ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hello everyone, welcome to the ccNSO Council meeting 175. Today is 22nd of July 2021 at noon UTC. My name is Alejandra Reynoso, I'm the chair of the ccNSO, and we're going to start the Council call.

Welcome everyone. B4e anything else, I will kindly ask all councilors to please add ccNSO Council to their name in Zoom so they can be found more easily. I'm going to put in the chat the link to the documents that might be helpful for this call.

Thank you, everyone, again for joining, and if possible, if it's in your capacity to do so, if you can turn on your camera, I will really appreciate it. if it's an inconvenient time to do so, please don't mind. But in any other case, I like to see you. Thank you.

Okay, so I've been told that we are quorate, and we have two apologies. Is that correct?

KIM CARLSON: Hi Alejandra. Yes, we are quorate and we've received apologies from Ali and Giovanni today.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you very much. I will run really quickly through the agenda to make some observations. We have the relevant correspondence, minutes and action items, then intermittent decisions since our last call, progress on ccPDP 3 retirement members' vote, CSC-related matters, and for item seven and eight which are the progress on the expanded

role on the triage committee and a proposal to create a representative group to coordinate Work Stream 2, we have some notes there.

We will talk a little bit more on the balance of the work load, we will talk a little bit on the resourcing and expected delivery dates. So let's see how we can cope with those. And on item nine, which is ICANN hybrid meeting, I propose to defer it to the next meeting. It is still very important and we will discuss it further later, but since ICANN 72 has been announced to be virtual, maybe we can discuss it in our next call and have some time, because we will spend some time on item ten, that is the ALAC session, and item 12 that is on the topic of ccNSO and DNS abuse. Item ten is the update on the ICANN Learn course and then the remaining items are updates which are all written updates so far. Next meetings, and Any Other Business.

Any comments or Any Other Business that I should be aware of beforehand? I of course will ask this again when we get to that item. Okay, I see no comments and no objection, so we will move forward. Thank you very much. I will have two AOBs and I will just let you know beforehand, I want to say this two times.

One is remember, please, that we have an ongoing survey on the rules of the ccNSO. The GRC subgroup has already published that. So remember that. And also, we need to start thinking about our bilateral meetings for ICANN 72-related sessions. Remember that in August, we don't have a Council call, so we will keep our work offline, but still, we need to think about those since in September if we might be a little too over the dates that we need to achieve. So I'll come back to this again at the end, but still, so you know.

Moving on to relevant correspondence, we have none. And yes, on our first draft agenda for this Council call, we included the letter to the ALAC chair because this was under the assumption that it was going to be adopted and sent before this meeting. However, as you know, the adoption of the letter is now on this call, so that is why we removed it from the agenda.

Moving on to minutes and action items. All action items are completed from the Council and secretariat perspective. Please note that item 173-03 which is regarding the tech working group update of their charter is going to be followed up and will be included in the next agenda in September.

Okay, moving on to next item. If at any point you believe I'm going a bit fast, please let me know. Item four, meeting decisions. We have the adoption of the member report on ccPDP 3 retirement. Thank you all for acting without delay on this matter. The report was distributed to the members well in advance for the voting, so this was a very efficient job to be done. Thank you.

And then we move swiftly to the next item that's in progress, the ccPDP 3 retirement members' vote. Please, Joke, would you be able to provide us with latest numbers?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hi Alejandra. Hello everyone. Yes, happy to do so. When I just checked, we received 81 votes—that is excluding any duplicates. And there are currently 91 voters that have not yet voted. So 81 ballots received. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Joke. This is certainly good news, but still, we need at least 86 votes for this round of voting to count, so please, all councilors do reach out to the ccTLD managers that you know, give them a call, send them a message. Please ask them to vote. We are so close to making the minimum that we require, and it's very important that we pass this hurdle of the voting so the process can continue. It has been hard work for several years with the effort of many members, and it would be a shame that it could not come to completion.

I see Irina has her hand up. Yes, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you, Alejandra, and hello everyone once more again. I wonder if we have a list of those who have not voted yet, because looking at that particular list, I could probably identify whether I know somebody and reach them directly instead of just sending messages to everyone.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Irina. As far as I know, the voting is anonymous, so there's no way to know that. Am I correct, Joke?

JOKE BRAEKEN: That is indeed correct. Ballots are only identified by their unique ID number but not by the e-mail address to which the ballot was sent.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Joke. So Irina, yes, I agree with you. It could be nice to know who has not voted, but unfortunately, we cannot tell from the votes.

IRINA DANELIA: Okay. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Irina. Thank you, all the regional organizations, for their efforts in spreading the word regarding the voting and explanation of the policy. And again, continue those efforts, ask people to vote. We're very close. This is a very clear example where regional organizations and the ccNSO demonstrate their collaboration and the complementary role that we have to serve the ccTLD community. Besides that Irina has just mentioned, can you think of any other suggestion how to invite people to participate in the voting process? I know it's hard. So thank you anyway. Please, again, everyone you know, just make sure that they have voted. Yes.

MARIE-NOEMIE MARQUES: Yeah, Alejandra, excuse me. I have a very candid question. [inaudible] maybe you can answer my question. I'm wondering why the people that receive the mail do not respond. Because I suppose that we do have the right [inaudible] right persons. So, does it put a question about the people that receive this? Because in fact, it is in the interest of all of the community, so I would believe, I would think that everyone would like to support the approach.

So for me, it's not very understandable why there is not a massive positive response. So I'm just wondering if we are very aware of the people to whom this is sent, and just to have a clue about why do they not answer.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Marie-Noemie. You have just asked the million-dollar question. Whoever has the answer wins the prize. I really do not know why. I have many hypotheses. Maybe it arrived to their spam folder or they're not aware of it. Maybe they saw it and put it for later and then they forgot, or I cannot imagine any other reason.

That is why if we reach out to the people and make them aware of this, maybe they will say, "Oh, yes, I saw that e-mail and forgot," and that will be it and we are the kind reminders, or maybe they just don't understand what's going on and we can explain to them what this is about and why is it important that they participate. But thank you very much, Marie-Noemie, for your comment.

MARIE-NOEMIE MARQUES: Thank you for your response.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No problem. And I see in the chat there are a couple of questions here. Sean says, "Can each of us be given a 15-20-block group of TLDs that we can each reach out so we know we don't duplicate?" That's an idea. Why not? And Ai Chin is asking, "Can we know how many votes from reach region?" Unfortunately, no, Ai Chin. I asked the exact same

question to Joke maybe a week ago and since votes are anonymous, we don't know who has voted. We only know numbers, as in how many votes we have received, of course, and how many we're pending. But we don't know who has voted, and that's why we can't know that.

Jennifer is saying maybe they have their wrong e-mail. I know Joke had an extensive work in updating the e-mail list, so maybe something changed between the update and now. Yes, that can happen. But as far as we know, Joke has done a very great job of updating the list. Pablo is saying, "Working closely with regional organizations to promote voting seems to make sense." And yes, for this, let me tell you that Pablo and I were invited to the LACTLD event to participate in explaining the policy and to invite people to vote, and also, with Jordan, the three of us were invited by APTLD also to a call. Thank you very much for the invitation. We appreciate it, and we had the opportunity again to promote the voting. So those synergies work very well. I see Jiankang has his hand up.

JIANKANG YAO: Yes. I have some comment about this issue. Actually, maybe some ccTLD manager don't know what ccPDP 2 or 3 [inaudible]. Because from the name, the retirement of ccTLD, maybe this policy will affect his ccTLD. So maybe we can have some question and answer session or list some question and answer to the ccTLD manager. So, what is about retirement of a ccTLD? What will trigger this process? So many questions the ccTLD manager may concern. So, I think that may help promote voting. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Jiankang, for the suggestions. All of those have already been done. But what we can actually do is maybe in the next days—well, the deadline is approaching fast—we can send with the number of votes that we have been getting that has been distributed, maybe attach a very short summary and why this is important to you, you should vote. We've done this again, but maybe put it in the text so they don't have to go to another link and read the whole policy. And if you think this does not apply to you, it does. Something like that. But thank you, Jiankang, and thank you everyone for your input. Now it is time to move on with the agenda because we have some other interesting topics. So, thank you very much.

Moving on to item number six, CSC-related matters. Because ICANN bylaws and the charter of the CSC, the ccNSO is required to organize the CSC effectiveness review. The first review was organized three years ago. Last week, the leadership team of ccNSO and GNSO Councils met briefly to talk about how to organize this review.

The importance of it is quite evident. CSC monitors the performance of the IANA naming function on our behalf, and that is why we also need to see that they're doing their job. I'm sorry for my dogs. Somebody is entering at the door and they're defending me.

So the goal is to build all avenues [inaudible] first review with one additional element. So it will be almost the same process except that we will now check if the implementations of the recommendations from the previous review have been done.

We also discussed the timeline, and as you can see from the agenda, that's the timeline. We are expected to take a conditional decision and to adopt the template for review. So GNSO Council is expected to adopt the template as well in their August meeting, and then both councils will have agreed on that. And since my dogs are already making too much noise, I can ask Bart briefly to run through the background material, please.

BART BOSWINKEL.   Thank you. Kim, can you put on the PowerPoint and just go to the next slide? So Alejandra already said a lot of things, so I'll just very quickly skip through it. Again, this is just as a reference so you know why the ccNSO and GNSO councils have to deal with this now. And as she said, the first one was in 2018 and concluded in March 2019. Next slide, please.

The method is again in the template, you will see language that includes a bit of an analysis about effectiveness at the time, and I think the leadership of both councils expressed a wish to have a lightweight and short-term review building on the results of the first CSC review and also on the IANA functions review, which was concluded not so long ago. And also to avoid overlap with any of the outcomes of that IFR.

Again, according to the charter and the bylaws, the ccNSO and GNSO councils determined the method of the effectiveness review, and so the proposal is to use more or less the same method as used—and I'll go into a little bit more detail about the method in a minute. The reason for doing this is effectively twofold. One is it has proven its worth in the first

EN

effectiveness review. It's very focused, it touches on all the aspects of the CSC and whether the CSC performs their tasks effectively.

The second reason for doing this—and that's probably a very interesting one—is it allows for comparison of the effectiveness of the CSC over time. So this was done three years ago. The review now needs to be conducted again, and again in three years' time. So if you follow the same method of review which has proven to be valid and valuable, then it's interesting to see how the effectiveness has evolved over time if any evolution took place, or how it degraded. So that could be the evolution as well. So it really is monitoring against the same standards the performance of the CSC itself. So I think that's an additional value of using the same method.

Another special feature of the CSC effectiveness is that the findings of the review need to be adopted by the GNSO and ccNSO councils, and then depending on the type of recommendations coming out, it's the question of who needs to implement them and then it becomes a matter of ICANN Org and/or the CSC—maybe even for the ccNSO and GNSO councils. Next slide, please.

So the scope of the review is very limited. I'll leave this up to you. Next slide, please. Just to give you a basic idea of how the first review team has developed its method and recommended—so that was the drafting team at the time—is so you have a metric, and this is more or less the metric means it's [inaudible] described in the charter of the CSC. So that's the starting point, with the exception of the first one, but that's just a housekeeping metrics.

So for recommendations coming from the first review, I think the first question that needs to be asked, have they been implemented, and what was the outcome of the implementation? Is it yes, no? Was it satisfactory? Etc. So that's the assessment. Here's a very good example how it works. So you've got the metric, then you've got the assessment—that's the review team—and the outcome is yes, no, satisfactory, etc. But that's up to the review team.

So you can skip the next slides, Kim. Review process, how would it look like, interviews with CSC, PTI, PTI Board, maybe even with the Board Technical Committee. At the end of the day, that's up to the review team itself. They have the mandate to do so. Public session post-ICANN 72, maybe a webinar. Again, this is just suggestions for the future review team. They have to produce a findings report and publish it for public consultation, and then based on the public consultation, etc., produce their final report to be submitted to the ccNSO/GNSO Council. Again, this is all captured in the template. Next slide, please.

So the timeline, adoption, establishment, and this completed. I've used a similar presentations from the first review. It's not completed. It's ongoing. [inaudible] etc. It is not ongoing, it needs to start, but it gives you a rough idea and the dates are correct in a sense of September 21 that the review team is established, including the appointment of members, so two members by the ccNSO, two members by the GNSO Council, and then a liaison from the CSC, and then a liaison from IANA to ensure that all the information is available, etc. and to coordinate the interviewing.

And then you can look, at your leisure, about the timeline. And as I said, the previous review, the first, did manage to be completed within this timeline, including the adoption of the final report at I believe it was the San Jose meeting. But I'm not sure again. In 2019. Next slide, please. I believe that's it. Yeah, back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Bart. Are there any questions? No, I think we were very clear. Thank you, Bart. Are we okay with the process moving forward? May I see some green ticks, please, or red crosses, just to know if you are okay with it? Thank you very much. I see some green ticks. Thank you. And for good measure, is anyone objecting to this way forward?

Okay. I see none. Thank you very much. Then we can move forward. The next item here is the update CSC call for expressions of interest. As a reminder, remember that I was the member of the CSC until recently and we looked for my replacement, and Frederico was selected as such. But his term will end in October because he was filling in for me. That is why we have a current call again for nominations for the next period starting in October.

If two or more candidates apply, we will use the same method to select one of them to be the person appointed to the CSC. Joke, could you please give us a brief update on how are we doing with the proposals?

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Thank you, Alejandra. So the call for expressions of interest has been circulated on the various mailing lists and published on the website, and it closes this Friday the 23rd by the end of day, so that's 23:59 UTC. So far, we have received two applications, and there's potentially a third one coming in as well, so we will indeed need to use the selection method that you just referred to. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Joke. So please be aware that this is coming to you and that you will need to make your selection. That is, put in your preferred order which is your most preferred candidate and the second one and the third one, and in case that you think that a candidate is not suitable for the role, then say so.

The ccNSO Council and the Registries Stakeholder Group need to coordinate the selection of the candidates with a few skillset and regional or geographical diversity. I've been in touch already with the Registries Stakeholder Group leadership to ensure that the coordination takes place. The Council has mandated a small committee to coordinate and confirm the selection. If you remember, this was done. And the full slate needs to be approved by both ccNSO and GNSO Councils. This has also been communicated to the GNSO leadership. And the ccNSO Council committee has been mandated to approve the full slate. So this is coming our way.

Next item is the CSC updates. They're written updates, so you can refer to it in the documents for this call. And now I will move to the next item. It's progress on the expanded role of the triage committee. In the

background material, you will have seen the evolution of the triage committee and why it is needed. May I ask Jordan—is Jordan on the call? I'm not sure. Or any other member of the triage committee to explain the next steps on what council may expect in the future.

BART BOSWINKEL: Laura, Nick or Marie-Noemie, if you're present on the call ...

MARIE-NOEMIE MARQUES: [inaudible] Nick [inaudible] make some progress on it, and I think it would be better to do like that. Is Nick available today?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yes. So we're talking about expanding the charter of the triage committee, and I've got an action from our call to have a go at—well, first of all, the charter hasn't been reviewed for a number of years, so it's due for a general review anyway, but I'm taking the first step at, A, reviewing the charter which needed to be done and B, to increase the scope to help us with our prioritization activity, which is what the plan is. But obviously, once that's done and the triage committee have got comfortable with it, then that will ultimately come to Council. And I think if it's not going to be in August, it should be ready for the September meeting and certainly, we're planning on having that ready for the September meeting. Did I miss anything out, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:	Not with respect to the review of the triage charter. Maybe anybody else from the triage committee? Otherwise, I'll chime in quickly.
NICK WENBAN-SMITH:	Jordan also took an action, didn'the?
BART BOSWINKEL:	I don't see Jordan.
MARIE-NOEMIE MARQUES:	Just if I can add something, the whole thing was about [inaudible] prioritization of actions in the triage committee. So all it is about is thinking about how to do it, and as Nick said, there is this updating of the charter which is concomitant to the approach that we have to ...
	So we have a meeting in August, on the 17th if I remember well, and I think that we'll be there at that moment to propose how to do it. So that's it at this stage, we have not gone so far.
	What we wanted to know also is to see if there's some [comment] from the Council or questions or whatever, because the idea was also to look for an agreement or support of the objective.
NICK WENBAN-SMITH:	Or at least to hear any objections to the approach. If there are any objections or questions, now is a good time to ask them.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Okay. Thank you very much, Nick and Marie-Noemie. I'm not sure, Bart, if you were going to say something else.
BART BOSWINKEL:	Yeah, maybe one more thing, so that was an assignment for Jordan and me, is to look at—first of all, you've adopted the baseline of activities at your previous meeting, if you recall. So that's the baseline or the baseline portfolio.
	We would identity two or three major work items and detail them, and see how the method of prioritization could work and apply to the work items. That's one. The second being that's related, it's also in the document that the triage committee and that will be reflected in time in the charter probably is it will be a bit of an oversight role, especially with those projects and work items which are fully under control by the ccNSO. There are a set of work items like Board elections or nominations, Council elections, CSC effectiveness review, etc. which are bylaw-driven.
	Because the ccNSO is what it is, you hardly have any leeway to organize them. However, there are other work items which you could defer and which you may or may not undertake or which are therefore fully under control by the ccNSO and the ccNSO Council. And these are the interesting ones to check if a little bit of more oversight and accountability would work in managing them and assisting the groups who undertake it to move forward. That's an additional point that was discussed and that will come up and that the triage still needs to think

through and think about next steps and how they want to organize it. Thanks. Back to you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Bart, and everyone in the triage committee for this work. So when you have a more finalized review of the charter and it's presented to the Council, then we can make comments to it. But if you want for us to have a look previous to that, please use the mailing list so we can have it in advance. And again, thank you very much for all your work. And with this, it is a very timely and nice segue into the next topic, ICANN proposal to create an ad hoc community representative group to coordinate on those Work Stream 2 recommendations where community prioritization and coordination may be required.

So the reason for including this topic on the agenda is twofold. First, last week the SOPC and councilors participated in the workshop on prioritization efforts introduced by ICANN Org, and the second is the specific case of prioritization on implementation of Work Stream 2 recommendations.

So for the first reason, this workshop on the prioritization efforts which was very interesting and very good, there was a discussion focus on the scope of the communitywide prioritization effort, the frequency and who should participate and how to organize the participation. Any immediate feedback from anyone who attended, or anyone from the SOPC if they wish to make a comment?

Okay, I see no hands up. Maybe even in the chat, do you consider it to be relevant for the broader ccNSO community, this effort presented? Ah,

now we go quiet. Okay. Well, in my view, it's a very interesting effort ICANN Org is doing. In particular, I'm very interested in the next session that will happen next Monday. Let me check the time for that one. It will be at 15:00 UTC. The focus of that session will be on techniques, systems and tools to be used to prioritize. So I think this will be very helpful for the triage that it's also looking to how to manage our workload, and to understand more about how prioritization will be done, what methods will be used.

Again, it's not only relevant for the SOPC. Maybe if some members from the triage committee can attend to that one, would be very nice, because they will deal with the same questions and issues but on a different scale and scope. But still very relevant. So please take note of that.

And the second reason, again, of this topic is the specific case on the implementation of Work Stream 2 recommendations. This is a topic that is coming up in another roundtable, maybe August or September, before our next Council meeting. And the main issue here is whether to create some sort of joint effort with the other SOs and ACs to work on the implementations, sharing best practices and all.

Do we have any comments on this one? Would we like to participate? Does this sound like a good idea? So far, the way we have dealt with the Work Stream 2 recommendation is that we have it as a checklist, so anytime we need to do something within the ccNSO, we go check if we can already attend any of the recommendations and make it work, instead of having them as a project or a priority and make them happen.

It has been effective. We have many recommendations already implemented or ongoing. But a concern on this joint effort is how much time and resources will it take from us that right now we might not have. So if you don't have any comments right now, please feel free to use either the mailing list or our WhatsApp group to let me know your views on this, because there will be a broader discussion later and they will want the ccNSO take on this. So let's keep it in mind.

Okay, moving on to the next item is the ICANN hybrid meeting. Again, we will defer this to the next meeting. It is very important, but again, since ICANN 72 is virtual, we can defer a little bit on this discussion. The MPC had an extensive and very interesting meeting regarding this topic in preparation of the outcome of the decision for ICANN 72, and there will be a roundtable very soon—as in Monday—to see lessons learned from virtual meeting and to start the preparation for ICANN 72. So if you have any suggestions on this, I will ask again to use them for the mailing list for this. Maybe I'll send a reminder later today, just to have your opinion for the Monday meeting.

And now I want to get to the next item, that is the update on the ALAC session, ccTLD governance models, testimonies from At-Large end users. So, before we go into the letter itself—and for the record, I want to make sure that everybody understands the process that we went through and approach that we have taken. As you know, the MPC always has a post-meeting session to review ccNSO-related or relevant sessions during the ICANN meeting. I always participate in those, both in my capacity as a member of the MPC but also as chair to listen and understand the feedback.

It was very obvious that people on the call who attended the ALAC session were concerned about what was said. Participating during the preparation myself, I had concerns on how this process was prepared and executed. Given these concerns, I raised the issues with you and proposed that we as the Council send a letter to the ALAC to express our concerns and suggest way to resolve the matter.

The letter then was shared as a draft, and with the help of everyone, we finalized it on Monday. Please note that the letter had a first draft and then when we received the complaint from Garth Miller, then we included his concerns and we tried to have a balance between the need to address the issues and the need for continuity of the relationship with ALAC, because we are both part of the ICANN ecosystem and we need to collaborate in future, if not anything else then at least decisional participants.

We are addressing comments from individual At-Large members about what was supposed to be the ccTLD they are associated with in their capacity as one of the many end users. This session was not about the role of ALAC. It was about end users and their views or their experience with their ccTLDs.

And people not sticking to the agreed purpose and agenda is an issue that we already raised. Maureen and I had a conversation recently regarding all these matters, and I believe that we understand each other in a very substantial matter. Still, there needs some work to be done there. I think the message was sent across as in we will have these requirements from now on to be able to do joint sessions. She understood them and she was aware that mistakes were made and she

apologized, and she knows about the letter that is coming her way and she said that they will look at it within her leadership and we could expect a response with sincere apologies. And I think we can move forward. Again, this was a learning experience from both sides and we should take the best of it.

But before we go into any further comments regarding this, I would like to see if you are okay with the process that we followed. So for this, may I ask Kim, please, to share with us some slides on how we're going to do this? Thank you.

We will use the annotate tool. So you can see where the screen is shared, there's a button called "view options." If you click on it, you will see in the menu a tool that says "annotate." So when you click on that one, you will see the toolbar that is right now on your screen.

With that, I would like you to, please, in the next slide, put yourself how you feel about the process that we did, having the MPC telling us their view on it, having it been brought to the Council, having it been discussed, drafting a letter, and then if we approve the letter, then we send it to ALAC. How do you feel about that? Please put anything you want there. For example, let me put one star, let's say I'm here in nine, ten. Please, all councilors, put—where you feel in the process. Was it a good process or not?

So again, it will appear on the screenshare where you see the presentation, there's a "view options" menu. It says in green you are viewing Kimerbly Carlson's screen, and right beside that, it says "view options." Yes, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: So if you feel comfortable that you think the process the Council went through, so not on the substance, etc. but just the process, because this is effectively the first time we went through it, if you feel comfortable, the ten is the marker. If you feel very uncomfortable, you think it was handled badly, put a mark near one. On my screen, I can only see three marks and I know there are more councilors on the call. So please annotate.

Your view option is at the top, so if you hover over the top bar where you see Zoom meeting, you see view options and you see you are viewing Kimberly Carlson's screen. Click on "view options" and then you can see a dropdown menu with "annotate," and then it opens and then you can use whatever marker you want to use, so either a stamp or an arrow or a cross to mark where you are, what's your view.

What I see on my screen, it's ranging from five, and I see a lot of entries in five up to nine, eight. Alejandra, may I suggest that we close this marking?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Mm-hm.

BART BOSWINKEL: And consider this a bit like the temperature of the room. Back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. Thank you very much for the input.

BART BOSWINKEL: May I take it from here, make it easy on you?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, please.

BART BOSWINKEL: This makes it easy for Alejandra as well. There were a lot of marks between five and six. There were a few on the higher end. What is nice to know going forward is not so much why you put it there, but if you're one of those people who put it between five and six, what is needed, in your opinion, to turn this into a—that you really have confidence in this process? What was lacking? What needs to happen to really put confidence in your process? Anybody who put on their mark between five and six want to speak to this? And some of you did, so you should have an opinion about this. Anybody?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Stephen says he does but he cannot unmute.

BART BOSWINKEL: There you are, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think all Council members know my view on this considering my correspondence on the 15th of July. I will not relitigate it. I think we discussed it.

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen, that's on the substance, isn't it? Or on the process?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Well, it's part and parcel because—yeah, that's a comment on the substance, but the process, I just think we should have had an extraordinary call to discuss it amongst Council. to tell you the truth, and that's why I ended up between five and six.

BART BOSWINKEL: A very fair point. I see.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: This was really serious, and I think we should have had an out-of-band call to discuss it as part of the "how do we respond to it" question. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Anybody else want to talk to this? What would have been needed to have more confidence in the process? I know there were more between five and six.

Okay, maybe we're too time stressed to do this now in this way. Back to you, Alejandra. But it's a fair comment from Stephen, it's something to take into account.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Can I just say something?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes please.

BART BOSWINKEL: Of course, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So I gave quite a good score in terms of the process followed. It's a fair challenge that we could have done an extra call, but it's quite hard to schedule these things, given the jurisdictions. And I think the way that it was done quite methodically and through everybody's input, through the Google doc, getting comments and refining it to end up in a place where everybody was happy to ... I don't think we would have done that in a meeting. The meeting might have been interesting and useful, but given the challenges with scheduling and the difficulties of explaining what's happened, some of us are not really paying attention to what happens in ALAC or some of us weren't involved, just watching at a distance, I think it did take a bit of time and probably, we got to a good place in a reasonably quick time frame.

I agree with Stephen, it is important and it merited a formal response in the way that we've done, but I think that's what we've done and it sounds like it's been set up very well with Maureen so that she knows it's coming and we can expect an apology for it. That seems good, and we'll be in a better place when it comes to the next ICANN meeting and there's another session.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Nick and Stephen, for your comments. All taken into consideration. And speaking about time constraints, we need to move forward. So now we will move to the stage of approving the letter.

So the draft letter is the result of common effort. We all participated. And as I said, the comment period closed on Monday evening to give everyone an opportunity to look at it and to avoid a continuous drafting exercise. We spent ten days on it. And there's a saying that says the best is the main enemy of good. And in my view, the letter is very good as it sends a clear message but it also keeps the door open for future cooperation.

Some of us were seeking a strong tone, others more accommodating, but I think we struck a very nice balance on that one. Again, is there any question or clarification on the letter itself, not on the content?

I see none. So we have a resolution in front of us. May I have a mover?

BART BOSWINKEL: Alejandra, Stephen has his hand up.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sorry. I didn't see that one. Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Alejandra. You know my view on this, and I just don't think this goes strong enough so I'm going to be abstaining. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you. Noted. But for that, we first need a mover and then a seconder. So I see Javier has his hand up for moving. Thank you. And Pablo is seconding. Thank you very much. Now we go to the voting. And if I understand Stephen correctly, he's abstaining. So, may I see some green ticks if you feel like you're in favor or red marks if you are not?

Okay, I see many green ticks. Thank you very much. And for good measure, I will now ask the reverse question: do you object to the resolution? Okay. Thank you very much. So we have one abstention and the rest in favor. Thank you very much.

Again, there's an exercise that I want to do with you on item 12. So if everyone agrees, can we put the item 11 for an online approval? Are there any concerns of doing that? Okay, I see nobody objects to deferring this to online approval. So we will go now to item 12.

At our meeting during ICANN 71, I raised this issue on DNS abuse in Any Other Business. As I told you then, I've been approached by several people with questions and comments about the role of the ccNSO in this area. At the meeting, we agreed to put this topic on the agenda for now.

As you may recall, at one of our earlier meetings, we already discussed whether the ccNSO should participate in the wider ICANN stakeholder environment discussion. At the time, it was decided that not take any further steps. However, since then, the topic keeps on returning on agendas and points of discussion also within our [context.]

For example, in ICANN 66 in Montréal, there was in ccTLD news a presentation on DNS abuse prevention system from EURid, and there was an ICANN plenary on DNS abuse. Then in ICANN 68, there was a session on the DNS in times of COVID, the ccTLD experience.

This session came to be after consulting with the participants in ICANN 66 if they wanted a session on DNS abuse, and they said yes, they wanted a follow-up.

Unfortunately, since ICANN 67 was abruptly made into a virtual one, we couldn't have it there so that's why it happened in ICANN 68. And then in ICANN 71—that's presently the one that just happened now—we had the ccTLD news session number two on DNS abuse, the ccTLD experience. And also, in Tech Day, the abuse and detection and mitigation system from EURid was again presented.

In the ICANN ecosystem, we have also some interest in this topic. GAC had a session in the last ICANN meeting on DNS abuse mitigation. There was a discussion during the ALAC session. The GNSO has approached us on the topic, and ICANN has the DAAR system on DNS abuse that it's inviting ccTLDs to join. Right now, they only have 16 ccTLDs.

So as you can see, maybe it's time to revisit and rethink the role and the relation of the ccNSO and the DNS abuse. For this, we have prepared a

mini workshop type of exercise to seek your views and thoughts about this topic. So, may I ask Kim to please show the Jamboard? Thank you very much. Next slide, please.

Councilors and others on the call are welcome to brainstorm and share their view on ccNSO and DNS abuse. What we will do is break out in rooms. There'll be three breakout rooms where councilors will be sent out for the exercise, and the rest will remain in the main room. For the first minutes, I will ask you to think of three aspects that come to mind when you see ccNSO and DNS abuse.

Then each group will come up with at most six aspects and then we will map them on impact, effort and [inaudible] Here, again, this is brainstorming. We don't have right or wrong, good or bad. Just we want to see where we go with this. So feel free. Next slide, please.

Here we have the examples that I already mentioned on what has been done to date. So you might need to go back and refer to them, but please do so in your group. Next slide, please.

So this is, again, time is key now because we have 20 minutes, so we will do this as fast as we can. Again, this is an exercise that there's no right or wrong, so just think fast. So we will have a couple of minutes, so you individually think something, then bring it to the group, then the group comes back and we see what everyone comes up with.

Thank you in advance for this effort, and please, if we can start the breakout rooms now, that will be awesome. Thank you. And the recording may stop for now.

Thank you very much, everyone. Thank you for this quick exercise. It's time for the summary. So maybe group one, start, please.

BART BOSWINKEL: I'll do it. We haven't decided, but the others were very much thinking—and I was just writing the sticky notes. And please, Irina, Laura, Jennifer—but she's on the bus—and Sean were on my group or in group one. And if I miss anything, then let me know.

So let me start with I would say what is probably the most—what could be a high impact but also is a very high effort suggestion aspect [inaudible] create kind of blacklist, TMF, terminate merchant file. So effectively, terminating registrants and registrars across ccTLDs.

You can imagine something like this, and it'll take quite some time. So it's a very high effort. If you look at the other ... There was a lot about sharing information, increase the news. That's middle impact to high impact and middle effort. And what was really supported by all members as probably a low-hanging fruit, quick win, however you want to call it, is develop a repository of what already has been presented, what ccTLDs are doing, effectively what we just started and put it somewhere in the ccNSO website or—and easily accessible for everybody else. And we didn't discuss the two other aspects but we just listed them, so I'll leave that there. So we start with develop repository, and the rest is in good order.

Back to you, Alejandra, unless anybody from my group has an addition.

IRINA DANELIA:	Yes, if I may, develop a common approach should be definitely moved. We didn't have time to discuss that, but I would guess that this is high effort and high impact.
BART BOSWINKEL:	Yeah. I agree. We didn't discuss it, so I left them where they are.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Thank you very much. So now we'll move to group two. That's where Stephen, Souleymane, Ai Chin, Javier and myself were, and we have these proposals. We thought also about the repository or some sort of good practices that should be gathered up to be able to be looked at and to be an inspiration for ccTLDs that might not have this in place already.
	The idea of creating a DNS abuse working group within the ccNSO to handle this or to channel the communications was thought as maybe too high effort but might be of high impact, so that's up there. and in the last one, maybe the channel of communication of this type of thing to the ccNSO could be the Council chair, but this could have very low impact as in it's one person and it could be a high effort because then this person should need to consult Council and see what's going on. So those are our four sticky notes.
	Did I miss anything from my group? Stephen, Ai Chin?
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	No, you got it. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, so that's it. Thank you very much. And we move to group three, please.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: That was the coolest room. The first thing that I would like to point out for group three is that we recognized the ccNSO's important participation in the discussion of DNS abuse. We should not stay away from this conversation.

I know that some have run with the ball with the GNSO and registries, registrars and others have been talking about it, but the ccNSO needs to play an important participation. And the ccNSO participation is extremely important.

So going back to what we did, we had three proposals. One was the development of a webinar in which several topics can be discussed to bring to the attention of the various ccTLD operators, and anything and everything that has to do with DNS abuse and discuss what are those factors that may promote or impede their adoption.

In addition to that—and we think that that is low effort, high impact. Engaging the community is another effort that we consider as low and has a high impact. And development of best practices, we consider that while we have a wide spectrum of ccTLDs, it would be high effort, low impact because we don't have a one-size-fits-all. if there is something that I missed, I invite any other members in group three to add what you think may be needed.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I'd just add one thing, Pablo. Thanks very much, totally agree and it was a very good summary and discussion. The only thing I suppose maybe I would say is that I know from the Registries Stakeholder Group, they have a set of definitions for what is actually meant by the term DNS abuse. So a lot of work has already been done there and we could take a look at their definitions and see if we can adopt those as the same or different, and maybe that would be something quite quick and easy to do since somebody else has done some of the hard work already. And if that were to be a standard and it could be put to the community as a sort of standard, then it shows that we're leaning into it. And I suppose I totally agree that we shouldn't not be part of this conversation, because the nature of these things is that if there appears to be a vacuum in what the CCs are doing, then other people like ALAC will seek to step into that vacuum, and that's no good for any of us. So that's my piece. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, group three. And right on time. May I go now to the main room group? Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Barrack is our man.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, then Barrack.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you very much. For group zero, the main group, I'll start with high impact, high effort is participating in ICANN's discussions which are already ongoing. There's a lot of conversation in the Contracted Parties House I believe and others on DNS abuse.

With respect to high impact, low effort, discuss what is DNS abuse within the ccNSO ecosystem and map the ecosystem to see issues that affect the registries, issues that affect registrars and issues that affect registrants. We also looked at information sharing, which has been talked about among ccTLDs, for example, what is already being done by TLD Ops and other constituencies in the wider ICANN community.

There's a suggestion for voluntary participation in ICANN's DAAR effort, and there's also a general feeling that DNS abuse should be considered, because ccTLDs are protectors of the Internet ecosystem and there's also more and more regulation being imposed on ccTLDs as a result of DNS abuse-related issues. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Barrack, and thank you very much, everyone for all your input. The secretariat and myself will consolidate all that has been shared, and then we will circulate the summary with everyone. And I know we are some minutes past the hour. I just want to make some reminders, as in, please go seek your peers and ask them to vote on the ccNSO policy. Remember, we have the GRC subgroup on rules survey running. Please do fill it in and let people know that it's in their inbox so they can fill it in too. And be aware of your e-mail, because

some of the topics were deferred and we will need your input on those offline.

Thank you all for attending this call. It was very nice to see you. See you next time. [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: The next call is September the 16th at 8:00 PM UTC.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]