
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Good time of the day, everyone. Welcome to our ccNSO Council meeting 176 on the 16th of September 2021 at 20:00 UTC. My name is Alejandra Reynoso and I'm the ccNSO Council chair.

For the ones who are just entering the room, please, councilors, remain your Zoom name with "councilor." I want to welcome you all, but in particular, I'm not sure if already here, but if not, later, newly appointed NomCom councilor, Tatiana Tropina who will take her seat after ICANN 72, and to everyone else who join this call.

For today's call, all documents are posted in our Wiki, which I'm sharing now in the chat so you can have a quick look if necessary. Kim can you please tell me how are we with apologies and if we are quorate?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Hi Alejandra. We are quorate and we've received one apology, from Giovanni.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you so much. Okay, with that, let me start by saying that there is a new structure on the agenda, with the intent of having a more efficient session, putting all administrative matters and updates on the first part of the agenda and all possible discussions on the last part of the agenda. So keeping that in mind, I'm moving to item two, which is relevant correspondence.

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.

Please note that letter to ALAC and a response have been received. This was an action item and no further action is required. And there was no follow-up session during ICANN 72.

The CSC effectiveness-related matters will be discussed on item 12, and the approval of the full slate of the CSC was [the action] to the Council CSC selection committee. They were the ones who did the approval, which for your information are Biyi, Jiankang, Irina, Sean, Javier and myself.

And regarding the ICANN bylaw request changes, it's under item nine on the update from the chair. That's where we will address that part. Moving along on item three, we have minutes and action items. So all action items have been completed. However, there are two actions from previous meeting which we need to follow up.

One of them is an update on the tech working group charter. Stephen, do you know if or when we'll receive the suggestions?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Alejandra. Yeah, the short story here is that nobody in that working group is a wordsmith except me, and I came to the realization that I'm going to have to do this. So I'm going to set out, after trying to pull teeth from a walrus, to propose a new charter for the working group based on what we've actually been doing these last few years as opposed to what was set out years ago, run it through that group and then give it to the GRC. My timeframe is to try to get that done in the next three weeks for presentation to the working group. I doubt we'll get a whole lot of response or enthusiasm, so my plan is to write a new

charter, have discussion with it with the working group chair, and assuming there's not huge pushback, submit it to the rest of the working group—I doubt I'll see any comments from them—and then give it to the GRC and move it forward in the usual manner. Does that work for you?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. I believe it does. What I want to confirm with you, is three weeks a reasonable time for you to take on this task?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, but it needs to be done and we've been kicking it down the road since early summer. And I would like to ... It's not going to be done for ICANN 72, but I would certainly like to try to get it to the GRC certainly in the November timeframe so it's in the GRC's court to deal with. It's not like writing the rejection action stuff, it's actually going to be pretty simple. I will endeavor to get it out as quickly as I can, but I do have a day job and other things going on, as you know. So it's not going to get done unless I take responsibility for it at this point, I'm pretty sure, because it's fallen on deaf ears until now and there's going to be no progress on tis that I can see unless I pick up and are un with it, so that's the plan.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Stephen. I think it'll be very much appreciated from all of us that you take this on.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You're most welcome. Thank you, Alejandra. Back to you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. The other thing that I wanted to discuss that we have from previous meetings is the discussion on the new role of the triage committee. As far as I know, they met recently. Maybe it was today that they met. And it might be quite soon to have a discussion now on the new role that the triage is going to have. So if there are no objections, I would like to defer that item to our next Council call. I will give time if anyone wants to raise a hand, say anything regarding that.

If not, let's defer that item for the next Council call. Thank you. Moving along to intermeeting decisions, we've taken some decisions since the 22nd of July. We adopted conditionally the CSC effectiveness template, we've selected Frederico Neves as member of CSC, adopted the resolution on deferring translation of the ICANN Learn course, and we also had some Council decisions following the triage committee recommendations. Any questions or comments?

I see none, so let's move forward with the next item. Here's where I was telling you that the format of the agenda has changed. Now we will go through the written updates. And unless there is any special developments that Council needs to be aware of or there's any Q&A or any questions, this is the way we will move forward. So I will go through each item and ask if you have any comments or questions. And if not, just move along to the next one.

Starting with item five, update on ECA and CSC. Are there any comments or questions? Just to remind you, there is a summary of all these written updates attached to the Wiki as well.

I see none. Then let's move with item six, which is the working group updates. Any questions or comments? I believe Pablo wanted to share something with us, but I don't know if he's in the call right now. If not, let me do that for him.

There was a suggestion from the GRC on updating the members meeting guidelines to address virtual meetings. And we passed this to the OISC. And after discussion within the OISC, they suggested that the Council should really put that in the hands of the MPC which are more involved in that, they're the best positioned to suggest any guideline changes, and we received an e-mail regarding that too. And the OISC does not want to interfere with the work of the MPC and avoid any overlapping.

So the proposal is for me to request the MPC to address the questions by the GRC and propose changes to the meeting guideline if deemed necessary. Any questions or comments?

If you think this is a good way forward, would you please put your green tick on? Thank you. I see several green ticks. Thank you very much. So if no objections, then I'll do what I said, ask the MPC to address these questions and to propose changes to the meeting guidelines, if any.

On the other hand, I do have some latest news from the MPC. The ICANN 72 ccNSO-related sessions will come later in item 14, but earlier today at the MPC call, it was announced that Guðrun Poulsen was

elected as MPC vice chair and the ccNSO Council needs to formally appoint her. So the proposal is to use an e-mail decision for this. Is there any questions or comments regarding this? Okay, I see none, so we will do an e-mail decision. Thank you very much.

Now in item seven, there are updates from ccPDPs. Any questions or comments? Okay, moving forward. If I'm going too fast, please let me know. Thank you, Javier. We have the updates from the liaisons from ALAC and the GNSO. Any questions or comments?

I see none. Thank you very much. Any now we start with the items that are up for discussion during the meeting. We are now in item nine, update from the chair, the vice chairs, councilors, regional organizations and secretariat. Let me start with some updates.

I have three. One of them is a meeting that I had with Göran. There is usually one on one meeting prior to any ICANN meeting. And the topics discussed were ICANN 73 being tentative hybrid meeting. There is no decision yet from the Board, but there were some observations regarding the recent worsening of the pandemic situation. It's getting a little bit more complicated. This involves traveling, transportation, visa requirements, etc. So it's something that they're taking into consideration now.

We talked about the ccPDP3, the retirement of ccTLDs and its successful completion with the final approval by the members. Also, briefly on ccNSO sessions that will happen in ICANN 72 and how the membership was participating under the COVID-19 pandemic.

Let me check one thing. Okay. So that was the first part. The second thing that I wanted to let you know is that there was a meeting with the ICANN Org executives on the next steps regarding the ccNSO website. As you saw in the e-mail I sent you, we created a steering committee to participate in the feedback and requirement gathering sessions about the ccNSO website. The first session will be scheduled between the 20th and the 30th of September.

Given the short time, it was decided to form a ccNSO Council committee, and if later we feel there is a need to expand this group, we can always launch a call for volunteers. I would like to take Stephen, Pablo, and Nick for stepping forward to join Katrina and myself in this steering committee, and we will be reporting you on our progress in these next steps on the ccNSO website.

And finally, the last update I had is regarding the bylaw change progress. So as you will know, some community members raised their concern on the latest iteration of proposed changes to Article 10 and Annex B.

The current consultation was about editorial changes to the proposed bylaw amendment, including the moving of the definition of territories from one bylaw section to another. It was not about substantive matter or the definition itself. It was just moved from one place to another.

But in any case, there was a concern about the introduction of the term territory as a concept to describe geographic areas to which country codes have been assigned.

For this, let me give you a little bit of history and some observations. The March 2020 bylaw change request is the result of separating ccPDP

in two, a request for the bylaw change to include IDN ccTLD managers as proposed in 2013 and to review and update the policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD string that is now our ccPDP number four.

And the definition of territory was included in the original proposed policy as supported by the ccNSO membership in 2013. And therefore, it was included in the March 2020 request for the bylaw change. So this term is not new. The first observation is, well, that this text has been around for at least eight years and this definition was supported through a ccPDP Council and membership decision making process in 2013.

Observation number two was that it again was explicitly presented and discussed in Montreal at ICANN 66. This was in 2019, and no concerns were raised at that time with respect to the inclusion of the definition of territory.

So, based on the history, there is practically no way that we can make a substantive change of this definition now on the fly, unless we go through a ccPDP to actually change it. For now, the matter is again in the hands of the board, which will include a public consultation as always. But from my perspective, I think the matter is closed. We cannot actually change this definition. And if you agree, I will respond to all community members that were concerned about this along the lines of what has been already explained. Any questions or comments?

I see none at the moment. Yes, Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Hi to all. Good to see you. Essentially, I don't know if I'm out of place, it's a question on a prior topic, on your conversation with Göran. Can we talk a little bit about that?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sure.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Will the Board have to then revisit the decision of ICANN 73 hybrid? And when would that be? Did Göran give you a sense, a time period?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, he didn't tell me when the decision was to be made. He only told me that there was not a decision yet on this particular topic.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Got it. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: You're welcome. And I see on the chat that Irina and Souleymane agree with my proposal on the reply to the concerns on the territory definition. Just for good measure, are there any objections? Okay, I see more agreement in the chat from Jennifer, Jordan, Pablo and Laura. Thank you very much.

So let's move on. Are there any updates from the vice chairs? Yes, Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Just two quick things. Apologies for being late, I had a clash with another meeting. And apologies for the delayed work on the triage stuff. My availability got changed because of a new COVID lockdown in New Zealand that started about five weeks ago. So I will definitely have progress for you at the October meeting.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Jordan. I see Pablo has his hand up. Yes, Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Alejandra. Just a quick reminder that my update was provided as a written update, so it's available there. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. Any updates from any of the other councilors or the regional organizations, or the secretariat? If not, then let's move forward with item ten. So as you all know, the recommended policy on the process for retirement of ccTLDs was supported by the members. According to Annex B, we as Council need to adopt the Board report. That's the report that will be sent to the Board. This report should contain the result of the members' vote, the ccNSO recommendation following the vote by members of the ccNSO, and a final report which contains the proposed policy process for the retirement of ccTLDs.

Once adopted, it has to be sent to the ICANN Board of directors and the reason for putting it on the agenda now is to mark the closure of the

part one of the ccPDP3 and to introduce the policy in our meeting with the ICANN Board during ICANN 72.

It is important to note that this decision is specifically required under Annex B Section 14 and mandated to the ccNSO Council. So this decision is not subject to the rules of the ccNSO.

Are there any questions with respect to the substance of this decision? I see none. May I ask for a mover? I see Pablo. Thank you, Pablo. May I ask for a seconder? Thank you, Jordan. Are there any questions with respect to the resolution itself?

Okay, I see none. So let's take a vote. If you're in favor, please check your green ticks. If you object or are abstaining, please, your red ticks. Thank you very much. Lots of green ticks. And just for good measure, anyone object or abstain? Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I just want to thank everybody for your support on the retirement policy and moving it along to its next step. Thank you guys very much.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Okay, so this has been approved, and now we can move to the next item, item 11, an update on the Council elections. For this, I will ask Joke to provide us with an update in her role as the election process manager.

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Hello Alejandra. Hello everyone. I'm happy to provide a short update on the call for nominations to the ccNSO Council. The call for nominations was published on the mailing list on the ccNSO website earlier this week and started on Wednesday the 15th of September. It will close three weeks later, so that is Wednesday, 6 October. That is the deadline for nominating and seconding candidates.

The instructions on how to do so have been circulated. There is a mailing list to which the nomination and secondment templates need to be sent, and that allows us to have a public archive accessible to all to view the nominations and the secondments.

Once the call for nominations close, once the deadline is over, the candidates will be asked whether they accept their nomination, and if they do, they will also need to provide a written candidate statement. And that is ahead of a question and answer session that will take place at ICANN 72. It's tentatively scheduled for Tuesday the 26th. It's a one-hour session where the community has the opportunity to ask questions and interact with the candidates for the ccNSO Council.

If there's more than one candidate for a particular region, an election will need to be held. The timeline regarding all of this is also published on the ccNSO website, and I'm happy to paste the link in the chat afterwards. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Joke. Any questions, comments? Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Alejandra. This is a question directed as Joke as election manager. I saw some correspondence earlier about a nomination that was made and then a request to withdraw that nomination and a follow-up e-mail from you saying yes, we can do that. I'm wondering if that should actually be part of the mailing list historical record, that a nomination was made and then subsequently withdrawn as opposed to not putting it in the permanent record, because after all, there was a nomination made, and a nominator I believe can always withdraw it and that's what happened, but I'm wondering if that little episode should not be part of the permanent record. Thank you.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you very much for the question, Stephen. So the mailing list works as follows. Once an e-mail has been sent, I receive a notification, and e-mails need to be manually approved or rejected. In this case, the person that sent the e-mail asked to reject the e-mail to make sure that it doesn't get published in the public archive. So that is why that particular e-mail was rejected and not published in the public archive. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Joke, for that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Okay, then let's move forward. Thank you, Joke, for the update. Now we'll talk about the CSC second effectiveness review. The staff circulated a call for two volunteers to serve on the second

Customer Standing Committee effectiveness review team on behalf of the ccNSO. The call for volunteers was opened from the 27th of August and closed on the 10th of September. Only two community members applied, and therefore in accordance with the selection mechanism in the ccNSO guideline, these members will be appointed by the Council.

Are there any questions regarding this topic? I see none. May I ask for a mover? Jennifer, thank you very much. And for a seconder.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll second.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Thank you very much. Are there any questions with respect to the resolution itself? I see none. Okay, then let's vote. Again, please, your green ticks in favor, your red crosses if you abstain or object. Okay, seeing many green ticks. Thank you very much. And again, just for transparency, does anyone abstain or object? Okay, thank you very much. Then this was approved. Thank you all.

We had item 13, the progress on the expanded role of the triage committee, but as we said earlier in the call, we will defer this to the next meeting. So let's move forward. And now we will talk about the ICANN 72 meetings and what is planned for us there. May I ask Kim, please, to share the presentation? Thank you.

So this is a more visual summary of what we have in the agenda. So we can see when is happening what. We have these two ccTLD news sessions, and we will have a new ccTLD news session number one that

will be a general session but not so general because it'll be split in marketing one part and legal and operational in the other. It will last two hours. I know it says 90 minutes there, but the latest update was two hours so we'll see how that one goes.

And the second ccTLD news session will be on the topic of Internet governance. Those will happen on the 6th and 7th of October prior to the ICANN prep week. And after the ICANN prep week, we will have two newcomer community webinars. One will be on the 18th of October and the other on the 20th of October. As you remember, these webinars help us promote what we do in the ccNSO and why it is important to participate and stay updated on the activities of the ccNSO.

Then we will have an ICANN 72 ccNSO Council prep call on Tuesday 18 October at 12:00 UTC. Please mark that on your calendars. And we have tentatively GNSO and ccNSO joint meeting scheduled for the 20th of October at 19:00 UTC.

And in the agenda, there were some topics that we had already proposed to discuss with them and I wonder if you have any other topics that you would like for me to send to them. Just let me read them aloud. One is the ICANN prioritization framework. Since the SOPC has been very active, they will also have a session in ICANN 72 and we would like to know GNSO perspective on that and how they do the prioritization of their work.

Also, we can talk about the CSC effectiveness review, and maybe discuss how is the coordination between the IDN EPDP and the ccPDP4 going, if

there is any need for any coordination. So those are the topics so far. If you think of any other, please let me know as soon as possible so I can send them to the GNSO.

Thank you, Kim, for the quick switch of documents. Now we will move forward to the ICANN 72 schedule. We will have on Monday Tech Day, three blocks. On Tuesday, we will have a Q&A that Joke has already talked about for the candidates for the Council.

Then we'll have the ccNSO governance, and the SOPC will have its meeting. On that same day, there will be the first plenary session on moving forward with the global public interest framework, and on Wednesday, 27th of October, there'll be another plenary on how to design inclusive, equitable hybrid ICANN meetings, which we will discuss ourselves later today. And there will be ccNSO and DNS abuse part one and part two, and this is coming from the exercise that we already did in a previous Council call. With this, we want to have the input from the community on how they see this topic, if the ccNSO needs to get involved and how. So please, do attend all the sessions that you can, but in particular, this one will be very interesting and I hope for a lot of interaction.

Then on Thursday, 28th, we will have a joint meeting with the ICANN Board and ccNSO. And for that, we have proposed the topic of explanation of the proposed policy on the process of the retirement of ccTLDs as I've mentioned before, and take the opportunity to thank Nigel Roberts for his work on the ICANN Board and to give him the opportunity to share his views.

If you have any other topic that you would like us to bring to the table for this particular session, please do let me know as soon as possible. We have received from the Board to provide input or comments on how you think we could efficiently identify and work more closely with governments globally, as well as educate, train and interact when it comes to geopolitical issues related to ICANN's mission. That's their topic for us. Please do think about it when we get to the session. And if you would like to start discussing it—well, not right now but through the mailing list or other means, that's also open to prepare for the ICANN Board and ccNSO joint meeting.

After that session, we will have our council meeting, and then the TLD Ops will have their public session and public forum, Board meeting for the AGM, and that's what'll happen in ICANN 72. Any questions, comments that you may have? I see Javier says the Board session will be interesting. Definitely.

No more questions that I see. Okay then. Good. Then now we will move forward with item 15. We have a mini Council workshop on ICANN hybrid meetings, what are the requirements from a Council perspective.

So you have received this material in advance, but I will do a brief introduction right now. This topic has been discussed by the MPC and in previous Council meetings. These hybrid meetings will become very relevant in the future since of course, life has changed for all of us and we don't see that it will go back to what it was soon enough. So we will need to live with these new formats.

So, the results of this session and input from other future meetings, we will try to work together with the MPC how to best have hybrid meetings. So for this particular session, we will have a little bit of a brainstorming and we will do it as we did last time. We will have the 3-12-3 format, so again, time is key here. In the first three minutes, we will be brainstorming in separate breakout rooms. There'll be breakout rooms where all councilors will go to, and the rest of the audience is welcome to join this exercise too and stay in the main room for the discussion of the exercise. We will stop the recording—not right now, I will say when. But the first three minutes are for brainstorming, then 12 minutes, we will discuss to identify three to six aspects and assessments on impact and effort that these particular proposals have.

And then we come back all to the main room and in three minutes, each group will report back on their findings. Are there any questions? And now I ask Bart if I missed anything from the instructions.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Hi Alejandra. No, you didn't. As Alejandra said, just to emphasize, time is of the essence. You've got three minutes individually. You will be preassigned to some of the rooms, so that may take some time. Then you have 12 minutes to discuss the impact and effort of your proposal, and then each group has three minutes to report back to everybody. And the next steps will be, as Alejandra already said, that a secretariat will record your findings or your suggestions and then the Council will take it from there in order to check whether there needs to be an action plan for the hybrid meetings of the ccNSO.

Maybe one last point is that the main room will be facilitated. The moderator will be Katrina. The other three rooms with the councilors, Alejandra, Pablo and Jordan will be the facilitators. We as staff will assist the facilitators, but they will run the discussions during the 12 minutes and they will report back from the findings of each of these groups. So in that sense, it will be community members reporting back to the full group.

I think that is emphasizing what you just said, Alejandra. Back to you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. Kim, may I ask you to please stop the recording and to start the breakout rooms? So we are back from our discussion, and it's time to report back to the main room and hopefully have a little bit more of discussions. As I can see, we have room zero that was the main room, and Katrina will report back. Is that correct?

KATRINA SATAKI: That is correct, but I think we'll go last like we did last time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Then in Joke's room, who was assigned to report back?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hi Alejandra. I believe that Jordan is going to report back.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks. Our little group did a bit of brainstorming about the issues. Most of those are in the yellow and tags on the left. But the ones we want to highlight was that the card on the right, the people from the region will be more present I think, because of travel restrictions and the slow resumption, and that will go to people who show up—it'll unbalance the meeting in terms of the informal discussion that'll happen.

And in terms of making the hybrid side really work, our two [inaudible] and when people are speaking, at the moment, as remote participants, often they don't appear, you just hear their audio. So we think it'll need to be a change to a video setup so that we can see people speaking when they are remote participants. and everyone can have a chance to see a face as well as hear them.

Now, of course, that also depends on the Internet connectivity that people have from wherever they're doing the meeting. So it isn't going to be possible all the time, but it does need to become an option, probably. And then the other one is translation, that there's an opportunity with hybrid meetings to build in more stakeholders from more regions who couldn't necessarily come to an in-person primary meeting, and we should extend the translation services into the ccNSO.

We said the effort was higher. It's a kind of expense effort, I guess, but maybe the organization will be spending less on travel costs with these hybrid meetings, so some of that money can be reinvested into translation. And then the yellow cards on the left are just topics that we brainstormed. So that's our brief report back, unless anyone else wants to add anything. Back to you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Jordan. It's my turn. In our case, we did a little brainstorming, and unfortunately, we couldn't finish the impact and effort analysis, but the ideas are there. In summary, there are some things that are worth keeping from the current virtual meeting. For example, be more selective on what gets in the agenda. No need to fill the day as packed as we did before.

There was a lot of conversation regarding socialization, networking, getting to know people that we only maybe see named in an e-mail but we've never seen them or spoken to them, and somehow try to bring these networking activities to the virtual environments to not only have the participants to have the chances on the hallway but also for remote participants to be able to do so.

And with this, there is a very nice concept brought that we should only talk about participants without making the distinction of whether they are remote or in person, all participants should experience almost the same thing regarding the ICANN meeting and that should be maybe what we should be looking forward.

And also, there were some comments regarding, to put it in the other way, if people can't have their vaccinations ready, then maybe there'll be some social distancing while present and facemasks and everything, and looking at it from a different perspective, this might be a disadvantage for those who are present and an advantage for those who are remote because they can show their faces without facemasks. So it's an interesting point of view.

There were some suggestions maybe to have projection of the remote participants and maybe some GoPro cameras to go around the halls. Some ideas. But in essence, I think that was it unless I forgot something. Please, team, let me know.

All good, says Javier. Thank you. So we can move to our next room, that's with Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: It's Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sorry. I just read the Jamboard. Thank you.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Bart and Kim, for all your support. I'd like to begin by stating that we found complementary comments with you, Alejandra, regarding social distancing, vaccination, testing, and having open areas or at least ensuring that we have proper air filtration to ensure the wellbeing of presential participants.

In addition to that, we also found complementary comments with Jordan's comments because we began to talk about equal participation, ensuring that remote participants—I apologize for using the terms of presential and remote participants. All participants. But in order to

ensure that remote participants have the same access. And while we did not define it as well as Jordan's group did, we were thinking about the same thing. So thank you, Jordan, for that, and thank you, Alejandra, for mentioning that.

One point that is very important is that in order to ensure that the wellbeing of presential participants is taken care of, we must comply with government requirements in terms of vaccination, social distancing, mask wearing and so on, at least in the US and Puerto Rico. So we're preparing for that.

So one of the things that we would like to do is to ensure, some of the comment that were made were to ensure that we had testing units on site and also vaccination units on site. With that said, if there is anything that anyone would like to add from my group, feel free, please. Otherwise, we're done.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Pablo. And now, we will go to the first but now last group that was the main room.

KATRINA SATAKI: The main group. Thank you very much. We probably took a little bit different approach. We started by defining things that we know. What we know is that meetings have always been hybrid. Of course, number of remote participants in those meetings was relatively low. This time, approach might be a little bit different. We need some critical mass of participants onsite and also critical mass of remote participants. For

that, we of course need additional prep work and we have to decide on a time zone, which is really a difficult thing to agree upon.

Another thing is what we see from our current experience in offices, that hybrid meetings do not work, because those who are in the room dominate and sometimes they just forget those who are connecting remotely.

So how to ensure that this doesn't happen when we meet in this hybrid setting? First, we need to decide what type of work makes sense to do, or why do we need to meet in this hybrid mode, what we can't do intersessionally. We must be really focused on what we want to achieve.

Another thing that's crucial is we need excellent chairs to ensure that the experience of those who connect remotely is similar to those who are in the room. And for that also of course we need some technical things like dedicated support or communication management staff who watch remote participants, who watch chats, who ensure that this communication flow goes uninterrupted. We also probably need additional screens around the room, again to ensure that those who are in the room feel as if they are connecting remotely, with some additional things like social gatherings, which we did not think about just because we were too serious and we were concentrated on work.

And probably the most important thing that needs to be decided, when should we have hybrid meetings, because that's a very important point here. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Katrina. Well, I see that we have several points of view. Some are overlapping, some are taking different approaches. Well, the next steps will be that the secretariat will produce a summary and suggestions for further discussion and to see if we can make this into an action plan. Not sure if it could be made during the next Council call, but maybe in the future. So those will be the next steps. I thank you all for participating and doing this brainstorming.

Also, if you think about anything else later and you thought you should have mentioned this or that, please do either write an e-mail, send a WhatsApp, whatever you feel more comfortable just so we don't lose the opportunity to keep track of those suggestions. Thank you so much, everyone.

With this, I am moving to the next item, unless anyone has any other comment on the previous one. Seeing no hands, thank you very much. Our next meeting will be ICANN 72 virtual meeting in Seattle time, and then we see our other two meetings in November and December. Is there Any Other Business from anyone?

Okay. I see none. Then with this, I thank you all for joining today's call. I hope you have a really good rest of the day. See you soon. This meeting is adjourned. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]