ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hi, everyone. Welcome to our ccNSO Council meeting #179 on the 27th of January at noon UTC. This is our first meeting of the year, and it's very nice to be with you again.

May I remind you, please, to add to your login name the word "Council" or "councilor" and your ccTLD if possible. Also, if it's within your possibilities to turn on your camera so we can see each other. Even in this virtual world, it's all very nice to see you. If not, it's understandable. Don't worry. Here, I'm posting in the chat the link to the Wiki where all the material that we'll be using in this call is posted.

And to start, let me tell you that I have changed, a little bit, the order of the topics. We have a lot to cover today. So we had Universal Acceptance as our Item #15, but now it is #19 in our schedule. It is a very important topic that we need to discuss, but it is less urgent at this stage. So if needed, we will defer it to the next meeting, but we'll see how we do.

By the way, Kim, are we quorate?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: [Hi, Alejandra]. We have one apology, and that's from Jenifer. And we are quorate today.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Kim. So let's move forward. So item #2 is Relevant Correspondence. Here you have the link to check it. There is

EN

no correspondence related to any of the agenda items from 10-20, so we will move along.

Then we have the Minutes and Action Items. All actions are completed, and some of them are still going. And for this, let me check first if we have Stephen on the call. I think he's not here yet. Okay.

Well, I've asked all the working group chairs and the committee chairs to review their charters. And I believe the Tech Working Group who was the one who started with this review should be included in this whole package. And I'm waiting for responses from them all for our Council call in February.

Please do note that this review does not include the PDP working groups since that would require a review of the issue report, and that's not something that we want. So it's only the regular working groups and committees that need to check if their charters need any review.

And I have received a couple of responses so far, but they have until mid-February to reply. So I'll keep you posted on that for the February call.

Okay, moving forward. The intermittent decisions that we had since our last call were the appointment of the volunteers to serve on the ICANN Community Excellence Award Selection Panel. That's Margarita and Javier. So thank you very much for this, for volunteering and for doing this service.

Now moving forward to Items #5-9. These are the reading updates. So I will go one by one. And if you have any questions or comments, please raise them when the item is called.

So we have #5, update from ECA and CSC (written updates). Are there any questions or comments? Okay, I see none.

Moving to #6, updates from the working groups, the IGLC, SOPC, GRC, OISC, TLD-OPS, Tech Working Group, or MPC. Any questions or comments? Okay, I see none.

Then updates from the ccPDPs. Any comments or questions? I see none.

Then updates from the liaisons, from the ALAC liaison or the GNSO liaisons. None? Okay.

And then we have any updates from vice-chairs, councilors, regional organizations, or the secretariat. Anyone? No?

Well, I do have some updates to give you. I had a call with Göran Marby jointly with Pablo and Jordan. It was more like a catchup call. We talked about the topics that we are working on in the ccNSO, such as the DNS abuse; also the kickoff of the new ccNSO website; a little bit on the developments regarding legal and regulatory global events such as UN, EU, ITU. And we reflected a little bit on the session that's going to take place in ICANN73 regrading this information sharing on the legal and regulatory developments.

Then there is a real hope to have this ICANN74 as a hybrid meeting, but as we already know by now, only time will tell if that's going to be possible.

Also, the report of the ccNSO achievements in 2021 was circulated the ccNSO members and the ccTLD managers. This report falls into the Work Stream 2 recommendation on accountability of the ccNSO Council which states then the ccNSO should public a brief report on accomplishments prior year in the area of accountability. So I think we can check that mark.

Also, another thing that I want to bring to your attention is the trend exercise that we have been invited to participate. Similar exercises have been done in the past and now, well, the timing is very good since we are in the preparation of a workshop on strategy of the ccNSO. So by now there is a Doodle poll in your inbox, so please go check it out and fill in all of the available slots that you have for this exercise.

Are there any questions or comments regarding this? Okay, I don't see any hands up. Kim has already posted the Doodle in the chat, so you have it within your reach by now. Thank you for that.

Okay, then moving on we have, now, Items #10-20 for discussion or decisions. So in this section of the agenda, I will actually need your active participation and for you to provide your feedback or input. Items #10-12 are administrative positions, so that's usual. But from #13-18 it's where I will please ask you to provide your comments.

So moving to Item #10, we have the appointment of the GAC liaison. As you know, Giovanni has stepped down from all of his ccNSO work, and one of his roles was being the liaison to the GAC. This meant that together with a GAC counterpart, there will be a suggestion on topics to have between the GAC and the ccNSO if necessary.

So although this is not a very time consuming job, it's very important to maintain a good relationship with the GAC. And after Giovanni stepped down, Biyi was kind enough to volunteer. So any questions regarding this topic? Okay, I see none.

We have a draft resolution. May I have a mover?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: I move.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Pablo is moving. Thank you. May I have a seconder? I see Irina raised his hand. Demi, Irina won. Next time. Thank you.

So, there is a draft resolution. Any comment regarding the resolution? Or questions? If not, then let's go to the vote. For this I will require you please to use your green ticks if you agree, your red check marks if you abstain or disagree. Okay, I see green ticks. I'll give you a second to find them. Okay, thank you very much.

And just for good measure, thank you all. You can lower your green ticks. Is anyone abstaining? Is anyone against? No? Okay, then this is approved. Thank you very much.

Now we go to the appointment of the mentor to the Fellowship Program. So the Fellowship Program has continued despite the pandemic, which is a very challenging job. And as ccNSO, we participate actively in this program providing information the work of the ccNSO and on ccTLDs in general. As part of the program, the ccNSO also

participates in mentoring Fellows. And last year, Jenifer was appointed and she volunteered again. Any questions on this topic? No questions? Okay, so we have a draft ...

I see a hand up. Yes, Ali?

ALI HADJI: Yes. Thank you, Alexandra. I would know exactly how is doing the Fellowship Program now? Because we don't have the face-to-face meeting, but all meetings are all online. How it's doing now?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, it's not an easy task but I have seen in previous rounds that have been virtual teams. The pandemic, it's almost two years now. Right? They are doing the best they can, as in Fellows are still motivated. They still have their general meetings with the SO and AC leaders. They are with their mentors they have regular calls and they try to get them as involved as possible in all ICANN corners. Definitely it's not the same as in person because these are a mix of people who already participate in the ICANN environment and people who are new.

The mentors have done a great job in inspiring them and getting involved. But I would say it's not as effective as an in-person program. But they're doing great and they have been publishing their reports on the website. And apparently they believe that even though it's a remote program now, that it fulfilled their expectations regarding getting to know ICANN and their groups.

ALI HADJI: Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: You're welcome, Ali. So, if no other questions or comments, we have a draft resolution. So may I have a mover?

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: I move.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. I saw Pablo's hand go up. So Javier moves, Pablo seconds. Thank you very much. Any comments or questions regarding the resolution. No? Okay, then let's go to a vote. Please, again use your green ticks if you agree or your red process if you abstain or disagree. I see lots of green ticks. Thank you very much.

                              You can lower them now, thank you. And for good measure, is anyone abstaining or anyone against? Okay, so none. Thank you. This has been approved.

                              Next one. We have the appointment of Internet Governance Liaison Committee vice-chairs. So this proposed decision is, well, fairly straightforward. The reason the IGLC is looking for two vice-chairs is to allow for a smooth transition in June. As you may recall, Pierre has indicted that he wants to step down at one point as chair, most likely around the middle of the year. And to allow a smooth transition between him stepping down and having another chair, the IGLC is proposing to have two vice-chairs.

Note that in the charter, it doesn't mention anything regarding vice-chairs, but the IGLC is working on an update to prepare for the transition. Then the IGLC is requesting to appoint the vice-chairs now.

So, any questions or comments? I see none. Okay, we have a draft resolution. May I have a mover?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: I move.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. May I have a seconder?

ALI HADJI MMADI: I second.

MARIE-NOÉMIE MARQUES: I second.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. I heard Ali first. Thank you very much.

MARIE-NOÉMIE MARQUES: That's fine.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Marie-Noémie. Any comments or questions regarding the resolution? Okay, I see none. Now let's take the vote. Now you know. Please go to your reaction buttons and if you agree, please use your green tick. If you abstain or do not agree, use your red cross. Okay, I see many green ticks. Thank you very much. You may lower them now.

And of course, as always, for good measure, does anyone abstain or anyone is against? I see none. So thank you very much. This decision has been approved. Thank you.

Okay. Now we are getting int other part where we would really, really, really appreciate your input. So please do provide your feedback on the following items. We have update on the Triage Committee. That's in preparation of the February Council Workshop.

As you may recall, the Council decided that the role of the Triage Committee would expand, and it was among others tasked with developing ccNSO internal prioritization model and redefine its own role. As part of the process to develop a prioritization model, it suggested a model based on assessment of impact benefit for the ccNSO or a ccTLD versus effort it would take to achieve the expected result.

So in November we agreed that the Triage would prepare a workshop to further discuss the model. And after the workshop we would start applying this for the next work plan.

So may I ask, Jordan, if you could take over and inform the Council on what to expect, please? Jordan, are you here?

JORDAN CARTER: Sorry, yes. I've managed to just put my screens on [the wrong] screen.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, no worries.

JORDAN CARTER: Oh, and I lost audio for 10 seconds just at the end of your [instruction on it].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Well, I was asking if you could inform us on the work of the Triage and what to expect of the work [track].

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah. So we've sort of got a 45-minute slot at the next meeting to do this workshop. And the key thing that we want to focus on is getting clear about the key priorities, the long-term goals for the ccNSO because what we're finding is that when you get the rush of work that comes in, you can assess the kind of impact relatively easily, but the importance is a bit harder if we haven't signed up to what we say is important.

So the idea is a really light strategy that identifies that the three or four goals that we're pursuing as a group over the next 3-5 years. And the Triage Committee will come with a draft, and we'll use the session as a chance to test and refine it because it's so short that we don't want to

start with a blank page, looking at the workgroup done in previous planning sessions on what's important.

And then we'll take away the feedback and update whatever we have arrived ready for members to look at it. Then the member's meeting during the ICANN meeting in March. So that's [inaudible] our expectation that we're setting. And that'll give us the ground to do the prioritization work that comes through in the planning process. So that's the quick outline.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Jordan. Any questions or comments for Jordan? Okay. I see none. Well, since, Jordan, you already said that you will take the feedback, of course, of this workshop, refine it, and then we will see something on the next ICANN meeting, do you see a necessity to have a follow-up session on this workshop?

JORDAN CARTER: I think it depends how well received the draft is at the workshop. If there's a lot of discussion and debate around what our priorities should be, we might need to do some more interactions. But if it feels pretty right, we might not need to do another one. But I think, I'm hoping that we can have it signed off by the end of the Council meeting in March. And if it takes more time, it's good because it signals that there's a real debate about what our priorities should be.

EN

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, Jordan. So if needed, then we will see in February what we can do to have a follow-up. The agenda between the February Council call and the next ICANN meeting is a little tight, so if needed we will try to see a miraculous spot there. So thank you very much. I don't see any hands up, so I'll move along.

Now we have an update on the case effective CSC Effectiveness Review. Okay. As you remember, per requirement of the bylaws of the ccNSO and GNSO, we have initiated the second CSE Effectiveness Review. The group started, on the basis of the method of their first review, looking at the tasks the CSC is supposed to undertake.

And as they are described in their charter it also says whether they have performed satisfactorily. In addition, the CSC Review Team has identified a few items that may need further discussion such as frequency of meetings, attracting qualified members and liaisons. They have met with the CSC and they will conduct further meetings.

So the review team is also expected to consult, of course, with ccTLDs and gTLD operators. And most likely, this will happen with they introduce their initial findings as well. So maybe after ICANN73.

Any questions or comments regarding this part? Okay, I see none.

But now the issue at hand is that Jens Pétur Jensen has informed the review team and the Council that he needs to step down immediately. And we are as Council are therefore expected to appoint a new member. So Bart circulated an e-mail asking how we want to proceed, and he suggested that the Council should appoint someone as soon as possible, and if feasible without going over a call for volunteers again

because that takes more time. And if we remember, when we launched the first call for volunteers, we only got two that we appointed.

So any questions about this issue? Or comments or suggestions? Okay. I am not seen any hands up. Do you agree that we proceed in such a way as to appoint someone without doing the call for volunteers? If so, just to check with you, can you please use your green ticks if you agree? Okay. I see many green ticks. Thank you so much.

And to cover everything, is anyone against this? Okay, so that's how we will proceed. Now, maybe it would be best to have one of us, one of the councilors appointed to the CSU Review. Would any like to volunteer right now?

Just to put it there, we have some that are not eligible, such as Nick for example, since Brett is in the CSC. And that could create a perceived conflict. Also, Demi is not eligible because, well, Frederico is there as well. And, well, or current appointee is Martin, who has a background as a lawyer. So maybe a more technical person would be nice to have there.

And just in case you're wondering, I'm also not eligible since it would create complicated process management for the CSC Review and being chair of the ccNSO. With this little bit of time for you to think about any volunteers.

So I see Sean says he would do it, but not sure if he is qualified. Well, I don't see why not. Maybe, may I ask Bart, what are the main requirements for this person to have?

BART BOSWINKEL:
I think the main requirement is that you are elected and selected by the ccNSO Council. It's fairly open. As long as you as a Council feel comfortable with the person that you appoint doing this, that's fine. It's like with Jens Pétur and with Maarten. So it's good to have, at least, the two people on the team and that they are aware of the importance and understand the importance of the IANA Function because that's what we're talking about at the end. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:
Thank you very much, Bart. Sean, if it is okay with you—and I see that you have support in the chat to take his position—can we put you up for this? Okay. He says, "Sure, yes." Thank you very much, Sean, for stepping forward. I assure you that you will enjoy your time there, and certainly the review team will put you up to date soon enough. So don't worry. And of course we will help you in any way we can.

Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:
Hi, Sean. Wearing another hat, I—together with Claudia—also support the review team. I'll inform them as soon as possible and get you subscribed to the e-mail list, etc., so you can subscribe sooner than later. Because I think Maarten would like to have some fellow ccNSO-related person on that team as well. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. So, good to see that that is sorted out. And again, everyone is supporting you in the Council in the chat, Sean, so do not worry. And thank you again.

Okay, then moving along we now have Item #15, Change the Rules of the ccNSO: next steps and what can Council expect? So the GRC subgroup has been working really hard to get us to a point where we can ask the membership to replace the 2004 rules for you to have an update. And I want to ask David McAuley to give his presentation. Please, David.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Alejandra. Hello, everybody. Thank you for bringing the slides up. What I'm here to do is, as Alejandra said, tell you about the work of the Rules Subgroup of the Guideline Review Committee that we've been working on to try and bring forward the rules of the ccNSO. Can I have the next slide, please?

This is just an introductory slide talking about why this effort was undertaken. And you can see, and we all understand, that the original rules of the ccNSO were adopted 18 years ago when the ccNSO itself was much different in character. It was some 40 members back then, whereas it's 172 members now. And in the interim, there have been some significant developments, not least in the nature of the ccNSO itself with new members, with IDNs, etc., with respect to the IANA Transition.

And in that effort, the creation of the Empowered Community and decisional participants, one of which is to ccNSO. And also the

EN

governance of the ccNSO has become more detailed, more sophisticated in light of the changing requirements within the ICANN Community. Next slide, please.

And you have probably noticed—many of you are on the Rules Subcommittee, and others have seen this—there's been a lot of discussion starting at ICANN69 where the need was sort of crystallized to do some work on updating the rules. Since then, the Rules Subgroup has presented at all of the ICANN meetings—70, 71, and 72. We've conducted a member survey. We have had a number of webinars, and we've had, most recently, a comment period that closed on December 23rd as we brought the draft to near final status on the changes to the rules. Next slide, please.

So talking about the scope of the rules, let me mention first what's not included. I spoke about the creation of the Empowered Community just a moment ago. The new rules, the new draft does not cover ccNSO's participation in the Empowered Community as a decisional participant. And the reason for that is that these are fairly extensive requirements, detailed in Annex D of the bylaws, and the Guidelines Review Committee on which I serve—and a number of the rest of you do—that committee is still getting its arms around decisional participation guidelines.

Once that's done, the rules will then be looked at again with the intent to see if the rules need to be updated to address decisional participation. So that's not ... The Empowered Community bit is not included in the new rules. Next slide, please.

What is included? So you'll see here a ticking off of the section. Section 0 is numbered that way because it's not formally a part of the rules. But it is an introduction and a reference to the principles of the ccNSO, simply as context. It's meant to give someone who comes to this brand-new, picks it up and reads it, to get an introduction into why these exist.

Section 1 will be on ccNSO decision making. Which decisions are for members? Which decisions are for Council? Which Council decisions are subject to member veto? That kind of thing.

Section 2 will deal with voting, quorum. Things of that nature.

Section 3 will bring in a new topic, sort of regularizing a review of the rule every so often. Maybe every five years, whatever it might be. But it can be requested at certain points, too. But it's to try and make sure that the rules are visited every once in a while to see if there's any need to update.

Section 4 will deal with changing the rules themselves and how that can be done. And we've also added a glossy.

When we talk about changing the rules in section four, recognize that to get these new rules in place, we will have to observe the change mechanism and the currently existing rules. Next slide, please.

What needs to happen to replace the rules? Well, we need Council's approval. And this reference to the bylaws. This is a very short section. 10.3 (k) in the bylaws that will tell you/inform you that Council needs to approve and members need to approve a change to the rules. Next slide, please.

Here is something that you may wish to discuss, and it's a proposed timeline for adopting the rules. There are sort of three important parts to it. One is the Council meeting next month in late February. We in the Rules Subgroup are in the process of forwarding to Council the new draft under a cover note through the Guideline Review Committee. It may already have arrived in your e-mail boxes, but if it hasn't it will be within the next couple of days. And it's with a view to asking Council to please approve. The Rules Subgroup will recommend approval of this new draft.

And so in the February meeting, I believe this will be a point of discussion. That is, the rules themselves. Also the timeline. And the timeline will sort of kick off, in the February meeting, with a view to having Council's approval and then having a member vote that would begin in March and stretch into the April time frame.

Because we're talking about March ICANN73, we'll appear there. And the Rules Subgroup, I believe, will sort of co-share some of the governance session with another effort, perhaps, on the conflict of interest work. But in any event, we would be prepared to be to be presenting there—listening, taking questions, whatever—during the process of the vote.

And then the timeline also recognizes, under the current rules—under Section 5.3 and 8 of the current rules—in the event a quorum is not achieved, there is the possibility for a second vote which would carry on from April to May time frame. And then you'll see there at the end, in May there would be a decision made. So that's what we're proposing as

far as a time frame, and that's something I believe you will want to discuss amongst yourselves. Next slide, please.

This, in my view, is an important slide. This tells you who has been doing this work. These participants, including the observers, have been thoughtful and generous with their time, with their reviews, with their comments. It's been a great group to be a part of. My thanks go to them.

And I believe that is the end of this presentation. Happy to take questions, but the substance or the summary of the presentation is. This group has been at work on trying to update the rules, for good reasons, and we're not at a point where were presenting them to you hoping that they can be moved forward. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you very much, David, for a very nice summary.

DAVID MCAULEY: Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes.

DAVID MCAULEY: Can I interrupt one quick second?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Of course, yes.

DAVID MCAULEY: I mentioned these folks that have done great work. I have to mention Bart, Kim, and Joke as well. Outstanding staff support. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, David. I completely agree with you. Any questions or comments regarding this? And I also agree with Sean in the chat which is, "David has done a fantastic work here as well."

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And I completely agree. Thank you for chairing and lead this subgroup.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So, no questions or comments so far? And having other participants in the call that are not councilors, do you have any questions or comments? I see Irina has her hand up. Yes?

IRINA DANELIA:	Yeah. Alejandra, thank you. It just came to my mind. I wonder, when are the holidays in April? Those long holidays [inaudible].
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Like Holy Week, you mean?
IRINA DANELIA:	Yeah, when most people go away for holidays. I hope our schedule does not conflict heavily with this holiday period.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Is a very nice question. Let me do a quick check here because I believe I have it in my calendar. So those holidays are supposed to be maybe between the 11th of April until the 18th of April.
IRINA DANELIA:	Perfect, very good. Thank you. So we are well informed.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Thank you, Irina, for the observation. And let me do another quick check of the timeline. Can we see it on screen again, please? Just the timeline just to check. And the vote would be, for the first round, before the 6th of April. So yes, we're good. Okay, just double-checking just to be certain. Thank you, Irina and also David.

I was going to ask if anyone outside the Council had any questions or comments since we have an open call. And I believe we have a couple of guests here.

Okay, well, as we have already checked, and you have in your inboxes too the timeline for this voting is—it's a bit long, but it's because we need to go through the process. So in the best-case scenario, it will take 37 days to complete the voting. And in the worst-case scenario, it would be when the first round—it's not where we get the amount of votes that we need, for example, then we will have a second round that will take 60 days. That's why we need to do our best to socialize the draft of the new rules and then seek for active participation among all ccNSO members. We need 50% of the members to vote as a minimum. So that will be as of now 86 members that will need to cast a vote. And further from that, from all the votes received, we need to have 66% in agreement for these rules to actually become the new rules.

So taking that in mind, as an action point, I would like to include that the Secretariat and the subgroup start developing an outreach plan, and also seek Council feedback by mid-February, because soon we will get this draft and I would like to please go through it and make any observations you could have, because then, at the February meeting, as already David has told us, if all goes well and we don't have any issues, we will formally adopt the proposed rules as required [inaudible] the ICANN bylaws, appoint Joke as our voting process manager and initiate the voting process by adopting the timeline then.

So please do be aware of these next steps. Thank you very much, Kim, for displaying the timeline. I think we can go back now to be agenda please.

Thank you. And now moving to item number 16, it's the ccNSO and DNS abuse. What should the ccNSO do, and the next steps. So it was shared with you the latest version of the roadmap on the ccNSO and DNS abuse. This roadmap is the result of extensive discussions during ICANN 72 and the workshop we had, and all the discussions within the small [inaudible] group. Today, this small group seeks your feedback to refine their proposals, and once finalized, they will be presented to the community during ICANN 73. For this, I will ask Tatiana if you could please provide us an overview of the discussions and the date.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Alejandra, and thanks to—I don't know if it's Kim or Joke who put the slides up. So it is my pleasure to present to you the work of this. Can we go to the next slide? Of that whole group, and you know, I'm only messenger, there were quite a few people involved in this effort, and including, of course, the best staff in the universe.

So to recap a bit on the history of this group. Of course, you all know this, but just as Alejandra said, it is based on your feedback already. It is based on extensive discussions. So the first task of our group was to summarize these discussions and recommendations and the outcomes of the November 2021 workshop on ccNSO and DNS abuse, present a summary to the Council and secure feedback. Perhaps you remember

this workshop with the Council, where we were split into breakout rooms and discuss recommendations and later voted for them.

Then we had to prepare the roadmap to solidify this vision and to propose the next steps with regard to the role of the Council and ccNSO as a whole in DNS abuse. And here we are right now what I'm doing is presenting you the first iteration of this roadmap at our January meeting, to seek your feedback. [inaudible] this roadmap before the meeting, but I'm going to recap a bit and maybe to go into few details and summarize, if we can have the next slide please.

So if we look at the summary of the discussions of our workshop on November the 18th in 2021, feels like ages, there were four main components, like four pillars, identified where we would like to dive deeper and enhance our efforts. So the first pillar, the first component is enhancing the sharing of information. The second component is messaging. The third one is creation of the DNS abuse committee, like a standing working group, and the fourth component is metrics. And we can go to the next slide.

And I'm going to go into them a bit a bit in details as a point of recap. So sharing information, how we scope it, of course with your help, and hopefully with your feedback is to strengthen the platform function of the ccNSO, so to share this information continuously, for example, via special sessions and other channels developed through it. Perhaps at some point, build repository, some point of reference for ccTLDs to have access to information they can trust. So relevant information, reliable information, and also actionable information.

The second component is messaging. So identifying the channels, how do we send this message, ccNSO, ccTLD community, develop narratives for these messages, and also again, repository for the messages, and how these messages are developed for different audiences, messages that will target various stakeholder groups life narratives for governments, narratives for GNSO and other stakeholders, including ICANN Org and At-Large and ccTLD community. It's not like there is a need to develop different narratives. The narrative, general idea is the same, but the message can be fine tuned to reach the audience in the best possible way. The next slide, please.

So the third component, and I'm going to elaborate on this a bit more in a few minutes, is the creation of the DNS abuse committee. So how we envisaged this based on what was discussed is based on the model of the TLD ops committee, to build the—we suggest to call it the ccTLD DNS Abuse Oversight Committee, and this model, how we would like to propose it and envisage it—but of course, that might change based on feedback—so it will include the mailing list, akin to TLD ops, there will be voluntary subscriptions for the ccTLD representatives to exchange information, to share information, to alert each other about incidents, and also to share background information.

So this module, we think, also foresees the creation of some steering committee with liaisons from ICANN Org, for example, and other relevant groups. So this committee will not exist in a vacuum. It will be the point of collaboration and connection for the ccTLD community, but also point for collaboration and connection and information sharing with the messaging with the other relevant groups and ICANN Org.

And last but not least, the work on metrics. So creation of overview have existing metrics, invitation for ccTLDs to share the metrics directly through [inaudible] or in any other way, because we know that not everybody is particularly interested in DAAR or can join. So we do think still that no matter what the ccTLD managers' attitude to DAAR the individual takes on this, it is important to inform the ccTLD community about its existence and possibly commission a study. Next slide, please.

A bit more about the DNS Abuse Oversight Committee. I promise to go a bit into details here. On a practical note, I scoped a bit its mission, how we envisage it, possible work. In terms of timeline, we suggest to create it March 2022, which is basically quite soon, just in a few weeks. As I said, based on TLD ops concept. So the community list on a narrow topic, this can be established pretty soon, and it is a pretty straightforward task.

Then the question is of course, who is going to be the members of this committee. As I said, ccTLD representatives, we think it can be members and nonmembers alike, and also liaisons. Based on the model we propose, it is going to be the ccTLD DNS abuse mailing list daily operations and it will go through the process of evolution. So it would not be a something static. Apparently it is going to be a dynamic process as you might have gathered, so we envisage some further developments of the ccNSO and DNS abuse ecosystem and related approaches where this committee will take direct part in. Next slide, please.

In terms of the phases, so the first phase more or less in the next few months, so, short-term and medium-term steps. At the ICANN 73, we're going to explain the plan to the community as a Council and seek

feedback from the community. In the aftermath of ICANN 73, as I said, we envisage creating a base mailing list of this oversight committee, with Council adopting the terms of references at ICANN 73 and then appointing the members to this committee following a call for volunteers.

So post ICANN 73, we hope that this committee can kick off its work and prepare messaging and liaise and collaborate with other groups and ICANN Org to create, to establish a mailing lists for alert, invite ccTLDs to subscribe to this list. And also start with the creation of a repository like information practices. As I said, there's going to be a continuous process. So it might look like [inaudible] from this slide in a few months. But what is envisaged here is the start of all this, and then continuing.

At ICANN 74, we propose that this committee will strengthen the [decisional platforms] through like tech working group and so on and so forth. If we can go to the next slide, please.

Now the long term, the second, third, the fourth phase, so we have quite a roadmap here. So post ICANN 74, starting from June 2022 and to ICANN 75 in September 2022. So more like medium term, we suggest that the committee will engage in various ongoing activities. So for example, execution on this messaging, continuous collaboration.

So basically what it means here, expansion of these activities, which will start soon, and then there's developing, building, elaborating, getting some—not some, getting actually continuity in this work, we propose that this committee will get functional.

So the third phase after September 2022. Now we are looking to the next year of March 2023. So again, continuing the ongoing activity, and perhaps already developing or starting to develop the documents related to best practices, and then from March 2023 and beyond that, we can already start reviewing on its effectiveness because it would be more than one year since the committee starts. And also, we suggest in the roadmap that this committee will develop a playbook, some sort of a playbook to mitigate DNS abuse and also playbook which will consider the impact of DNS abuse on the ccTLDs. The next slide, please.

And here on the next slide, you're going to see everything—sort of a great visual visualization of the steps which I was talking about. I don't think I need to repeat them again. But I want to say the roadmap we propose has concrete steps that are connected to the ICANN meetings. They are in the short and medium term. And we will of course have some vision of how it is going to work after March 2023, ongoing effort, but the proposal with concrete steps focuses on the next year and a few months.

So the next steps, very, very much immediate steps. So the next steps for us in the ccNSO Council member meeting on the 8th of March to be confirmed where the Council and the [inaudible] group will inform the community about the plans and seek feedback. So starting this work, and then the ccNSO Council meeting on the 10th of March, the Council should expect to adopt the roadmap. Of course, we hope it will happen and we hope for your feedback. And also underlying actions we can confirm, like, including drafts of the terms of references for this committee, and also adoption of the roadmap by the Council. And so the ad hoc group concludes its work. And ad hoc group is not only me

who is presenting here, let's go to the last slide, I think next slide is going to be the last slide.

So I joined this group only after my appointment on the ccNSO Council and all these other people were already doing an amazing work. So you can see the names of these heroes on the slide. But who wasn't mentioned is, of course, staff, Bart, Kim, Joke. Thank you very much for supporting the work of this group in the best possible way. And with this, I will finish. And I hope that if there are any questions or feedback, and it's not only me, but anybody of these group members can also chime in and answer and reflect. That's all for me.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Tatiana, this was an excellent summary of the work done. Any questions or comments for the members of this group? So I see one in the chat. Let me read it from Ai Chin. It says, what's the difference of function between TLD ops and this—I guess it's the DNS abuse committee. What's the difference between them? Do you consider to enlarge the function of the TLD ops or form the subgroup under TLD ops? Anyone would like to tackle that? Yes, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I put my hand up before I heard the question. So I wasn't answering the question. I'll leave it to Tatiana to tackle. I was going to say that my perspective of involvement in the group, we were very conscious that this is not a policy creation exercise. This is not anything to tell people what to do, is more really for discussing the issue in a very sort of safe, inclusive sort of place, and try and share best practices because it is

obviously a very active topic area everywhere else, it just seems a bit strange if we don't appear to be at the table talking about the issue, at the very least. So we're very sensitive. And it's important that people have their say in how we progress forward, because it's important that everybody's comfortable with how it's set up and the direction of travel. I'll leave it to Tatiana to actually answer the question.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick.

TATIANA TROPINA: And yes, I'm going to answer, and Alejandra, Nick, and maybe staff, correct me if I'm wrong. I think that the difference here is that TLD ops, the division of TLD ops is just the model. So this committee would be a separate group. Am I right here? I think that that the interaction here is not make this committee a part of the TLD ops, no. So it is a creation of a different group. But using the model, which in our opinion, already functions successfully, and fulfilled, in fact, its functions on an ongoing manner. So why invent a wheel when there is something that already is there, already proven with time? So we decided to take a model, but the group will be something different. I hope that I did answer this question in detail. But I also wanted to add to what Nick said, that indeed, our task here is make a suggestion to you. It's not a policymaking process. It's actually a community effort that we are framing. We're suggesting you something, but it's up to the community to take on this. And this is why we suggest to create this additional group.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Tatiana. And just to add a little bit more detail. Yes, the DNS abuse committee is a separate one from the TLD ops. And the need for this is that they have different focuses and approaches. TLD ops deals mostly with security-related issues. And this DNS abuse one will be focusing exactly on that. And even though they tend to be a little bit confused, or think they're similar, in reality, and technically they're not so it's better to keep them separate so each group can focus on their own matter. I see Ali has his hand up.

ALI HADJI: Yes, thank you, Alejandra. As you said, TLD Ops is for the security. Also, if some ccTLDs have for example [insight] from his system, he can ask the TLD ops just to get the help and then the TLD ops continue to make up some tools just to help all ccTLDs. I think about the TLD ops of DNS abuse, it will be different mission, but for this, I would just like to know that because we have TLD ops today and we want just to make up another TLD of the DNS abuse, for example, DNS abuse, we will have oversight, for example, but did you reflect or have a question how you will, for example, increase the community just to be part of this approach? Because [inaudible] difficult in the TLD ops just how we can invite all community to come in this community. And we have sometimes the language barrier and the [inaudible] to have feedback every time, etc. Did you discuss about this approach? Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Ali. Tatiana, would you like to take that one?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah. Please feel free to chime in, anybody, if you think that I'm not reflecting on this enough. I think actually one of the reasons that we decided to create this additional group, not a part of any ongoing other tasks, is exactly the outreach. So there is this huge, but still stand-alone issue. And if there would be a particular committee dealing with this, they might think about a better outreach, a better engagement than just adding layers and layers on the task of some other groups.

So I think one of the reasons—and that was always kind of underlying our discussions, is, how do we get ccTLDs engaged? How do we reach out to them? And sometimes it was about some nuances. So some programs, like for example, how do we inform people about DAAR, right, but the work on DNS abuse is much broader than that. So, in a nutshell, I think that the entire idea of creating an additional committee that will be tasked with collaboration, with outreach, [with being there,] is one thing, but of course, we do need to make it clear.

If you on the Council or other members of ccTLD community think that the outreach might be a bit difficult because of the language barriers, because of the lack of awareness, because of any other issue, I think that this is something that we can take as a huge point of feedback and put it to this committee, like saying, look, this is your task. But we also think that there might be something you want to take a closer look at.

But I can certainly assure you that we did speak about outreach and involvement of ccTLDs and how to frame this message and how this committee can potentially do this, indeed. But there is also—and this is

not something apologetic for me, right? We also felt like this ad hoc committee, our task was also to propose something, but we didn't want to be too authoritative here, because we are a small group of people. But at the end, it would be up to ccTLD community to form these groups. So we had to balance between these two tasks, if I may say, so if anybody has anything to add, if I wasn't eloquent enough, because you know, I joined this effort somewhere like one third of its path, maybe there was something I'm not aware of, but I think that yeah, I did my best [inaudible].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Tatiana. I think it was a really good response. And also, it's well to take into consideration that when the TLD ops was created, things didn't happen instantly, right? Things take time. So even though we are very eager to have this committee up and ready and going and doing magnificent things in the future, we should also wait for time for them to settle, to see how they want to approach these challenges. But certainly, outreach is one of the things that they will do. Ali, does this respond to your question.

ALI HADJI: Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Ali. I do see that we are a little bit short on time. So I will cut this topic here on the queue. So sorry, [inaudible]. I see your hand up. But we need to move along. I just have one more question for

the Tatiana, since you are now informing us on this topic. We have been talking about the terms of reference of this committee. Can you tell us when the Council will have them for them to review them?

TATIANA TROPINA: If there is anything I'm very bad at, it's dates and numbers. So you can expect somebody like me to forget about her dad's birthday though he's one of the most favorite people in my life. Bart, can you help me?

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks, Tatiana. It's for both. So one of the things is the intention of the subgroup is to present the terms of reference ahead of the meeting to the community. So that's before ICANN 73, we're talking about. So as part of the package that a draft terms of reference will be included. So the Council will have it as well. So that's the intention. And I know the subgroup or the small group, the ad hoc group will be working on them over the next week or so and have a discussion about it. So that's where we are. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Bart. So I have nothing to add except apologize. I remember that the hard stop was before the ICANN 73 [inaudible] of course, sorry, and back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No worries. Well, thank you very much. So then we should include this topic again for the February Council meeting and see where we are

there with it. So thank you all. And then now I will move to our next topic, which is the coordination group to implement the specific Work Stream 2 accountability recommendations.

So as you have seen in the mailing list, I circulated the latest proposal to you on the coordination group to implement the specific accountability recommendations, and these would be a group that could assist us, the GRC in proposals to implement some of these recommendations. We have discussed this before. And given the limited scope of this group and the potential added value, I propose that we support this ICANN Org initiative. So do you have any questions regarding this topic or any comments on the proposal that you had in your inbox?

Okay, I don't see any. So just to be certain, could you please use your green mark if you do support the creation of this coordination group? And of course, your red crosses if you abstain or do not support it. I see lots of green ticks. Thank you very much. You can put them down now. And for good measure, does anyone abstain or anyone object? No.

Well, thank you. Now that we have agreed, may I suggest that we have the GRC to nominate someone for this coordination group. They're the ones that are dealing with the same topics. If anyone from the GRC is— well, Sean is on the call—and would like to say something, this is your moment. Sean, I see that your microphone is unmuted, but I cannot hear you. Is it just me?

BART BOSWINKEL: We can't hear Sean.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I think we had some technical difficulties. [inaudible] on the chat. Okay. We will take it up on Monday. Or do you want someone named today? Oh, no. I just wanted to know if you agree on the suggestion and having someone from the GRC to be nominated or if comments. And yes, he says he agrees. Okay. Thank you, Sean. And sorry that your mic is not cooperating with you.

So if anyone else has any comments regarding this suggestion, now is the time. I don't see any hands up for this. So again, please do check your green mark if you do support asking the GRC to nominate a member. Jordan puts in the chat, "I'm happy to support anyone appointed from GRC. As someone who was the cochair of the Work Stream 2, I'm not volunteering to be the rep of the group. Can be a contact point if needed." Thank you very much, Jordan, for this. I see lots of green ticks. Thank you so much.

For good measure, I will always ask if anyone else thinks or does not agree with this suggestion. Okay, we are in agreement. Thank you very much. So I will inform then the other SO/AC chairs that we agreed on the creation of the coordination group. And I will also well send an email to GRC as well on what we agreed on having them nominate someone to this group. Thank you very much.

And now we move to item 18, the ICANN 73 meetings. Please do note that some dates need to be confirmed in some cases. And as I mentioned at the beginning of the call, we only have two weeks between our February and March meetings. This one got quite close

one to the other. Third call in February will be on the 24th at 21:00 UTC. And then we will have the next call in March in two weeks.

So we do have a prep meeting where we need to discuss roles and responsibilities of councilors, but the question is, when are we going to have that that call? It should be before ICANN 73 because we also take this opportunity to see what we'll be discussing ICANN 73. And for now, the options are Tuesday 1st of March, Wednesday 2nd March and Thursday 3rd of March.

It would be ideal if by now we could say which day we would prefer. OF course, it will be on one of our usual times of meeting, either 12:00, 18:00 or 21:00 UTC. Anyone would like to say something on that? Ali, I I notice that you need to leave. Good luck and all the best.

Okay, nobody has any comments on this one. Okay, what we will do— and I do please encourage you—we will set up a doodle then to have this prep call. And do fill it as soon as you see it in your inbox, because we need to schedule it as soon as possible. Thank you, Chris. Yes, doodle is a good idea.

Okay, then moving along, let me just check the chat. Okay, so Jordan is just asking us that, if possible, not to have it in the most frequent 12:00 UTC time slot. Okay, we will set up the doodle. And of course, please do check your available times. And if need an in case of need, we will have that option to not just when you're available, but also not your preferred one, but if you can make it, just check it as well. Okay.

We will also have—we've said that our Council meeting. And for that, we will have as our main topics the elections of chair and vice chair. So

do think about that. We will agree on the roles and responsibilities for the next year. And also, we will be looking forward to adopt the DNS abuse roadmap and the terms of reference if everything goes well in their session during the ICANN 73, which I hope it will. And our bilateral Council meetings. As you have seen, we won't have a joint ccNSO-GNSO meeting. This was a suggestion from our two liaisons, Sebastien and Martin. And then we will have a ccNSO joint session with ccNSO-related Board members. And for this, I would like to ask you if you still want to do a Q&A, or shall we look for a different format? Any comments on that one? I don't see any so far, but I do see that Katrina is on the call. Do you have any thoughts on that one?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Oh, hello, everyone. Any format that works for you, anything that you want to discuss with either country code top-level domain-related board members or the full board, just let us know. We're absolutely ready and willing to accommodate any wishes. Have you already thought about topics? I know that you asked. But I mean that if you have any thoughts about things that are of interest. I assume there are some like with ccPDP or maybe with the budget or strategic plans or anything else. So, maybe there's any hot topic you'd like to discuss. But Patricio and I are ready to accommodate any of your wishes.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Katrina. You got a little bit ahead of me because that was going to be my next question regarding topics. But regarding the format, yes, what we are aiming for is just the informal casual meeting

with related Board members, the ccTLD-related board members. And since Jordan has been chairing these types of Q&A sessions, do you have any comments or do you think this format works well?

JORDAN CARTER: I think it can do. It's getting a little bit harder with the growing numbers of ccNSO-related Board members on the ICANN Board because we can't fit too many questions in. And it'd be fair to say that people aren't very forthcoming with questions or topics that they want to suggest. But it seems okay from my point of view, and Board members seem to enjoy it from what I can tell.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. So, well, maybe for this time being, we keep the same format as we don't have any other suggestion. And now we'll come into what Katrina mentioned. Do you have any suggested topics that you would like to discuss with the ccNSO-related Board members at this stage? Yes, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you, Alejandra. It's probably up to Stephen, but I cannot see him right now on the call. So I take a risk. We might be interested in what's going with the policy on ccTLD retirement, depending on what will be happening in the next weeks, but this might be of an interest.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Irina. Yes, the ccPDP on retirement just closed their public comment period. I agree with you, it would be an interesting topic to discuss. Okay, Chris says, maybe on the list call for topics? Yes, definitely. That was going to be my next observation. But I won't take Chris credit for suggesting this. Any other topics that you can think of? Please do send them to the mailing list. I know it might be not easy to have them spontaneously. But still, if you have any, like Irina just said, Katrina also. Pablo, I see your hand up.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thanks, Alejandra. And greetings to all. One topic that I would personally find very interesting are the legal and regulatory topics regarding UN, EU commissions and how would that affect specifically ICANN and ccTLDs. How do the Board see that and how do they feel about it? That type of topic would be of interest, because it would have an impact on ccTLDs. And as you know, when a decision is taken by the EU, somehow it gets to us in this side of the world and we have to make decisions to work on that. So I think it would be—personally I find it very interesting and I think it's intelligence that we can gather regarding what's going on in that area. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. I agree with you. And there will be also a plenary session on that right after our council call that day. So I think it would be a good start of the day to have it. Tatiana, last on the queue.

TATIANA TROPINA:	Actually, I think Alejandra, you said what I wanted to say, that there is a session. And I also wanted to point out that during the last ICANN meeting, I was on the GNSO and in our conversation with Board, the Board question to every SO and AC was actually hinting to those developments, but they framed it differently, like threat to multi stakeholder model. But I think ultimately it does boil down to the legislative developments and it's much broader actually than just the idea of a threat, because it is rather what does have an impact, what is affecting the DNS function. And I think it would be really great to have this question, so I just second what Pablo said.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	thank very much, Tatiana and all. We are taking notes on your suggestions. Still, I would like you—if you think of any other topic, please use the mailing list and send it. If you get any other inspiration in the next days, please share it with us.
	And our time is running out, so I will defer then the 19th item that is on ccNSO and universal acceptance. This will be on our next Council call. Please do think a little bit about that so we can have a discussion. Our next Council meeting will be on February 24 at 21:00 UTC, and remember that this will include the workshop on strategy and prioritization. So be ready for this exercise. It was so nice to see you all. And unfortunately, it's time for the meeting to get to a call. So good rest of the day for you and see you next time. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]