, don't get lumped in with what else is going on out there. It's not that big of an issue, I don't think, within the ccTLD community, and I think that's where we need to distinguish ourselves from the rest of the pack. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. I still do not understand how we can make sure that we get information back from those who participate if we do not have a formal group, so [inaudible] no chair who would inform [inaudible]

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think we need to have some sort of liaison effort with those groups that are wrestling with this issue just so we know what's going on, but other than that, I don't see anything further. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Stephen. Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you. I am on the other side of this discussion, as in I thin kif we want to join this effort, we need some sort of structure to be able to do so. So I do believe that a committee would be a good idea, or maybe a working group, why not. And I wanted to know why the others state it is not necessary.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Alejandra. Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Just to respond to your question, I was more thinking that you'd have an open call and see who you got from our community and sort of discuss that with them, whether they think a working group would be a good vehicle with a sort of formal person who's [inaudible] with the chairing and being the liaison with other efforts or whether they thought it was enough to write down some shared perspectives and then just use our normal liaisons to the other councils or ACs to do it. So I'm not against a group. I think we should test whether that is the right approach with an

open call for those people who are interested in this topic areas rather than just deciding in this call to set up a group.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I concur with Jordan completely. I think the idea of setting up a working group at this point is overkill. I understand, Alejandra, your concerns about being in touch, etc. But at this point in time, if there's interest, okay, yes, but to put out a call for a working group and have nobody pitch up is not a good optic for the ccNSO, and I don't see in my gut that this is a topic of seriously high concern that cannot be addressed by our liaisons. So that's my take on that. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Stephen. I think one of the things is to make sure that it remains not an issue for ccTLDs. Nick, I see your hand is up.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Thank you. Yeah, I agree with this. And I don't object to a working group if that's the right way to go. I would say that some of us are already involved in other DNS abuse forums, so Internet & Jurisdiction, and I don't know if you've noticed but PIR have set up an abuse institute, so there's going to be an advisory council for that for example. So some of us are already doing this out in other forums. So there are other ways to do this.

I think it's a really high interest topic, and I think we need to be a bit careful not to be complacent about it. So I do think we should definitely do something. And maybe we'll end up forming a more permanent working group, but let's start at the beginning, I guess.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. We will prepare information for the community to share with you and see what else you'd like to add there, and then we just send it out and see what the reaction is.

Okay, now exactly we have half an hour, and hopefully, we can sue it for our exercise. Again, that's an experiment and see how it works, this council setup during this regular council call.

As you remember, last time we showed you the Jamboard. We also shared the output of same exercise when we did it with the guidelines review committee. The list of currently identified topics for the rules of the ccNSO, the list had been shared with you, so you can have it open, or you don't have to consult the list. If you think of a topic that needs to be included, please, by all means do that.

We will break into two groups. Here you see the list of currently identified topics. We'll break into two groups. One will be managed by Bart, another by me. Group two will leave this room, group one will stay here, and then we will come back and really briefly compare our notes and we'll continue the discussion. For example, during the upcoming council workshop.

Are there any questions? Or maybe let's just try and see how it works. Okay, let's break now.

[KIM CARLSON:]   Bart, are you still there?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, I am. I think it's easier if I share my screen. Or you need to do the sticky notes.

[KIM CARLSON:]   No, it's up to you on what you would like to do. You see what I have. So right now, we've got the group one. The group two people have already moved over with Katrina.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. So if you can do the sticky notes, or Joke—I don't know, it's your screen, so I can do the sticky notes.

[KIM CARLSON:]   Yeah, I'll let you do that. Let me stop my share, because I might need to stop over into the other group.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. There we are.

EN

JOKE BRAEKEN: Bart, I'm happy to take notes if that is helpful.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, you might take notes, but what I want to do is—I'll do the sticky notes and leave it up to you. Some of you may have, through the MPC, already done this exercise. I've changed the screen. In front of you, you see a list of topics that is—

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]