

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hi, everyone. Welcome to our ccNSO Council meeting 182 on the 21st of April at 12:00 UTC. I would like to remind all councilors to please add the word council to your Zoom ID so it's easier for us to see you. And of course, if possible and you feel comfortable with it, to turn on your camera so we can see each other during the call.

For the record, may I ask Kim whether we are quorate?

KIM CARLSON: Hi Alejandra. Yes, the meeting is quorate.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Kim. And today's background material, you will find it in the wiki page, I will place the link now in the chat so you have it at hand.

Moving along with item two, the relevant correspondence. We received a letter from Theresa Swinehart and we will discuss this in item 12. And then we move on to minutes and action items. The minutes have been published and all action items are completed. And moving to item four, we can see the list of all the decisions that we've made in between our Council calls. And I would like to ask now if there are any comments or questions regarding these items. I see none. So I'll move on. Thank you very much.

And now we have the written updates. So I'll go one by one to see if there are any questions or additional comments regarding anything that

---

*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.*

---

has been already put in the document that summarizes this. So first, it's the update on the ECA, CSC, CSC review team. Any comments or questions here? No. Very well. There's updates from the working groups. Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I give you a real quick update on the tech working group charter revision. Chair would like a couple changes. As I explained yesterday, it looks like the charter will be changed a little bit to two vice chairs with staggered terms. We should have that finalized before ICANN 74. And the working group is planning to meet in person there and I'm sure it'll get wrapped up there and be finalized. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Stephen, very looking forward to that. And we will discuss also chapter reviews later on as well. Thank you Stephen. Updates regarding CCPDPs. Any questions or additional comments? Okay. Oh, Stephen. That's a new hand.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, it is. Real quick upgrade on PDP3, the subgroup that was working with ICANN Legal on coming up with a binding mechanism met yesterday. And we have a slide deck that we're going to present to the full group at our next meeting on the 4th of May. And I presume we're going to present an update to the community at some point during ICANN 74. So that's where we are there. Thank you.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Stephen. Next one, update from liaisons. Any comments or questions regarding those? Okay, I think none, then update from chairs, vice chairs, councilors, or regional organizations and the secretariat.

Here, I have a bit of an update. Next week will be the roundtable with SO/AC chairs in Los Angeles. And the topics that we are going to discuss are the five-year strategic plan, prep session and the FY 24 planning. Inside of that, they will update us on how the prioritization pilot and their next steps are, also how the role of the SO/AC chairs will be in this community prioritization.

We will talk about specific SO/AC priorities for this year and next year. Also the next steps regarding organizational review that we will touch upon later in the meeting, in our call now. Also improving the process of Board consideration for advice from ICANN's advisory committees. And update and next steps on implementation work on enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN multi stakeholder model. And of course, ICANN 74, what to expect and planning ahead of future meetings.

So to start with this, I would like to ask either Chris or Irina to give us a brief update regarding the prioritization pilot, since this will be a topic that we will see next week. And any message you would like us to convey there.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm happy to do that, Alejandra. Simply put, it's a five-meeting exercise. And we are three in, we've got two more to go. The last one is supposed

---

to be a taking stock, what happened? What points can they take forward from the pilot?

But the main crux or the main weight of the work has been a spreadsheet of I think from memory 45 recommendations across various different ATRT3, WHOIS recommendations, SSR2 and so on, that have already been approved by the Board. And this group's job and in a future next time around once it's set up post the pilot, the next group's job will be to rate those in an order of priority. And it's on a matrix of urgent and important, urgent and not important—although quite how that works, I'm not entirely sure—important but not urgent, and so on.

And fortunately for us all, ICANN staff have done a spreadsheet that has their own suggestions as to the ways to do it. Suggestions of which ones should be prioritized. To be clear, the job is not for this group to decide, oh, there are too many P1s—P1s are the top priority, P4s are the lowest—but just to go through the process. And then it's not for us to say, “Oh, this might be too expensive,” because that's a separate process. Once we know what the priorities are, then the budgets will be looked at.

It's been difficult to try and keep people on track about not—the fact that they don't particularly agree with a recommendation, shall we say, from ATRT3 is not a reason to say it should be a P4. The recommendation has been approved by the Board. The fact that you don't like it isn't relevant. What's relevant is, having been approved by the Board, how urgent/important is it?

---

So it's quite complicated to try and manage that because people naturally are going to push what their own beliefs are. But of course, hopefully enough of a diversity across the group will make that happen.

I was concerned that we weren't going to get through it. I think we made enough progress. I'd be interested in what Irina thinks. I think we made enough progress on the last call to give us a chance of getting through it in time. The process is raw and obviously needs going forward—that's the purpose of running a pilot—to be smoothed around the edges, and maybe some additional criteria given to members of the next group.

But look, it's happening. There are things being prioritized. That's a good thing. It's being done by a group from the community. That's a good thing. The staff have contributed a suggestion for each one. That's a good thing because this thing about staff stepping back and never saying anything is not a good thing.

And so that's where we're at. Irina, would you have anything to add? Because Irina has been on the calls as well. So credit to Irina for being there.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you very much, Chris. My general assessment is the same as yours. And I participate this call in just listening and watching mode. I do not participate in the discussion itself.

I must say that from one side, ICANN Org did a very good job preparing this process. But from the other side, for me, just three of five meetings

---

are actually scheduled to do the actual prioritizing job, and to go through 45 recommendations in three meetings seems challenging.

After the first step of this exercise, I really doubt it's possible. After the second step, I believe it works better, so speed increases. However, I still would distribute the time of this group probably in a little bit different manner, giving more time for actual discussions.

But however, it's a pilot, it's a thing which should be tried once and there will be lessons learned. So somehow, it's happening. Thank you very much.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, thank you very much, Chris, and Irina. So it seems that it might work. But more time would be necessary for a true exercise. Is that correct?

IRINA DANELIA: This is my feeling. But maybe I'm wrong. And maybe a more structured approach, as Chris mentioned, with predefined criteria will help to speed up the process in the future. But it's quite difficult to discuss. Yeah, sorry.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I actually think there's enough time, as long as there's a discipline of not wandering past a hole in the ground and wondering if that is in fact a rabbit hole and then diving down it and spending 20 minutes down there talking about stuff that has nothing whatsoever to do with the

---

prioritization and everything to do about how I feel personally about a particular recommendation. That discipline is important, and it needs to be.

So I think that the biggest feedback that I would give right now is that the group needs to be slightly more firmly harnessed than they currently are.

But that said, I still think we'll get through it. And I do think that the exercise will be valuable. And I don't think that the fact that we may run out of time and have to extend a bit, or that we manage to get it done in time, is an indicator of it not being done properly. I think it is being done properly. I just think there's a lot of extraneous matter going on, which is unnecessary.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you very much to you both. And of course, I'll let you know what comes out on the roundtable next week. Any questions or comments from anyone regarding the topics being discussed in next week or what Chris and Irina just shared regarding the prioritization pilot? Yes, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Just in terms of the meeting arrangements going forward, fully hybrid, is there anything more that we need to know? Because it seems to me that a lot of people are going to be attending in person in The Hague. And I wonder if any updates on the numbers of people registering and whether it's going to feel like an old meeting or whether it's going to be

---

more sort of 50/50 attendance, whether there's any sort of insight as to that and what the practicalities—would it feel like an old meeting of the sort that we're used to, or will it kind of feel weird? I'd be very interested to know what to expect, I guess, in terms of planning my arrangements for The Hague. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Well, they haven't shared any numbers with us yet. So I hope that we will know then. But what can be said regarding expectations, it's more on the health and safety protocols that there will be going on.

I understand that next week, they will do trial with us attending, as in, for example, wearing your face mask, taking your temperature, taking daily tests, asking questionnaire regarding how you're feeling. And also having social distance in the rooms and the capacity, the number of people that can be in a room at a certain time. Those things are the ones that are going to be very different from the past. But regarding numbers and how many people have already registered and what to expect, I will ask them next week if they have any numbers yet, but they haven't shared with us anything so far.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

I suppose I suppose my point is that if we have 3000 people attending in person, but there's the sort of strict enforcement of the two meter distancing, I'm just struggling to see how in practice, that's going to be possible, for example. Is there gonna be a massive queue to have temperatures taken? Well, I think they've made some quite odd decisions in terms of the meeting protocols, given that these things are



---

not legal requirements in Holland at all. Anyway, I've been just really curious as to what—because there must be a sort of iterative process of experimentation to a certain degree, right?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, I agree, we'll need to see whatever we go through next week, with a small number of people will translate to a big number of people in The Hague. I see Chris has his hand up.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks. Nick, I can't answer the question in detail, but I can give you some clues. My understanding is that the rooms—obviously each particular session will take place in a main room. That room will have social distancing enforced, there will be overflow and people will be masked, and they will actually be participating on their computers. In other words, there'll be no head to table, everybody will be using their computers.

And my understanding is that there will then be overflow rooms in the center, again, where people will be able to go and that again, people will be participating.

The goal is to hold each session so that no one is disadvantaged by not being in the room. In other words, the fact that you can see people in the room is obviously an advantage. But other than the fact that you can see them, all communication is through the computers.

---

And the other thing to remember is this is a policy forum. So there are no plenary sessions to speak of. There are only individual policy meetings for each of the SOs and ACs, plus a number of joint gatherings.

And for what it's worth, my humble opinion is that a lot of people will choose—given that there is no challenge to participating in the hybrid meeting on your computer, lots of people choose to do so from their hotel where the requirements to wear a mask will not be there and where small groups of people can gather together and participate in the meeting together. That's what I suspect will happen. As for numbers, no clue. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

No, thanks, Chris. That's really interesting. Yeah, I think you might be right about people just remotely participating from the lobby and then joining in the other things, which are the positive and personal experiences, right. Anyway, thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Nick, and thank you, Chris. I'll let you know whatever comes out from this roundtable regarding those numbers and any other things that we need to consider for our participation in ICANN 74.

Okay, I see no other hands up. So let's move on to the next items. Now we have the discussions and decisions during the meeting. So the first one is the adoption of the roles and responsibilities for the councilors. It has been circulated before. We had to do some updates to some of the committees and well, councilors were asked to volunteer to any of the

---

committees that we have. And this is just about the roles and responsibilities of councilors. We have a separate thing for our appointments to external working groups. And I don't know if we have it on cue to show it up but it's not necessary. You have it on your package. I would like to know if there is any question for clarification regarding the roles of councilors for this year, or comments.

Okay, we have it on the screen, and it's on the wiki so you can see there who is in which group, thank you all for volunteering. And if there are no questions, may I ask for a mover? I see Jordan. I see Irina has her hand up to second. Thank you very much, Irina. We have now a resolution. I'll read it really quick.

The ccNSO Council adopts the 2022 overview of roles and responsibilities and requests the secretariat to publish this resolution as soon as possible and publish the aforementioned overview. This resolution becomes effective upon the date of publication.

Any question regarding the resolution? I see none. So okay, let's go for the vote. So I will ask you please use your green ticks to say that you are in favor or your red crosses if you disagree or abstain. This is for the councilors. Okay, I see lots of green ticks. Thank you very much. Thank you all. So please now take them down because we will use them again later. And for good measure, is anyone against or abstaining? Okay, I see none. So this has been approved. Thank you very much.

And now, going back to the agenda, we move to the item 11. So here, we were requested to appoint ccNSO representative to the Nominating Committee. Juhani's service in the NomCom is term limited, he served

---

two consecutive terms. Thank you so much to Juhani for his work. It's really appreciated. Now we need to replace him with a new appointee.

There was a call for nominations open from the 30th of March until the 23rd of April. We received four candidates, and we as the Council—excluding Chris because he was one of the candidates—selected one person to serve on the FY 23 NomCom.

We now have the results of such process. And the person who received most of the votes was Chris. So congratulations, Chris, in advance. Are there any questions regarding this topic, or comment?

Okay, I see none. May I have a mover? I see Demi's hand. And Stephen, you have your hand up. Will that be for seconding or a comment?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:                      Seconding.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:                    Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Demi and thank you, Stephen. So Demi moves and Stephen seconds. Any question regarding the resolution? I will read it really quick.

The ccNSO Council appoints Chris Disspain as ccNSO appointee on the FY 23 NomCom committee. The secretariat is requested to inform the candidates and the NomCom support staff accordingly and publish the decision. The ccNSO Council thanks all candidates for standing. The Council also wants to express its gratitude to Juhani Juselius from .FI for serving on the NomCom the last two years.

---

Any questions regarding the resolution? If not, it's time for the vote. So please, again, use your green ticks if you are in favor, or your red crosses if you are against. I see lots of green ticks. Thank you. Thank you very much. And of course, for good measure, is anyone abstaining?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, I am.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you, Chris. Noted. And anyone again, just in case? I have none. So thank you. Noted your abstention, Chris. And congratulations.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. I appreciate everybody who supported me in whatever position they put me in the ballot. And thank you all. I just want to say one thing. Those of you that know me well know that I think the Nominating Committee is incredibly important. And I'm really personally delighted to be able to take up a position on the Nominating Committee. I think it's a really important part of ICANN. So thanks very much, everyone.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. And moving on now to item 12. It is regarding the deferral of the ccNSO organizational review. So as I told you when we started the call in the item of correspondence, we received a letter from Theresa Swinehart, ICANN senior vice president on global domains and strategy, asking for a deferral of the next, third ccNSO organizational

---

review until the time they understand better the impact of the ATRT3 recommendations and also the workload the community has at that time to see if it's feasible to do another organization review.

So this ccNSO review was scheduled to start in November this year. And we are requested to provide our feedback tomorrow. So any questions or comments regarding this? Okay, if not, may I have a mover? I think Stephen is moving, correct?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, just confirming. And I saw Jenifer put her hand up. Was that for seconding?

JENIFER LOPEZ: Yes, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jenifer. So now we have a resolution to support the deferral of the ccNSO review until the time that it's appropriate. Any questions regarding the resolution? I see none. Okay, so then let's get the vote. So please, again, use your green ticks in case you are in favor of the resolution and your red crosses in case you abstain or are not in favor of this resolution.

---

I see green ticks. Thank you. Thank you very much. Now you can turn them off. And for good measure, is anyone against the resolution? No. So thank you very much. This has been approved.

Next one on our agenda is the adoption the voting report on the change of the internal rules of the ccNSO. So we are finally here. This is the last step. We had the report where we received 96 votes. And from those, vast majority was in favor, only five voters did not support the recommendation. This was a huge effort done by everyone involved. I would like to take this opportunity to thank also to the regional organizations for their help in spreading the message to their members, and letting us address them and unexplain any concerns they might have. I see Javier is clapping. Thank you, Javier. This was a very long process. So Joke, I don't know if you would like to say anything else regarding the vote.

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Thank you, Alejandra. Your summary is very accurate. Just to say that there were no issues or hiccups or observations. So the voting process went smooth, there were no particular issues to report. All details regarding the voting have been published in a vote report, which was circulated on the Council mailing list prior to this meeting. And I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Joke. Are there any questions or comments on this matter? Okay, I see none. May have a mover? I see Demi. And a seconder It's Sean. Thank you very much, everyone. So any questions

---

regarding the resolution? Okay, I see none. So now let's have a vote. So please, again, use your green ticks for approval, your red crosses for abstaining or being against. I see green ticks from the councilors.

Thank you. Thank you all very much. Now you may put them down and, for good measure, as always, is anyone against or abstaining from this vote? I see none, so this has been approved. And this was the final step on this process. So big congratulations. I think this is a milestone and it was a great job. So thank you to everyone involved.

Moving along, now we have item 14, the impact of upcoming change in Article 10 and Annex B to include IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. And for this, I would like to Ask Bart to introduce the topic.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Alejandra. So with the GRC, there was a discussion about the anticipated impacts on the bylaw amendments to include the IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. As some of you will be aware, the bylaw change was put up for public comment recently. And ICANN Board did receive some comments but all in favor of the bylaw change. And can you go to the next slide please?

The major change effectively is twofold. One is the change of the definition of who can be a member, and the second and related change is the inclusion of the definition of what is a territory. This was needed—and can you go to the next slide please—to link decision making by the members to territories and to avoid the situation where we had—just a minute. My wife is showing her new hair, that's why. This happens when working from home.



---

So, going back, the major change is that as a result of the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs as ccTLD members, as managers, you may end up with two or more members per territory. And in order to avoid this and to avoid any potential issue around capture that was identified in 2011, I believe when the proposal was developed, you see the introduction of first representative—so that's the primary contact—and then if the IDN ccTLD member becomes IDN ccTLD manager becomes member of the ccNSO, the introduction of an emissary.

An emissary is a person or representative from a territory who will vote on behalf of all the members from that specific territory for specific decisions. And what you need to think about these specific decisions is, for example, in Council elections, when there is a vote in a region on Council elections, it has to be done according to the bylaws by the emissary. PDP votes in future, it has to be done by the emissary. And the emissary is clearly linked with the territory. And this way it is ensured—and that's a major change, I would say as a result of this bylaw change from one vote per ccTLD manager to one vote per territory. And that's only in specific circumstances. So PDP vote, Council election, and these are foreseen in the bylaw. Next slide, please.

So if you think about it, it's not just the specific decisions according to the bylaws, it may also have an impact on the voluntary arrangement around the Board nomination. If you recall, the Board nomination according to the bylaws, the final vote on a Board domination is with the Council.

However, as the result of a voluntary arrangement, the members, the current members, and also the future members will nominate and

---

select the candidate for a Board seat. So the question for the future will be, who should have the final vote for the Board selection? Should it be the emissary or should it be a representative? So should it be a vote per territory or should it be per ccTLD? manager?

It's an open question. But you can see that as a result, the Board nomination guidelines may need to change because of this impact. The Council election guideline will need to be changed as well. But that's the easy one because it just follows what is in Article 10 itself. So that drives it. But for the Board nomination it's going to be an interesting discussion.

And the final one to make it really complicated—and again, this is first for the GRC—if you think about it, what happens with—you just adopted the rules, the final set of the new rules, and there is a member's veto vote. And the member's veto vote, the first question is, who could launch such a process? Should it be on the basis of again, an emissary or representative, so per territory, or per ccTLD manager? And then the final vote, again, so if you have a member's vote or a veto vote on a Council decision, should it be done on the basis of representative or an emissary, so per ccTLD manager, or per territory? So that's one area where there needs to be clarification, at least discussion, what the community will want.

And the second one is around quorum, how will the quorum be counted in the future? Is it the members? Or is it the emissary? Should it be 33% of the members, or 33%|so that's on all 33% of the territories. And this will make a huge difference. Think about it. And this is the most extreme case, if NIXI would become member for both the ASCII ccTLD

---

and all its IDN ccTLDs, it would count for 21 members or 20 members, but it's only one territory, it's for India.

So you can see the impact of these choices around the quorum and the voting mechanism. So this is where there needs to be a change of procedures. And a final one that needs to be changed—and as you can see, and that's probably the first step and this is really where the Council becomes important, is a change of the application form for ccNSO membership. This is still geared towards the current definitions, but as soon as the bylaw changes, the definition needs to change as well, and therefore the application pool.

So that's my brief overview of upcoming work for the GRC and upcoming work for you. I don't expect you to provide any feedback at this time, but food for thought for later discussions. Thank you, back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Bart. You have given us some homework. For this, I would like to ask Sean as the chair of the GRC if he has any comments or remarks regarding the impact of the bylaw change.

SEAN COPELAND: I had hoped that Bart's explanation would be very good, because it was very good, and that you were going to skip over me. I guess not.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Nope.

SEAN COPELAND:

Nope. Okay. So, I was asked to comment on the impact of the upcoming changes to Article 10 and an Annex B, and I brought the subject up lately in the subgroup on COI. It was from there that expressed my view, I'm not speaking to you here as a councilor—or sorry, I'm speaking to you here as a councilperson, not as a member of the GRC.

Bart has gone over the history. I do want to bring up that going all the way back to 2013, Bart has been bringing up the idea of an ambassadorship or an emissary as a means of mechanism for dealing with this. And I was really surprised to see it all the way back then.

The reason I'm talking about it—or the conflict of interest is we as councilors have to be aware that once the new bylaws are in place, and IDNs are at the table, we will actually have two stakeholder groups for a moment in time, existing members of the ccNSO and the IDN members, and we have to acknowledge our fiduciary responsibility to our current members. And this means that any changes now or in the future may appear unbalanced to those that are coming in from the IDN community. At the same time, we have to be charged with ensuring the balance of our existing membership.

This is perhaps semantics, but it may be important down the road. So I brought up Bart's documentation from 2013. And I'm actually pretty glad that he had the diagram up, because it really highlights the ambassadorship idea. And I feel that it's been carried forward very well for the last decade, and I think it's very important for the core definition

---

of the ccNSO, the ambassadorship idea and how it relates to us being linked, if you will, to the 3166 ISO table.

So on that particular thing, I do believe it is in our best interest to produce a written statement from the Council to acknowledge that we are aware of such a potential perceived conflict and a conciliatory message, and then move on from that right away.

From that, outside of the work that Bart has outlined—and also [inaudible] those new rules will have to be implemented and adjusted according to the working group. And that is something that will go to the front of the main group of GRC. And hopefully, we'll have something to by ICANN 74. I'm hoping that it is more of an administrative function than anything. But you never know.

Finally, I do want to point out there's other areas that will be of interest to us on Council. With the impact of the IDNs, we have to kind of look at the feasibility assessment, in particular items, seven, eight and 10, and definitely number 11. The ccNSO website needs to be up to date, I think, before the IDNs are officially joining this community. It just has to get done. And it's an odd place, I realize, under this section to say it, but it kind of goes to bringing in this community and having a nice or welcoming place for it. That's my thoughts. Thank you. Yes, Chris. It is very out of date.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay, thank you. Thank you, Sean. And Chris's comment that we need to update that also the GRC website is noted, and I see Irina has her hand up.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you, Alejandra. Just one brief comment and one suggestion from me. First, I was following this process for quite a long time and I'm aware of the concept of emissary, but my reading of this bylaw change was never that one organization can be a member of ccNSO two, three or four times like NIXI or the Coordination Center where I'm from, cannot become two times a member of ccNSO for the IDN ccTLD and for ASCII. But that's for further discussion.

And my suggestion is that probably to make all further work a little bit more informed, it would be convenient to have a list of territories for which this is applicable, like which territory has not only ASCII but also IDN ccTLDs and whether the manager is the same or another one. I believe this information is available, definitely with IANA database, but it should be just put in a more convenient format. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Irina. That sounds like a great suggestion. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

The first one is with respect to your second point, Irina. I'll pass it in the chat, there is a very nice overview, a map on the pages of the IDN group of ICANN which includes a world map with all the IDNs, but also related is a list of IDN ccTLDs which are of IDN ccTLD strings that have been approved, but also which have been delegated and the names of the entities. So that's available and publicly available as well.

---

With respect to your first point, question, it is interesting. So in cases if you look at the emissary, there is indeed this caveat if it's one and the same organization that runs the ASCII and the IDN ccTLD, the emissary will be the representative of one. So in principle, it will be one vote for that entity.

The real issue with emissaries is where there are two distinct organizations running the IDN ccTLD and the ASCII ccTLD, which both can become member of course, and where you have this issue, who will vote on behalf of the territory, or on behalf—and this is where the emissary really comes into play. But in principle, there is one emissary per territory, and in most cases, I think it's only in two or three cases, two or three territories where the manager of the IDN ccTLD is a different organization than the ASCII ccTLD and where they need to appoint an emissary. In other cases, the emissary is appointed automatically. It is a representative of one entity, but still they can become member of each and every one. That's at least the way I read it. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Bart. Thank you all. I think there is quite a lot of work to be done here moving forward. And I have no doubt that the GRC will tackle this as soon as possible and guide us through the next steps. So thank you all. If there are any other comments or questions on this topic ...? I see none. Okay.

---

So we will move on to our next item, 15, the update on the triage committee. So first, we have the outcome Council workshop on the 24th of February. And for this, I would like to hand it over to Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Alejandra. Hi everyone from the middle of the night. The last chair's committee looked at the feedback from the workshop that we had in February. And thank you all for the participation and input there. And the kind of finding was that the discussion had validated what we had in the draft document. [And I think Bart circulated that draft around the Council as part of the papers for here.]

We didn't hear any major cause to change or reassess those priorities. And so we might just have a couple of little wording tweaks to do on it. But I wanted to say that that draft as developed will be what we use to do the prioritization task and preparing the work plan for adoption at the next meeting. So that's the update there. I couldn't remember, Joke, whether we had circulated the report from the workshop yet. Can you help me with that?

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Hi Jordan. No, I haven't circulated the report yet. Apologies for that.

JORDAN CARTER:

That's okay. There's a lot on, obviously. But that report will come to a everyone for your information as well. Are there any questions on that?



---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I see none.

JORDAN CARTER: So we have our work plan that you'll have seen before in a many layered Gantt chart. And we've been working to put that into an online tool that's easier to see a live snapshot of what's going on with excellent support from Bart in particular, as we work through that.

And we're still ongoing on having the whole [inaudible] in there, and then applying the prioritization approach that we've been talking about before. So we're going to do that in two meetings of the triage committee in May, and ready for the Council to adopt the work plan 2023-25 in the call in May, so have it all done before we get together in The Hague meeting in June.

And as part of that process, or maybe just after it, I want us to write down the cadence of that annual planning process so that we know which meeting of the Council we can expect this to come with and so we can get that prioritizing work done with the new tool in good time for consideration and so on.

I think this year, ideally, we were meant to have done it by the March meeting. This is taking us a bit more time to get into the new tool and to sequence that discussion of strategy followed by making sure that the plan is consistent with it.

So that's the update [inaudible] the next call. Triage colleagues, anything I have missed from that update? I hope not. Once again, are

---

there any kind of questions about that? Two very informational updates, more to come next time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: As a comment, I am excited to see this new tool in place. I'm looking forward to it. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Me too. Cool. Thank you back to you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Jordan. Okay, moving along. Now we have item 16 on charter updates. So if we can put up the overview of the charter updates to see where we're at. You can see there that most of the working groups are in green, whether they have already reviewed their charters and gave us feedback on whether they needed to be updated or not. And Stephen told us during the working group update of the tech working group it's almost there to finish their own update.

Regarding the MPC, they will start the review of the charter after ICANN 74 because they want to take into consideration the experience of the hybrid meeting to see if there's anything that they need to add in their charter regarding that. And the other one that is still not green is the SOPC. So does any member of the SOPC have any comments regarding how the charter is moving along?

---

IRINA DANIELIA:

Yes, Alejandra. Honestly, it did not start to move yet. But we will start in the next week. I have SOPC meeting scheduled on April 28. And SOPC chair Andreas and I with the assistance of Bart and Joke had two meetings to get prepared for this SOPC meeting. And the main topic we are going to discuss is the approach for the future work of the PC and its main component, which is reviewing a yearly and five-year ICANN plan and budget, and also to have a look at the charter and decide whether we need any amendment or not.

I personally do not expect any major changes, probably some minor adjustments, if needed. And that will be the outcome of our upcoming meeting next week. And we probably will have another SOPC meeting in May for further discussion on this issue amongst others. That's my update. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much. Looking forward to see the outcome of your exercise. So thank you. Okay, any questions or comments regarding the charter update? Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

Just a little query about what's written there and the triage committee. I'm pretty sure we did a more substantive update for it late last year to account for the new role of the committee or even maybe at the start of this year in February. I'm just a little bit confused by what's the adopted date there. And I'm wonder if it means we've got the wrong version of the terms of reference on the website or something.

BART BOSWINKEL: That's the latest version with respect to the change of the terms of the membership, and that was done last week or two weeks ago.

JORDAN CARTER: But there was one before that—

BART BOSWINKEL: Absolutely. That was more substantive.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah. I just got confused by the date saying it was last adopted in 2019. That's all. I don't know if it matters, but we might want to just update that for now.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Sorry for creating the confusion. But the last one was indeed March 2022.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Cool. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan, for the observation. There are two dates actually in the column that it's in with the colors. At the end it says adopted March

---

2022. But yes, the other should reflect the same data as well. So it will be corrected. Thank you.

Any other questions or comments? Item 17 is the interpretation during ICANN meetings. So I have to seek for a way to get more ccTLDs involved and informed of the activities of the ccNSO. And I would like to look into having an interpretation at least during the ICANN meetings for our sessions. Doing a very brief research regarding the official languages that our current members have, the top two that are of course not English are French and Spanish. So with this in mind, I did ask Kim to look into it to see if we could have it as soon as possible, and if so, what was needed. And with this, I would like to ask Kim to give us an update on how this task is going.

KIM CARLSON:

Thanks, Alejandra. Hi everyone. I don't have a whole lot of information outside of what Alejandra already shared. But what I do know is, as she mentioned, we did ask what it would take to have real time interpretation first at the ICANN public meetings, then eventually for select intersessional meetings like webinars, whether it would take an ABR or something like that.

We were told that this was already being discussed at the Org level before the ccNSO inquiry. This is an Org initiative to make the public meetings more accessible and enhance that experience for both the virtual and in-person participants. Specific languages were not discussed. Although I did mention the initial ccNSO request would include Spanish and French and then Arabic.

---

With ICANN 74 Being only 52 days away, the primary focus right now is prepping for that meeting and to make sure we're ready to provide that enriched hybrid meeting experience.

Additionally, all the sourcing and the contracts and staffing was done months ago. So this additional service would not be available for 74. We are hopeful for 75. And I will continue to work with the Council leadership and the Org representatives on this. And that's all I have. Thanks, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Kim. Are there any questions or comments regarding this topic? Okay, I see none. So we'll keep you posted when we find out any more information. Thank you, Kim.

And moving along. Now we are on item 18, the ICANN 74 meeting. Some things to remember is that for this particular meeting, it will be the first hybrid meeting after the pandemic. Please remember that registration to the event is mandatory and schedule will be published on the 23rd of May and also the registration to the sessions will be necessary for ICANN to know how many people will be in a room and they will try to keep the capacity of the rooms according to social distancing and everything. So it is very important to not only register to the event, but also to the sessions you will be attending especially in person.

With that, I will move along to the meetings we have. So for the Council, we will have a prep meeting in the week of 16th of June. That's before the meeting. So it will be a virtual one.

---

Informal Council meeting on Monday where I hope that we can gather and speak to each other in the same room in person and then we will have our Council meeting as usual at the end of the week.

And now regarding bilateral meetings, I would like you to know that a ALAC has reached out to us to seek if there are any issues that we have in common to have a bilateral session whether now at ICANN 74 or better at ICANN 75. Do you have any topics you think we should discuss with the ALAC right now or shall we have a little more time and stick for ICANN 75?

While you think a little bit, I'll just mention that there were no proposals from ALAC, so we don't have anything to start with. I see Chris says ICANN 75. Anyone else? Irina says IDNs but can wait until 75. Okay. So okay, the chat again. Agreement. Yeah, agree with Chris, lighter meeting agenda is best for 74 given the experiment and everything.

So with that, I concur. It would be best to see how we do in this new format in 74 and to prepare a more structured agenda with ALAC at ICANN 75. And also, I would like to mention that. Lianna Galstyan is the new liaison of ALAC to us. She's right now on the call. Hi, Lianna. Just to let everyone know.

Okay. So just to be sure, we agree that it would be best to do the first such bilateral meeting with ALAC on ICANN 75. If that is the case, could you please use your green tick? Just to see that we are all in agreement. Okay, I see green ticks. Thank you all. Thank you very much. So we will do it like this.

---

Moving on with the bilateral meetings. We have proposed topics for a joint session with the GNSO during ICANN 74, and here you can see in the agenda the topics proposed. I would like to know if councilors are comfortable with these topics or if you have any comments or other suggestions to include in this agenda or shall we move forward. Please let me know now.

The GNSO joint session is one hour long if I'm not mistaken. Too many topics. Which one should we request not to include then if there are too many? Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah. Hi, Alejandra. And Chris, I agree with you. There's a lot of topics here. Just for information, they're ordered in the order of what Martin and I saw as priority discussions. The IDN for example has been a theme on our bilaterals a number of times already, and it would be just a very quick update. The same goes for the SSAD ODA is just to keep you guys aware of What's happening on the GNSO, but it's not really a discussion topic. So really the two discussion topics for that, either the first two. The second two are more informational.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Sebastien. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Alejandra. And thanks, that's actually useful information. On that basis then, my suggestion would be topics one and two for



---

probably sort of 25 minutes each and then a five-minute update on the other two, if indeed there is a need for one. That'd be best.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you. Thank you, Chris. Anyone else? No, okay, then we keep the first two as main topics and the last two as informational and if time permits. Is that okay with everyone? If so, please use your green ticks. Okay, I see many green ticks. Okay. So that's the way we will move forward. Thank you all. You can lower down your ticks.

Okay, next on the relevant sessions, we have the ccTLD relevant sessions. There will be a ccNSO webinar for newcomers. There will be ccTLD news session. Joke, if I may ask you to give just a brief summary on the ccTLD news session, the topics and what it will be about.

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Yeah, hi, Alejandra. So regarding ccTLD news, the meetings program committee has had a discussion and decided to organize the next editions of the ccTLD news sessions again prior to the ICANN meeting, so it will be a completely virtual ccTLD new session again.

Dates have also been defined already. The first session is on Thursday, the 19th of May. And it starts at 13:00 UTC. And the second session is the week after on the Tuesday the 24th of May starting at 6:00 UTC. So this allows for the audience members from various geographical regions to participate in a time that is more or less convenient for them. All sessions as usual will be recorded as well. Meetings committee decided

---

to limit the duration of the session to 90 minutes and also decided to have a focused or themed approach for both sessions.

The first session, the one on Thursday the 19th will focus on the impact of the pandemic on ccTLDs. MPC still welcomes presentation proposals. I will pass the link later on in the chat. So if you're interested in giving a presentation at ccTLD news or if you know of any potentially interested peers, other ccTLDs that might have something interesting to tell, please drop me a note, have a look at the link that I just posted in the chat and MPC will be very happy to welcome your proposals.

The second session of ccTLD news focuses on cybersecurity. And that topic was suggested by the IGLC, the Internet Governance Liaison Committee. Leadership team and the members decided that based on their regular topic review of what are the hot Internet governance related topics across the globe, cybersecurity is a very hot topic recently. And together with the meetings program committee IGLC decided to focus this session on the link between ccTLDs and their national cyber emergency response teams, so CERTs again from a regional perspective, having contributions from ccTLDs from various regions that could speak to this topic, have an interesting discussion with the audience and also potentially have a more operational point of view added on top of what the ccTLDs are able to share with the audience. Very much looking forward to two sessions. If you have any suggestions, ideas on how to make those sessions work under the framework established by the IGLC and the MPC, secretariat is happy to hear your input. Thank you.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Joke. I'm very looking forward to those sessions. They look very interesting. Moving on with the agenda, we will have, of course, Tech Day on Monday. And we will have also ccNSO members meeting. So we have four here planned. And I would like Nick to tell us a bit about the first three, and then Irina about the last one, if possible.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks, Alejandra. So you can see that in terms of the ccNSO member meetings, the first item are the regular policy updates, and I think, certainly from the PDP3, we know already there's going to be quite a lot of serious and substantive discussion required in relation to the legal opinion from ICANN Legal staff which we need to discuss more fully with the community and a small group mostly of the lawyers from some of the ccTLDs have been looking at that. And there's a slide deck as was referred to earlier which is going to be presented to everybody to bring everybody up to speed with what our assessment of where we're at is going to be in what the options are going forward, not to give too many spoilers on that.

So there's quite a big item coming up on PDP3. And there'll be the regular update on PDP4, the IDNs, you've we've heard already about that. Very interesting work going on there and going very well by the sound of it.

The second item is in relation to governance. So it's great that the vote has preceded. The next item in terms of governance we've got here is some ongoing discussions which we've been having for a few Council

---

meetings in relation to statements of interest, conflicts of interest, and whether there should be more that the CCs should be doing.

This is obviously handled very differently in different parts of ICANN, but the different parts of ICANN have different roles. So it's understandable there are different procedures for these things. But maybe we should introduce something more there. And I know a number of us have been discussing specifically—not so much the conflicts issue, but the statements of interest and whether we should have more process and a degree of formality in relation to Statements of Interest and have them properly itemized and declared. So that'll be an interesting session, and quite an important one, I think.

And then the final thing I'm covering here is in relation to DNS abuse. There's a lot of this going on. We've tried to and had some really good abuse discussions. Obviously in parallel with this, there's the standing committee on DNS abuse being set up. And I think this will be part of their mandate in terms of a bit of a presentation on ccTLDs and emphasizing, I think, that we don't call it the ICANN gTLD policies, it's very much individual related to culture and jurisdiction and to try to showcase some of the very good things that are coming up there.

So those are the three sessions I'm covering. I don't know if there's any questions or if I have gone too far off the reservation, as it were, but if there are any gaps or if there's any questions, just shout out.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Nick. While any comments come your way, may I ask Irina to talk about the SOPC session?

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you, Alejandra. So, as I mentioned before, we are going to have one, probably two SOPC committee meetings upfront the ICANN and they are supposed to build a basis for the further discussion with the whole ccTLD community. And the question which disturbs me personally is that currently the ICANN's yearly and five-year operational plan and financial plan and budget is a huge document. It's like 300 pages and very few people are actually able just to read it from first page to the last one and to interpret and to submit valuable comments on that.

So probably, we should adjust our approach and focus on the areas of this operational and strategic plan which are the most applicable or most important for the ccTLDs. And the idea is to discuss such an approach and to understand what these areas should be and where we should focus mostly, and what we can probably skip at all, and not to cover. The current [vision,] but that may definitely be adjusted in the upcoming two months.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, Nick and thank you very much, Irina, for letting us know what is coming our way for ICANN 74. I believe we will have very interesting sessions. And also, there will be some working group meetings that it's important you're aware of, and there will be plenary and other cross-community sessions. So for now, it is apparently not confirmed yet, but I think it will be confirmed that there will be the plenary, who sets ICANN priorities as we proposed, and

---

Jordan and Chris will take the lead on preparing these sessions and be ready to get approached by ICANN to have these sessions planned. Yes, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Alejandra, forgive me. I'm a little confused. I had heard that there were going to be no plenaries.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, I haven't received any communication regarding whether our proposal was officially approved or whether it was definitely no plenaries.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Because it's a policy forum. And generally at the policy forum, there aren't plenary sessions. But anyway, I'm happy to do it if necessary. Just wanted to flag that we might want to check to make sure before we put too much effort in that actually, it may not be happening. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, it was proposed at the first planning meeting for ICANN 74 to have a space for plenaries. And the SO/AC chairs were asked if they would like to have them. And then we proposed one and we had some support saying, okay, we would like to have that plenary moving forward. Other said, maybe not, maybe yeah. So that's why I say it's not official yet. But I see Bart has his hand up.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:                   Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL:               Two things. First of all, it's linking plenaries or not linking plenaries to policy forums. What is interesting, this one was five years ago when it was a policy forum as well. So that makes it so interesting. So that was the Joburg meeting.

The second thing is, based on the discussions of the SO/AC planning committee—don't ask me who's on it, etc., but it became clear—so there was a discussion about a thematic approach. And that's why you will see a session on SubPro, and I think that's the start on Monday morning at 9:00 AM local time for those who are interested.

And there is one plenary and there is a geopolitical forum at the end of the day. Again, a kind of plenary, but that's a follow up from the previous session during ICANN 73. So that was the latest that we've seen both from what was discussed by the SO/AC planning committee and what we've seen from staff. So that's what we are scheduling around. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:                   Thanks, Bart.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:            Okay, thank you. Bart. And with that, we will move on to our next item, which is our next Council meeting. And our next Council meeting will be the 19th of May at 18:00 UTC. And I would like to ask if anyone has any other business.

Going once, going twice. If not, thank you very much for joining today's call. It was really nice seeing you. And until the next time,. Have a great rest of the day or night.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**