
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Welcome, everyone, to our ccNSO Council Meeting #180. Today is the 24th of February at 21:00 UTC. My name is Alejandra Reynoso and I'm the ccNSO Council chair.

It's nice to see that we have many guests. So welcome, everyone. Today's background information is, as usual, in the Wiki space. And I'll place the link in the chat for your ease.

And we do have a lot to cover today. From the previous meeting we have the Universal Acceptance topic. It's now on the agenda. And also be aware that at the end of the meeting we will have a workshop that will focus in identifying the strategic goals of the ccNSO. And this is organized by the Triage Committee. So stay tuned.

There will be a small break between our current, usual agenda and the workshop. Don't worry. But still, keep that in mind.

Kim, may I ask you if we are quorate?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Hi, Alejandra. Yes, we are quorate.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. And just because, well, I know we will get on with business quite soon, but is there any other business that you want me to take into consideration right now? Okay. If not, you can think about it. And also, I'll ask again later. I just wanted to see if there was anything right away.

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.

Okay, Item 2. We have the Relevant Correspondence, and you have there the links from the notes that we received from Sean and David that are introducing the update on the ccNSO internal rules. And we will discuss this in Item 10.

Move to Minutes & Action Items. The minutes have been received and no comments were made on the minutes, so they are adopted. And all action items have been completed, but do mind that there was a little bit of adjustment on the numbers. We had a double 07, no pun intended. But now it's 07, 08, and 09.

And moving with the Intermeeting Decisions. We have there listed the two appointments we made since our last call.

And now I'm moving right away to the Written Updates. So I will go, as usual, one by one. If any of you have any questions or additional comments, please raise them when we are at the item that we are looking at.

So let's start first with the update on the ECA & CSC, and CSC Effectiveness Review. Any questions or comments for this one? I see none.

Moving along, we have Working Group Updates. Here we do have an item on almost the end of the agenda regarding the charter updates. But other than that, are there any questions or comments regarding the working group updates? Okay, I see none.

Moving right along, updates on ccPDPs. I just wanted to not here ... Oh, yes, Stephen, please. Stephen, you are on mute.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. When you get to Retirement Review Mechanism, get back to me quickly.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. So I just wanted to make a comment here that the Review Mechanism and the ccPDP4 were asked to provide an update to the GAC in the joint session. And as far as I know, in ICANN74 we can expect an extensive update on the two working groups that are currently in progress.

And now it would be the time, Stephen, if you wanted to say something on Retirement.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. With regards to retirement, it's entirely at the point up to the Board. We had a discussion with Patricio last night on the Review Mechanisms Call. They have an ad hoc group formed. They're scratching their heads trying to figure out how to handle a policy from the ccNSO community, to be frank. And hopefully, they will sort it out and it will come to the Board soonish. I don't have the time frame. Patricio last night did not have a time frame either. But that's the last step with regards to Retirement.

With regards to Review Mechanism, we're kind of at a crossroads with regards to Section 8 of the IANA Functions operator contract which calls for mediation. The work we've been doing as a group coming up with

binding and non-binding review mechanisms per RFC 1591. That story is to be continued after the ICANN meeting. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Stephen. And moving to the update on the liaisons, any questions or comments regarding that? Okay, I see none. Thank you very much.

Now we move to the updates by chair, vice-chairs, councilors, regional organizations, and secretariat. So, anyone have any update that they would like to share right now? I don't see any hands up just yet, so I'll start because I do have some updates for you.

On Monday the 14th of February there was the SO/AC Roundtable Meeting. And one of the topics was the Prioritization Framework. Here the chairs of all SO/ACs were asked to seek for a volunteer and an alternate to participate in a pilot to test the next iteration of the Prioritization Framework.

As you may recall, we discussed this extensively with the help of the SOPC. They have been working together to develop the framework. But now we are asked to volunteer someone to participate in this pilot program.

Where we left with the SOPC is that the updated version of the original framework would be included in the FY23 planning document as a background material. But it was not included. And during the SOPC meeting with ICANN Planning in January, the suggestion was made that

further development would be done post ICANN73. So we have here a little bit of [a non-matching] of the schedules.

So any thoughts on your end right now on these ICANN requests? If not, I do have some questions for you. One is, should we remind ICANN of the regional schedule that was talked with the SOPC, or not? Or should we move along? The next question is, should we participate?

JORDAN CARTER: Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: I think we should participate. And I want to make it clear that that isn't a volunteering from me, but I think that it's been a long-time ambition to see ICANN do this better. And notwithstanding the kind of scheduling challenge which looks like it's fallen over slightly, I think it would be good if someone from the SOPC could kind of support and engage with this process.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. I see Chris's question in the chat, if there is a reason not to participate. Well, there is not a specific reason. It's just that it's not what we had expected, as in what was the original plan and now the current place. So I agree with Jordan that it's not a bad idea to

participate, though we were hoping to do so in a different manner, as in in a more orderly manner.

What I see is that maybe some conversations might have gone within the ICANN. And we all knew that this was going to happen, but there was maybe a miscommunication there to tell us that this was coming right now. Or at least we failed to see that.

So I see Stephen is saying that he agrees with Jordan and Chris that we should be in the mix. Okay, "to keep an eye on things."

Okay. Just to seek that we are on the same page, if you could use your green tick to say "yes, we should participate" or your red crosses to say, "no" or "abstaining." Okay, I see a lot of green ticks. So, yes, we should participate. Thank you very much.

Now, who should we nominate or appoint to this pilot? Should it be a councilor? Should it be a members of the SOPC [inaudible] or shall we launch a call for volunteers to the community to seek for a person? I see that Nick's proposing that the chair of the SOPC would be ideal. "And/or we should ask the SOPC to find a volunteer." Okay.

Okay, from what I'm seeing in the chat, it seems that it would be a good idea to ask the SOPC for them to find someone. And yes. Jordan says, "Given the SOPC's interface with ICANN planning, it is a natural group." I concur. And yes, there was a clarification there that the chairs didn't see the need for it to be exclusively on the SOPC to participate, but I agree that it would be natural.

Yes, Chris. I see your hand up.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hi, Alejandra. I was only going to say that I think asking the SOPC to find a volunteer is sensible. Actually volunteering the chair is probably [inaudible]. But asking them to see if they could find a volunteer I think will probably be the best way forward.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you very much, Chris. Okay, the thing is, also, it should be noted that they were requesting to have this person appointed, like, now.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: But I think we can be a little late and have our own process to find the right person to be there. Right? They gave us a very short time frame. I really don't remember when, but maybe this week. I got a reminder on my e-mail today.

Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks, Alejandra. Please note that the chair of the SOPC was approached and the was, I would say, not immediately very enthusiastic about it. He did not a role for the SOPC immediately in the pilot phase. So maybe there are a few councilors who are also on the SOPC. Would it

be an idea that, say, one or two of the councilors? Because the question was a person designated by the SO/AC chairs and an alternate, if feasible. But if someone who's on the Council and also on the SOPC and various members would participate.

With respect to time commitment, [inaudible], the expectation is it will take ... Every week in March, there will be a session of about an hour to 90 minutes and probably some prep work. So just to inform you about the time commitments needed. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And Chris, I see your hand is still up.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So I was going to say that whilst I acknowledge that there's not a role for the SOPC, that doesn't mean that somebody who's ... [It's] not appropriate from an SOPC member to do it, given that that's the Prioritization role. But that said, I also acknowledge that there's a timing issue here, so maybe we should try and fill the role ourselves in the next 24 hours maybe.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Anyone would like volunteer now?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm resisting the temptation to put my hand up and volunteer, just on the basis that I know [I'd be out of the committee before I did it.] But I

do think it's very important work because this prioritization thing is critical to the community work moving forward and the log jam that's currently existing being cleared.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Just to fill you in, they did tell us in advance that this commitment will be of 60 or 90 minutes per session, and they expect five sessions starting early March. So that's more or less the time commitment that they're seeing at least live online. Right? Besides any reading and studying and research.

Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Just to clarify. So we did send, say, as background what is expected of this pilot. It is testing the Framework for a limited set of work items. So maybe following up from Chris, may I suggest that, say, you review the material again and by tomorrow afternoon, close of business UTC, if there is a volunteer, self-nominate. First one in, the first one to be appointed. And maybe the second one as an alternate. That way you meet the deadline and you do have some time to check whether it's feasible for you to do so. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I see that we have a path forward. Yes, Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. I'll do it if everyone's happy for me to do it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I don't have any objections. And I do see that Irina [inaudible] saying something.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, I don't want [inaudible]. It's not "if nobody objects." No, I'm joking.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Any comments? Would it be okay, Irina, if we put Chris as our first and you as an alternate?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: [inaudible] together if Irina's happy, we can [inaudible].

IRINA DANIELIA: I think that would be great.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, then. Thank you very much, we have our team. Thank you so much for volunteering in such short notice. Thank you.

So the second thing that I wanted to talk to you about. In that meeting there was a discussion on the possibility of traveling to ICANN74. We were asked to see within, well, within our communities, but I'm asking

you councilors if you see there is feasibility for you to travel to ICANN74. And if so, in what conditions? Or we can discuss it later.

Tatiana says she will be there. Thank you. In my personal situation, I don't see any restrictions from my country regarding vaccinations or visas yet. So if possible, I would be willing to go there.

I see many of you say you will do your best to go, so that gives me a good sense of at least willingness. Right? Because we know that there are things that are out of our control. But thank you all. I see in chat.

And lastly, I just wanted to mention that there is a potential meeting for SO/AC chairs in Los Angeles by the end of April. This is not yet confirmed, but it's a high possibility so I wanted to let you know.

Is there anyone from the other topics that we have here? It's the trends exercise that we went with the councilors and SOPC. Anyone would like to comment on that exercise? No? Well, I think it was a really nice exercise. We got to discuss current trends and to give some feedback to ICANN Org. I thought it was very good interaction and good conversation with all that participated. So, thank you all that attended.

And if there are no more comments, I'll move on to the next item. Thank you. So, we are now on the adoption of temporary chair and vice-chair election procedure.

So as you may recall from last year, the guideline in which the chair and vice-chair election is described still assumes that the chair and vice-chairs are elected in an in-person meeting. But unfortunately, we

cannot be in Puerto Rico this time. And then we'll need to do this procedure again.

So to manage it more appropriately this time, not that it was not the last time, but to do it in a little more in advance, the proposal is to adopt this election procedure before we start the nominations to ensure a smooth and transparent process.

So the procedure is quite similar to last year. The changes are, of course, the dates. And the idea is to start nominations by next Monday. And they will end on Friday, the 4th of March. And the acceptance of nominations will be due the 7th of March. And by the 8th of March, the secretariat will provide the list of candidates.

And depending on the number of candidates, there will be a call for selection and a formal appointment during the Council call on the 10th of March, or if there are two or more candidates, we will have an e-mail vote on the 9th of March from the 9th to 10th of March.

So, any questions or comments regarding this? May I have a mover? I see Pablo and I see Chris. Chris, I will put you as seconder. Thank you.

Okay. Any comments or questions regarding the resolution? I see none. If not, okay. Then let's vote. So please check your green ticks if you are in favor or your red X if you object or abstain. I see lots of green ticks. Thank you very much. And for good measure, I will ask does anyone object or abstain? No?

Okay, then this is approved. Thank you very much. You can now clear your green ticks for the next ones.

And now we are in the Launch Roles and Responsibilities Discussion. And for this, I would like to ask Bart to run through the overview of the current roles and responsibilities, please.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you. As you may have seen on the agenda, one of the items of the prep meeting, but also on the forthcoming Council meeting during ICANN73 will be the roles of the various councilors in various committees. As every year, councilors will be requested to sign up to any of the roles, let me go through the list.

Obviously, there's chair and vice-chair. That's why we started this, and that's the real election.

But then there is the Triage Committee, outreach and involvement committee, ccNSO-GNSO Council agenda [person to date]. Currently it's Biyi. So GNSO, it's Maarten and Alejandra. Could imagine others.

Other agenda committees: Rejection Action/Approval Action Process Manager. Fortunately, to date we haven't done so, but in case something like this happens, somebody will need to perform that role as the Process Manager. PDP Oversight Committee. Council CSC Selection Committee.

They are all included in a list. The secretariat will send out a Google Doc for your information and so you can sign up, either tomorrow or Monday, so that by ... And if there are any questions, we'll run through it on the Prep Council Meeting which is next week already. And to finalize this by the Council meeting itself so the Council can approve the

role and responsibilities of each and every councilor. So that was, yeah, what will happen next and where you can volunteer for a role. Thanks.

Back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Bart. So please, when this is shared have a really good look at it, and please sign up.

Now we will move on to the next item. It's the ccNSO & Universal Acceptance. So this topic was deferred from our last call. Again, I want to reiterate that this is a very important topic. We have been asked to appoint a liaison to the Universal Acceptance Steering Committee. This is a community group currently chaired by Ajay Data.

As you may remember, he was a former ccNSO councilor appointed by the NomCom. This group, together with ICANN Org, works really hard on Universal Acceptance. And, well, for those who might not be directly involved or familiar with the IDN world, the secretariat did include an APTLD white paper on the topic.

If possible, may I ask either Ai-Chin, Jiankang, or Irina to talk a little bit more on the UA experience?

IRINA DANIELIA: I can start.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA:

Actually, Universal Acceptance efforts definitely requires a lot of commitment and resources from the registry. And currently, today I guess, it was mentioned during ICANN Prep Week, but there are 61 IDN ccTLDs, taking into account that India has 22 of them. So there are roughly between 30 and 40 IDN ccTLD managers. So these are members who are directly impacted and interested in this effort.

I don't know if that's enough for the whole ccNSO to be involved or not. But if we speak about Universal Acceptance broadly, holistically, in an ideal world and in a quite long-term perspective, this may be a common issue for every ccTLD registry because theoretically it would be good that any frontend and backend registration system supports and accepts IDN e-mails and IDN addresses. This is in the long term.

If we are talking about today's perspective, this is quite a limited group of ccTLD managers which are already in these or that part involved in the different activities. They definitely probably need more support. My understand is that UASG is looking more for the contact person from the ccNSO just to be able to communicate through this channel when they want to ask questions or get a position from ccTLDs.

So I'm hesitating whether there is a role for the whole ccNSO or this could be formed at subgroup within the ccNSO like, for example, gTLD registries have .brand subgroup or the GeoNames, Geo TLD subgroup.

But this is the topic for the first discussion, I guess, with their members. That's what I have to say.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Irina. I agree with you, and I would even expand a bit more on who might have to deal with IDNs because, yes, there are IDN ccTLDs that are inherently IDNs. But current ccTLDs as in the non-IDN ccTLDs manage, also, IDNs. So this is something that is a little bit broader, I think. So there might be a role for that.

I see that Ai-Chin has her hand up. Yes please, Ai-Chin.

AI-CHIN LU: Yeah. I believe Universal Acceptance should [be initiated] by the local community. And the ccTLD manager is appropriated to do so, and for the ccTLD manager I think that they can play an active promoting role to team up with the registrars, stakeholders, e-mail service providers. But for the ccNSO, in my opinion, I think we can do two things.

One is to play a promoting role if we want to. Still it is [dependent upon] the ccTLD manager that focus on sharing information and the experience exchange knowledge and best practice in our community and in the ccNSO members [between].

And the other idea is maybe we can create a UA Readiness index to let the ccTLD measure his stage. Yeah. I agree with Irina and I'll say that maybe not most of ccTLDs have an IDN ccTLD, but I think that if we want to maybe create some UA Readiness index for their reference, maybe that is another idea. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Ai-Chin. I see your point. And from what I've heard, would it be then a good idea to do something similar to what we have done with the DNS abuse when we were seeing to see if the ccNSO has a role? Should we do something similar, as in prepare something maybe for ICANN74 and ask the community on their thoughts to see if there is a clear way or a path that the ccNSO should follow for IDNs? Would this be a good idea?

AI-CHIN LU: Yes. Maybe we can try. Yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, Irina?

IRINA DANIELIA: Maybe in preparation for this, we can do at least two easy things. Let's first count how many, actually, IDNs and ccTLDs managers do we have. Secondly, ask probably via the list whether there is interest or not as a kind of preliminary survey.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. And include not only IDN ccTLDs but everyone that handles IDNs in a way or another. Right?

IRINA DANIELIA: Yeah. Just ask the other list managers what do they think and whether there is relevance to that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you, Irina. I see Jiankang has his hand up.

JIANKANG YAO: Yes. So I agree with all of what has been said. And we at the ccNSO, maybe we should do something about UA IDNs and EAI because IDNs are a hot topic for the ccNSO. In the future we will more IDN ccTLD. So UA was an important topic or project for our ccNSO community.

So for how to do it, Ai-Chin has already suggested something. She [inaudible]. Yes, I think it is a very good idea for my part, because I think UASG has done a lot of nice work. UASG united a lot of multistakeholders.

So maybe in the future, ccNSO can do something to help UASG to do a good job, because UASG maybe not focus on every region of the world. But ccNSO can cover every part of the world. So if UASG needs some support, for example in some country and some region, a ccNSO ccTLD manager may can provide some help.

So for the second question, if the ccNSO wants to appoint a liaison, I think maybe we should have a, Irina said, we should have a contact person with UASG. So if the UASG has something to coordinate with the ccNSO, we can help to do something to promote our UA work in every part of the world, is my point. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Jiankang. And you give me a really nice segue to that question. Should we aim to appoint a liaison to the UASG now or not?

And while you think about that, I see Ali has his hand up. Yes, Ali?

ALI HADJI MMADI: Thank you. Alejandra. Just to answer you that you had asked us about the Universal Acceptance. I think two weeks ago, that you know, for example, in Africa, we have many, many local languages that you know. French, for example, and English are not the majority languages in here. And many questions [inaudible] make up during the session and out the session. And we can notice that many ccTLDs asked why we can [inaudible] about this Acceptance Universal.

And I think that we have just to make a program, for example, the building capacity and sensibilization for the users and to make sure that all things they will send—for example, the e-mails for example, there is not a problem for this.

I think together we have just to make something to make sure this Universal Acceptance, for example, is adopted with all ccTLDs to go forward together. Just this is what I have just to note today about the Universal Acceptance. Thank you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Ali. So, what do you think we should do? Shall we do a call for volunteers to seek someone to appoint as a liaison? Or should we wait a little bit? What do you think? Because I think that it's

clear that we need to work a little bit if the ccNSO has a role in this. But that's a separate thing on, but we were requested to have a liaison.

Yes, Ai-Chin?

AI-CHIN LU:

Yeah. I think maybe we can appoint it later. But for these issues, I think it doesn't matter wither the liaison is Council or not because the liaison's responsibility is the same according to the ccNSO requirement. So I think a liaison is to have a better coordination on UA with UASG and to have a good response and feedback to ccNSO in time. That is my opinion, yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Ai-Chin. Anyone else? Okay, so if you agree, I will ask you to indicate so with your green ticks or your red X's. Let's do a call for volunteers and then from whom those apply, we will need to do a selection, of course, of the person who would be appointed as liaison. Is that okay?

I see green ticks. Okay. And for good measure, does anyone abstain or object? No? Okay, then that's what we'll do. Thank you so much.

So let's do the call for volunteers and also, of course, inform the ccPDP4 Working Group about this.

Okay, moving with the next item, now we are going into the change of the rules of the ccNSO and the Council acceptance and next steps. So the GRC Subgroup has been working really hard to get us where we are,

and now we can really ask the community and the membership to replace the 204 rules.

So in January, we worked extensively [inaudible] by David McAuley on the new rules and the process on how we got to the point that we are now. David and Sean, as chair of the Subgroup and chair of the GRC, have sent us a letter formally submitting the new set of rules with a request to accept them and launch the membership vote.

So the major changes were highlighted in the letter and I want to remind my fellow councilors that they have been extensively discussed with the membership of the ccNSO.

So before we got into decision mode, are there any questions on the changes themselves or the process to date? If none, I want to make two personal observations. First, this is one of the final steps of an extensive process. As you can see from the draft resolution, this was one of those topics we knew we had to deal with. And although it was very important, it was not one that we wanted to tackle right away.

However, I also believe we have now reached a milestone where we showed that we have truly matured into an organization that is able to tackle such complex topics.

Secondly, we have developed new ways of collaboration and outreach by being able to handle these kinds of topics in times where we do not see each other in person. So I think this is a great accomplishment. So those are my comments.

And now we have a decision in front of us. May I have a mover? Okay, there are too many hands. So let's say Pablo moves and Irina seconds. Okay, thank you very much.

Any comments or questions regarding the resolution itself? Okay, I see none. And given the importance of this topic, I will ask each councilor individually how you vote on the proposed resolution. Please unmute your microphone to tell me if you approve, object, or abstain.

Ali?

ALI HADJI MMADI: I approve.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Biyi. Is Biyi online? I think he's not. Okay, moving to Souleymane.

SOULEYMANE OUMTANAGO: Yes, I approve.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Ai-Chin.

AI-CHIN LU: Yes, I approve.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Jiankang.

JIANKANG YAO: Yes, I approve.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: I approve as well.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Approved.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: I'm in favor. Approved.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Approve.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Approve.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Sean. I'm not sure if Sean is ... He's not right now on the call. Stephen. Did we lose Stephen, too? Okay, I'll move along. Javier.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: Approve.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Marie-Noémie.

MARIE-NOÉMIE MARQUES: Approve.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Approve.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO: In favor.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Jenifer.

JENIFER LOPEZ: In favor.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. And at last, myself. I approve. Thank you very much. So this has been approved. And [inaudible]. I see Bart's hand is up.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just for the record, Stephen and Sean are on the call. Maybe they have some issues with the line. Maybe ask if they want to approve, say, by a green or red tick. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. So asking again for Sean and Stephen. I believe that they might be dealing with something right now.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Maybe come back to them later, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: And I think you missed Tatiana.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, I did ask her. Didn't I?

JORDAN CARTER: You absolutely did.

TATIANA TROPINA: You did, sorry.

[KIMBERLY CARLSON]: You did, yes.

TATIANA TROPINA: I did appear on the screen. I don't know why I wasn't visible. Sorry about that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No worries. Okay, I will come back to them just to confirm, but I believe that they would be in favor. But in any case, for now it is approved.

So, next steps. Yes, Irina?

IRINA DANELIA: I see both Stephen and Sean in the list of the attendees right now, and I just wonder how many in favor we actually need to make it happen.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I think we just need the majority because we don't ... In the new rules, we do need at least 14 councilors, but this was not a requirement in the current rules. So we're okay.

IRINA DANELIA: Anyway, I see both Sean and Stephen right now.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yeah. I got a message from Sean saying that he needed to attend a call. So maybe he's still on the call. And from Stephen, I don't know. But I will get back to them later when we move to the next, maybe, topic.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Stephen's traveling abroad and it's probably not straightforward for him in terms of time zone and stuff.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. So let's move forward. Now we need to see the timeline on appointment of the voting process manager. So since we just accepted the new proposed rules, however the most important aspect is that the members adopt the rules. So in the manner that is in the current rules, that means that there should be an e-mail vote called by the Council, the chair, or the members themselves.

So the proposal is that the ccNSO Council calls for the membership vote. And there are some time constraints, as you remember when we discussed the timeline last meeting. The proposed timeline was included in the background material as well. So in addition to [approving] the timeline, we will need to appoint a voting process manager.

The proposal will be to appoint Joke as the voting process manager. Any questions or comments regarding this? No? Okay, may I have a mover? I see Irina's hand.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: I move.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And Javier seconds. Thank you very much. Any comments or questions regarding the resolution? If not, I see none, then please do use, again, your green ticks to say you're in favor or your red X's to say you abstain or object. I see all green ticks. And just for good measure, does anyone abstain or object? No? Thank you very much. This is approved.

And as I said, when we are done with this, I wanted to go back to see if maybe Sean or Stephen are back to the call. I don't think they are. Okay, no problem. Moving on.

So now we are in the Item 14. That's the review of the working group charters and the Terms of Reference. So here we are under (a), to adopt the updated charter of the Guideline Review Committee.

Are there any questions or comments regarding the updated charter? And for those of you who still have your green ticks on, please clear them because I will ask you again briefly. So no comments or questions? Then may I have a mover? I see Jordan. Thank you. And a seconder? Nick. Thank you very much.

So now I will ask you to please use your green ticks if you approve of this resolution. Yes, Chris. You have your hand up. Oops, sorry. No problem. Wrong button.

So if you agree, please use your green ticks. Thank you. I only see green ticks, but for good measure does anyone abstain or object? I see none. Thank you very much. This has been approved, and you may clear your green ticks.

Okay, now we are on introduction of Terms of Reference for the Triage Committee. Jordan, would you like to introduce the updated Terms of Reference?

JORDAN CARTER:

Sure, Ale. And thanks, everyone. This follows the discussion we had. [I can't remember about the rest of the last] [inaudible] meeting before

about updating these Terms of Reference to better represent the new planning and prioritization role for the committee. And we hope to get these to you in time for adoption at their meeting, but we just missed the deadline [inaudible] of confusion. So that's why this is an introduction and not an adoption.

It's a pretty straightforward document. I think it was circulated earlier in the week. If there are any questions, we can answer them. Otherwise, I think the plan is to move this to an online decision after this meeting.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Yes, exactly, Jordan. So if you have any questions or comment, please let's do them by e-mail because now I see that we are a little bit behind schedule. And we will have an online decision next week, so there will be plenty of time.

Then the next one—thank you, Jordan—(b), progress on the review of charters. We received information from TLD-OPS that there is no need for a review now. Tech Working Group is working on a draft update. IGLC has approved their revised update, so we will expect also another online decision maybe next week. [MPC] will have a look after ICANN73, and other groups are still to reply or give us an update on that. So we'll keep you posted on how that evolves.

And moving to the ccNSO and DNS Abuse: What should the ccNSO do? Next steps.

Well, in the background materials, you have the latest version of the Roadmap of the ccNSO and DNS Abuse, and there have not been any

changes to that. And this is a result of extensive discussions during ICANN72, the workshop that we had with the community and the small group calls.

So we have proposed Terms of Reference for the DNS Abuse Standing Committee. And the idea today is to seek for feedback on those. And maybe Nick, may I ask you to give some highlights on this?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Yeah, thank you. So we've gone through a number of processes with the discussion on the DNS Abuse and how or what this should [inaudible] ccNSO work streams. There's been basically a number of community discussions going forward, and workshops.

But one of the leading suggestions has been, I think probably from quite early on, is that there ought to be a dedicated working committee of the ccNSO to focus on this. And this would be sort of a dedicated forum. And there are a number of reasons why that's the case, largely because showcasing that the ccNSO is interested in this area. And I'm emphasizing that this is not a policy formation, but rather a best practices sharing forum.

And I think also demonstrating, I think, given that every [single] SO/AC is sort of involved in this topic, it seemed a bit strange when there are so many good examples from within the ccNSO community to draw on that we didn't have an opportunity to provide that showcase.

So there's been a small ad hoc group looking at the topic generally, and there will be further workshops going forward. But one of the likely

outcomes is going to be, essentially, a request to the Council to set up. So this is essentially ...

There will be opportunities for the community feedback, and so this is not everybody's last opportunity. And we're not asking for approval for anything, but I think the way we'd like to work is through a sort of iterative approach whereby there are no surprises. You can see the inputs that we've had. You can see what we're proposing, what people have said. And then ultimately we'll put this to the community.

But I think we want to move fairly quickly, given that there's a very high degree of consensus that this is the right thing to do and a high degree of consensus that there's something useful here in the work that we have.

So when it comes to the actual terms, I don't know if it's worth putting them up on the screen and going through it briefly. But in essence there were four topics suggested from the community. And I basically, like all good lawyers, I shamelessly plagiarized it and put it into my own document.

So the real issue for discussion, I think, is the fact that it is not a policy body. Absolutely not. It is just for sharing examples of good information and best practices and what has worked, what hasn't worked. That's more or less given. I think there's an interesting question around metrics, and I think people have talked about their experiences with the ICANN [bar]—some positive and some sort of more neutral, shall we say.

But this is an area where these can be better socialized and all of the community members can see, and ccNSO members can participate and learn a bit more about what are the things that people are doing, what are the metrics which are useful, what are things that people have tried and wasted time on and which they shouldn't concern themselves with.

The one point which was suggested would be, because a lot of the ... This is not part of the TLD-OPS Committee at all, but we wanted to ... Several suggestions were, "Well, the TLD-OPS is working really well, so why don't we essentially create something, clone it essentially and have our own thing but call it for the DNS Abuse?"

One of the functions of the TLD-OPS is this e-mail list that they operate. And that was one of the suggestions, but I think the ad hoc group ... And others on this call can weigh in on the question. But where you have a threat, an emerging thing, then maybe sort of a rapid response list and sharing is a useful tool for this on the DNS abuse topics where you're talking about longer term initiatives. I'm not quite sure ...

Or I wasn't. I didn't fully understand the merits of having a dedicated e-mail list, another dedicated e-mail list on that. So my inclination would be to probably not have that as part of the Terms of Reference. But that's one of those thoughts that was put in. But, yeah, there will be further processes.

And I must say that I don't generally favor the creation of new working groups and committees because there's sort of a tendency for proliferation. So we have ... More and more get created, but none of them get ... It sounds unfair, so none of them get euthanized. So maybe

we should have, “You can’t create a new committee unless one of them is canceled.”

[inaudible] this is a very beneficial area. Seriously, this is a really important piece of work. And if other people can happily reach out to any of the members of the ad hoc group or reach out to me personally or reach out to Alejandra who’s also on it, we would really value feedback because, ultimately, we want to put this to Council for approval following the end of the ICANN73 meeting.

I don’t know if there’s any sort of specific questions based on the draft and materials provided, but happy to answer any.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Nick. So as Nick already said, this is going to be presented to the community now in ICANN73, so you have a quick preview to give us any feedback that you might have. I will ask you to do so in the mailing list or to ask directly due to time constraints.

And I also wanted to inform you that this topic is also part of the agenda with the meeting with the GAC along with the updates of the ccPDPs. So, for your knowledge.

And moving along, now we are on Item 16, ICANN73 Meetings. As crazy as it sounds, it’s in two weeks so we will need to do a lot of things soon. And one of them is our prep meeting that is next week. So for this, we will, as mentioned, see roles and responsibilities for councilors.

But also, I will share with you—because I don’t remember having done it already—ICANN Board questions that they have for us. And now that

I'm seeing this, I will circulate them as soon as the end of this call so that, by the prep maybe, I would like to seek for possible answers that we can give to these ICANN Board questions.

Okay, well, there's not much of a change of information that we had in our past meetings to what we have right now. Only to note that there will be five minutes at the start of the Council meeting that we are going to give to the NomCom to make their announcement for new leaders. And also that Irina has agreed to moderate the Q&A session with the ccNSO-related Board members. Other than that, there are no new things here.

So with that, unless there are any questions or comments regarding this ... I see none, so we move to the next Council meeting that will be on Thursday the 10th of March at 14:30 UTC. And we will have all the topics that we've already said we will have there.

So is there any other business? Okay, I don't see any. So with this, we adjourn the part of the Council meeting. We will have a very short [10-minute] break. Please do come back in 10 minutes so we can start the part of the workshop. And thank you, everyone, for attending this. And see you soon.

Thank you, Kim. And thank you all for coming back. Now we will start our Council Workshop. And I'll give it to you, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you, Alejandra. Hello, everyone. I'm going to make this intro snappy so we have enough time for the discussion. We're here talking

about a strategy document, and you might wonder why that is the case for a Triage workshop on prioritization. And it's because, as we discussed earlier, we need to just have a very clear view about what our high-level strategy is to help with the prioritization of our work.

So what the Triage Committee has done is pulled us together a document on a page which is in front of you on the screen now. The purposes statement of it is what the ccNSO has already agreed. And all we've done that's different about that is come up with three pillars of that.

What are the three goals that we will pursue in a three- to four-year time frame, really, to give effect to our purpose. And so they map quite closely what's in the purpose. And then stated some foundations around what we do together and the ways that we work to support us achieving those goals.

It isn't meant to be a detailed strategy, and it isn't meant to be controversial. This is not about trying to set out on a new direction for the ccNSO. This is about being really clear about what our direction is. And then we can use this to build our Annual Work Plan off. And the Triage Committee can use this when new requests come in so we can test them. Is this really going to help us achieve what we're trying to achieve or not?

And so through the workshop that we're going to do, is ask you to look at this and to address a few questions and to do a bit of a stress test of it. Now I want to emphasize. This is the first time you've seen this. This is our first cut. We're not going to get to the final version of this an

approve it in this workshop. There's time for more discussion at subsequent meetings in February and March, so don't panic about the fact that we don't have a lot of time today. It's good to get the quick impressions and so on.

And the way that we're going to do that is to get you into breakout room. We've got one breakout room for the observers, and then the rest of Council members. And there are a couple of questions which is: Are those goals the most important one? Is there some area of work that's missing that we have to include?

Because if we're going to do a bit of work and we have to do it and if [inaudible] strategy document, then the strategy document isn't all that needs to be changed. So we need to see if something is missing.

Is there any other feedback that you've got about what's on there?

And then the fourth one—and I'd say do it fourth, do it if you've got time in your groups—is look at those topics that we've put down there. DNS abuse where we have started doing some work; Universal Acceptance which we've started to talk about maybe doing some work; and the RDS WHOIS Review as a previous area where we decided not to get too involved. And just check it against these strategic goals and as a reality check.

And we're going to do those breakouts and then we're going to get everyone to do a quick report back to the plenary and just see what things are doing. And you've got a Jamboard thing that will be introduced to you in the rooms. So even stuff we don't have time to

verbally report back to the group will be captured and pulled together by the staff.

So that's the purpose. Strategy on a page. Making sure that we've either got right or got the feedback to adjust just two or three of the longer-term goals that we as the ccNSO are pursuing in our work. And then we'll take the feedback from this discussion and wrap it into the next version of this ready for another discussion later.

Are there any questions about what we're doing today? Because if there are not ...

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

How long have we got, Jordan, for the breakouts?

JORDAN CARTER:

Just on the time frame now, we're going to do 20 minutes in the breakout rooms. So until 40. I don't know what the first hour is, but 20 minutes from 11:20 AM my time. And then we'll have about 4 minutes or report back time from everyone. We don't have time for a plenary discussion of our report backs. So that's the time frame that's involved.

Okay, let's get into it. Staff, could you move us into the breakout rooms. And have a great discussion. We look forward to hearing what comes from it.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Hey, everybody. I guess this is it. How many have we got in this breakout room?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: It looks like we have six. We're pretty even with the other groups.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Perfect. Who wants to kick this off?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: [Counting].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I'll just sort of lead on this since I've seen this before. We've come up with, basically, three goals here. You can see across the middle—Goal 1, Goal 2, Goal 3. And, essentially, the outcomes.

So the first goal is to evolve global policies that serve ccTLDs in the ICANN environment, consistent with ccNSO values and the needs of ccTLDs. And so that's essential the policy work of the ccNSO which is fairly narrow in scope. But it's an important one.

So for example, the review mechanisms and PDPs and one which I don't know so much about but obviously is very important, which is the IDN PDP.

You can see down here, the middle column, supporting the "growth and development of ccTLDs around the world through the exchange of

information, ideas, and building strong relationships.” This is the very traditional role of the ccNSO around whether it’s Tech Day or the other [sharing the] best practices and new sessions. Essentially, we’re a community which share and collaborate very strongly to move everybody forward in a positive direction with our own cultural frames of reference and national jurisdictions.

And then the third one, you can see around playing our part in ICANN’s broader role of core mission and responsibilities as one of the decisional participants and to make sure that other parts of ICANN are aware of what we do and the fact that the ccTLDs are individual, special, or different, and however you wish to describe it.

So this is not supposed to be revolution. This is supposed to be sort of evolution in approach. And you can see here the questions, really. Well, question one really is, in the view of this particular breakout room, does this seem broadly correct?

And over the next three years, strategically, does this match with what should be our strategic roles? Because it helps those of us who are on the ... I should say I am on the Triage Committee. But when we’re looking at things in the Triage Committee to try and assess their priority, it’s difficult to do that without looking at a strategic document which sets out what the strategic priorities are. Then we can easily see ...

You can see the fourth question, looking back at the things we’ve chosen to do or not do versus these strategic priorities. Do they still make sense?

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Nick, it's Rosemary Sinclair from .au. Can you hear me okay?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I can hear you perfectly, Rosemary. How are you?

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: I'm very well. Pleased to be here this morning, but I very much feel I have my training wheels on. So with that small caveat, if I could just make an early comment.

As I read the three goals, the first one is really focusing on what we need as ccTLD managers. The second goal is focusing on how we can help each other as a group of ccTLD managers. The third one is focusing on how we can use our knowledge and expertise to assist ICANN's broader work.

The bit that's missing for me, Nick, is some reference to the end user, that we're doing all this good work for the benefit of the users of the Internet. So if we could capture that link somewhere to outcome and impacts, I think that might, from time to time, give us a lens which stretches our thinking on our contribution.

Because, given that we are all so busy, the easy default position when new matters come up is to say, "No. We're too busy." But if that answer of "no" means that we miss out on contributing to something that will have incredibly positive impact for Internet users, then I feel that we would not be contributing in the way that we ought to be contributing. I'll stop there.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you, Rosemary. That's a super interesting perspective. Does anyone else want to chip in either on "are these right or have we missed out already" or to comment on Rosemary's interesting point? So this is perfect and we continue?

Kim, are you taking note of the feedback?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Hi, Nick. Sorry, I am not. I was trying to get people into their breakout rooms. I was told that you were taking notes.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay. I've made my own note, but I was making sure that [inaudible].

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Sorry about that.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: No, it's all good. I've got that note. And as I say, I've kind of worked out what I think about it. There is obviously the At-Large Advisory Committee which is specifically for the end user perspectives But you ...

In a sense, it's right in that every ccTLD manager [inaudible] but my approach as ccTLD manager is that we're here to represent our communities and, Ultimately, the end users.

Yes. Of course, David. Please pitch in.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thanks, Nick. I definitely am an observer, not a Council member. And I stepped away for a little bit longer than the break. So apologies for that. But I'm getting the gist of what's going on.

So my comment would be that if the goals are listed on this page in the order of priority—that is the one on the left is number 1, the middle one “support the growth, etc.” is number 2—my comment would be it seems to me that the middle one should be the top priority. That is, “support the growth and development of ccTLDs.”

This goal, to me, sounds like a statement of the essential nature of the ccNSO which I think is a very good organization that create relationships, that passes information along. And it seems to be growing in that respect with this DNS abuse work that's going on. It's sort of really getting good legs and it's grown its membership. But to me, this seems like this would be the top one.

The one on the left, “evolve the global policies,” I have to say ... And I've been involved in ccNSO since 2015 in some respect not that well steps as some of the folks that have been here a lot longer. But it seems to me that many of the principle global policies guiding the ccNSO are sort of principles in nature not likely to evolve greatly and sort of well-established things like guard, independence, that kind of thing. I would actually make that third, almost.

So those are my comments just as an observer, as I said, not a Council member. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you, David. I don't think that there was a deliberate ordering in terms of 1, 2, and 3, left to right. That's not my understanding at all. But I do agree that presentation is important. And you may have missed my introduction, but I did say when I got on to the middle column that this was my orthodox view of, classically, what the ccNSO has really spent the most of its time on and been really good at.

So I don't know whether I'd prefer it in the middle, front and center, when you look at the page or whether it should be the primary ordinal on the left as we go across. And I think that is a really interesting point which we can reflect on. Thanks.

Rosemary, you have your hand up again.

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thank you, Nick. I was just going to say that we at .au have just finished a process of developing strategy on a page and the value that go with that. So when I look at this, I look at it as part of an escalation, if you like. So I'm looking for alignment.

This is a very particular view, I know, but I wondered whether it might be useful if people were prepared to—a I certainly am—to provide our own strategy on a page to the committee as part of the reflection on this particular proposal. So [inaudible].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, that would be great. My registry Nominet did used to have a plenary on a page as sort of strategic for the one- to three- to five-year direction. It was very text-bent, as I recall. But I think it's interesting to

see how other folks have done it, and particularly whether you prioritize, like you have sort of 1, 2, 3 or equally. And how we measure these things is also something that's sort of interesting to try and think about.

Do you still have your hand up, Rosemary?

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: I'll put it down.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay. Feel free to carry on if you—

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: [Lowered].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Is there anymore? Stephen? Sean? Barrack? I'm just pulling out names. Soulemayne? Speak now or forever hold your peace. Actually affirmation that these are broadly correct—other than the comments that have already been made—that these are things that you would support or would also be really helpful to hear?

Kim will tell us in a minute. We've got seven minutes left, so it's plenty of time. Thank you.

Sebastien, the floor is yours.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, just quickly from an observer, a GNSO perspective, and somebody who's been watching the ccNSO for a number of years. I keep on coming with points, and they all fit in one of those there boxes.

I think it's concise, but it covers all the bases. It describes very well what you're doing and what you're meant to do.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Well, thank you. And did you have a view about whether one is of a higher priority than the others, or with the sort of [inaudible]?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think I tend to agree with David and with you that the middle one is. Presentation wise, should it be on the left because it's more important? Or in the middle? I don't know. It probably depends also the rest of the page. Some of it is blocked, so I don't know how that reads. I didn't read it left to right. To me, that middle block is indeed the more important. And it doesn't bother me that [they should look] in the middle.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: The psychology of presentation is the very individual and a whole topic in its own [and a] super interesting one. When we look at decisions we have made, the DNS abuse would be something that the ccNSO would spend some time, devote some of their limited volunteer time and resource towards. Yet the RDS WHOIS-type issues would not be. And that might have predated my time, but essentially WHOIS policy is very much a devolved question of policy making or each individual ccTLD, and therefore is kind of like the ICANN debate on GDPR and WHOIS. It's

kind of interesting but time consuming and not of a priority. I mean, do people broadly agree that if you use these prioritization goals and outcomes, that actually would ... If we look backwards from what we have done and look at these, would that still hold true in terms of reality checking [inaudible]?

David.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thanks, Nick. It think it would. I think, for instance, the example that you just mentioned, RDS WHOIS, is extremely important on the GNSO side, for obviously reasons because of contracts with ICANN, etc., and the GDPR driving change. Although there are other countries coming in with their laws, too.

On the ccNSO side where things are a little bit more independent, I think that it's important for ccTLDs to manage this, but with an eye towards law enforcement as it applies to them. And I say law enforcement because I personally—I'm speaking personally now—sort of weigh that above the interests of intellectual property owners. Not saying that second one is not an important consideration. It certainly is. But to me, the real imperative of WHOIS is for law enforcement purposes.

But I think the other examples you mentioned, DNS abuse—and I'll mention TLD-OPS—those to me would be applications of the middle principles or maybe the third principle that are very good for information sharing for ccTLDs. If there's a DDoS attack somewhere, the TLD-OPS list is going to help someone immediately. If there's DNS abuse

that's cropping up that's somewhat acute, it's possible that the information sharing in the DNS abuse center is going to be quite helpful.

So to me, those are quite important applications which fall under various goals here. I think RDS WHOIS is important, but perhaps not as important on this side as it is on the GNSO side. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Thank you. And thank you, Hadia, for the comment about "essentially in agreement that the WHOIS is not a ccTLD priority." And also speaking personally, I wholeheartedly agree with your comments, David, in terms of registry data and law enforcement. It's important for every TLD in the ecosystem.

So I think we've got two minutes left if there were any other points that we need to absorb. So it looks like we've got a couple of minutes if there are any further thoughts. And I'm keen to hear all viewpoints, but especially for people who've not spoken so far. And thank you, Hadia, Sebastien, and David for your feedback.

KIMBERLY CARLSON:

Hey, Nick. Would you be willing to do the reporting back since [inaudible]?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Yes, surely. Of course, I can.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I can't say that it will be good, but I will try to face the [inaudible] feedback [inaudible] for the group.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Thanks. Sorry for the misunderstanding.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: No, no, no. It's okay. There are a lot of these workshops and things going on, and it's a little bit easy just to sort of get mixed up.

Okay, so 30 seconds let anyway, so I suggest we just compose ourselves. I'm just going to actually make a couple of notes.

JORDAN CARTER: Are we all back in the room, or are there still people in a breakout?

[MARIE-NOÉMIE MARQUES]: I think there are people in breakouts and they're talking to each other, and we are sort of crashing the party here.

JORDAN CARTER: Oh, no.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: I just closed the rooms. We've got about 20 seconds to rejoin.

JORDAN CARTER: That's okay.

MARIE-NOÉMIE MARQUES: Okay.

JORDAN CARTER: Alejandra's going to share out report back in a moment.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Waiting for everyone to get back. And I don't know if the rooms are numbered. Let me check.

ALI HADJI MMADI: I'm sorry. Something went wrong. It was [inaudible]. I'm sorry.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hi, Ali.

ALI HADJI MMADI: Hi, Alejandra. I'm sorry to hear something went wrong and I came back now. I'm sorry. There were some issues with my connections.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No problem. We are just coming back from our breakout rooms, and I believe that we are all back now. Is that correct, Kim? Do you think we ...

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Everyone's back.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you very much. So maybe we should start the recording for this part.

JORDAN CARTER: The recording is on, yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, sorry. I didn't notice that. Okay. Well, thank you all for your hard work in the breakout rooms. Now it's time to report back and I will go in the order that I have it in the Jamboard file. So is it okay if we start with the main room with Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay, brilliant. Thank you. So I will try to succinctly summarize the comments made from the main room without attributing who made them. But I think, broadly speaking, we settled on a pretty rough consensus.

I suppose the first point was: Should there be, in terms of ccNSO focus and prioritization, or the strategy against which that's [set], some sort of reference to when this is beneficial for end users of that ccTLD? We had a bit of a chat. As you know, there's the ALAC with [inaudible] focus specifically on the end user. So I think it's an interesting comment that none of these goals essentially promote the experience of the end users of the ccTLD and whether that might be a useful comment.

We then spoke a bit about ... I mean, I wasn't leading the jury, I hope. But when I got to the second ... The presentation and the order of these three goals and outcomes is important. Right? And when I got to the first ... The first is on the left, the second's in the middle, and the third's on the right. And I kind of read left to right. That's how I look at things.

But I think when I got to the second one in the middle where we talked about supporting the growth and development of ccTLDs, this is what we all agree, I think, we spend most of our time doing and is really the primary valuable function of the ccNSO.

So one way of saying whether or not ... Are these all equal, the three goals? Or is one of them of a higher order of priority? Or are they all the same? Maybe that could be made a bit clearer. But the view of our group was that the middle one is the main priority against which objectives should be set.

And finally, and look at this going through. There's a bit of a query about whether policy creation is really that important for the ccNSO because, let's face it, most policies are [inaudible]. The few policies that we do create are important. So that is [inaudible] question. There was a

question around, well, is policy creation really one of the primary functions, given that, as you know with the DNS abuse, we've made it very clear that policy creation isn't really one of the functions. So that was an interesting thought, I felt.

And finally, when we looked at the questions like the DNS abuse and RDS WHOIS questions, we 100% agreed—and contradict me if I'm representing it wrong—we 100% agreed that those were correctly decided, and we 100% agreed that those would solidly be the outcome if you were assessing your priorities against, particularly, the middle goal as stated on the one-page plan.

There you go. 53 seconds [back].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Excellent job, Nick. Okay, I think that it would be a good idea to go through all breakout rooms and see if there ... We have two minutes left. Then we can have a discussion just to get everything on record.

So now it's Room #2, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

That's me being sentenced to the report back on this. Our group is an amazing group. Just to let you all know that. Like all the other groups.

We thought the answer to the question was yes, broadly speaking. They are the right areas to identify. [inaudible] any area missing, we focused on the third of those goals. And there was a discussion that we wanted to table for you to think about. That was that this should include the

ability to work on issues that related to ICANN's mission or support the broader multistakeholder Internet governance system.

So basically saying that there might be issues where there isn't a ccTLD interest but it's still important for us to work on them and to help uphold the system or to help ICANN advance its mission. And so that's a little bit more broad in the way the wording is done there. So we wanted to bring that up.

In terms of any other feedback on the third question, we talked about the word "modern" in the second of those foundation bullet points. "Modern" can mean many things. We thought may "collaborative" would be better.

And then in terms of the fourth one, [grading] the work required on the topics mentioned [which I think was] RDS WHOIS, DNS abuse, Universal Acceptance. We thought that this framework of goals would allow that. The DNS abuse, the way we're approaching it, would fit under the second goal. And the Universal Acceptance would fit in the third. We didn't get into trying to assess or prioritize those three as examples. So maybe we missed the point a little bit there.

But that is the broad feedback. We also had a little discussion about whether we thought the overall purpose of the ccNSO was still fine, the top bit of this document. And we agreed that we didn't think it needed any kind of reassessment at this point. It's been agreed recently.

So that's my report back on behalf of the group, Group 2.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. And to move along then, let's move to Room #3, and I see it's Marie-Noémi.

MARIE-NOÉMIE MARQUES: Yes. Room #3. So I'm trying to give you a picture of myself. Okay, good. So regarding the Room #3, we first of all, for Question 1, we feel that the goals are well reviewed and that they capture the strategic directions. So this is fine. The response is yes.

And regarding Question 2, what is maybe missing and could be added. We said an exchange of information maybe is not enough. And we also wonder if capacity building is covered and [aware].

And there was also the idea that relations with original organizations are [inaudible] ISOC could be dealt with or covered.

Any other feedback in relation to Question 3. We wonder if dialogue between members is captured because there is a feeling that this is important.

And the other questions is about innovation and for new topics. And the question is about, should it be included?

In relation to Question 4, how would we rate the work required or these topics? We have taken the example of Universal Acceptance, and we feel that there is a different importance depending on the committees that are involved. But I suppose that for the ccTLD, the importance would be rather medium than high-level importance. But it's to that, for the organization, it would be a strategic importance.

So, have I said everything? I think so. I can't see the right [inaudible] highly important [to] ... Oh, okay. We just started speaking about WHOIS, but I think that there was no conclusion about that.

So this is finished for me, for Room 3. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Marie-Noémie. I see that we still have, well, some minutes left. If possible maybe to have some discussion, comments, or feedback [inaudible] room [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: We have one more group to go.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, sorry. I thought that was it.

IRINA DANELIA: Yeah, Room 4. There is still one more room.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, so sorry. I'm so sorry. Please, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you very much. Let me report on behalf of Room 4. [inaudible] Question 1 was mentioned that, yes, these other areas are most

important and they are aligned with our previous discussions. And the pillars are then defined by the ccNSO.

With regard to the Question #2, it was mentioned that in general, areas [inaudible] correctly. But there was an observation that ccNSO voice is not heard loud enough in the world and that we probably need to do something to promote the work done by ccNSO more broadly.

This definitely depends on a context of how we see our work position [inaudible] ccNSO and its work in ICANN or through ICANN.

Answering Question 3. The only feedback was that the group likes this one-page strategy because it's clear and concise and very convenient and useful to communicate, and allows us to stay on track. So, the full support of the idea.

And unfortunately we had not enough time to discuss the Question 4, so there were just a couple of comments that DNS abuse seems to be quite important and not sure about Universal Acceptance whether it's important to any ccTLD manager.

And that's actually all because we had to stop at that moment. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Irina. And, well, I wonder if Jordan and the rest of the team have enough material to move forward.

JORDAN CARTER:

Yes, I think so. I think this has been really helpful. My very broad time-back of the overall theme is that it's helpful to see it like this, that it's broadly about [inaudible], and that there are improvements that we can make to it.

And some of input here can feed into the preparation of the work plan that would sit under this strategy. So thank you very much for the feedback and for jotting all those notes down in the Jamboard that we can use. We appreciate it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, all. Just wondering is there anything else, any immediate feedback from anyone else that participated that would like to say something now just because we have one more minute? Or on the session itself? Was it useful? Did you like the exercise? I will take that as a yes.

So with that, let's give everyone five minutes of their time. Thank you all for joining and for your contributions. I think they're very valuable. So under the next time, please stay safe. And see you soon. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]