

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So thank you, everyone, for joining to the ccNSO Council Meeting 183 at 19<sup>th</sup> of May 2022 at 18:00 UTC.

My name is Alejandra Reynoso and I'm the ccNSO Council chair. I welcome you all today. Just a quick reminder, please all councilors at the word Council or councilor [inaudible] if possible. Maybe, Kim or Bart, can you tell me how are we doing on apologies?

BART BOSWINKEL: I don't know about apologies, but I know you [court]. So that's the more important part. We did receive some apologies but Kim is aware of them.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you. And here for everyone, I'm putting in the chat the wiki for today's call. So there's all the reference material. And moving along, we go to item number two, which is relevant correspondence. We have received a rejection action petition regarding the Bylaw change we requested, and we will discuss it later in item five of the agenda.

Then item three, we have minutes and action items. Minutes have been published and action items have been completed. Any comments? If not, now we're moving on to item four, intermitting decisions.

We had two appointments for members on the DNS Abuse Standing Committee and later appointment for Tatiana. Thank you all for joining the committee.

---

*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.*

---

Moving along. Now we go to the updates on items five and ten. So most of them are written updates and they have been circulated as well. But there are some highlights in a few of them. So I'll go through each of them. So we have on item five the update on ECA, CSC, and CSC Review Team. So, on the ECA, that's the Empowered Community Administration on the 10<sup>th</sup> of May, we received a notice from the ICANN secretary that on the first of May, the ICANN Board approved the standard Bylaws amendments to Article 10 of the ICANN Bylaws. This initiates a 21-day rejection action petition period from the community and meet those from the 10<sup>th</sup> of May until the 31<sup>st</sup> of May. We will discuss a little bit more regarding the Bylaws on item 12.

Now moving on to CSC, as you may have seen in the ICANN community digest that we received today, CSC call for volunteers will be launched shortly by ICANN Org and we will need to notify our appointments by Monday, 1<sup>st</sup>. Brett Carr's term is up by the 1<sup>st</sup> of October. He's not term limited but we still need to do the procedure of launching the call for volunteers which we will do in our June meeting. With this, I just want to alert the corresponding councilors that we need to coordinate the appointment of the members of the CSC first, and then approve the full slate later. We have a committee for this. And just a quick reminder who are in this committee: Irina, Jenifer, Biyi, Sean, Jiankang, and Javier. So please be aware that this is coming your way soon.

Regarding the CSC Review Team, I know that they are making progress, but I would like to know, Sean, if you have any updates to give regarding the review team.

---

SEAN COPELAND:

Sure. First, I want to acknowledge that being on this is a fairly immersive experience for me from the get-go. I'm appreciating that the critical term or the critical word in this group is "review". I happen to went through the administrative process and I'm intrigued about my individual experience versus the aggregate results that we look at in our monthly reports.

My only observation that I'm wondering about is the KPI indicators and how extraordinary they are. They're really good. I went back all the way to 2016 and they tend to be in the mid 90s to 100%. However, I'm intrigued about the December 20-21, 2021 engagement survey because it has an acceptance rate of about 80%. And I find that really strange because the KPI indicators are kind of wildly different and I'm wanting to understand why that is. It may be nothing, it may be something. It would be interesting to find out if there's a flaw in the KPI indicators. And by not looking at or figuring that out, are we allowing for a systemic failure somewhere down the road to appear? So maybe nothing, as I said, maybe something. We'll see. That's my comment.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Sean. Please let us know anything you find out there. Thank you. Any questions regarding item five? No comment? Okay. I see none.

So moving on to item six where we have the updates of the working groups. They're all written updates but I want to note that we now have two more updates here. It's the implementation of the Work Stream 2 and IRP panel selection process. We have received from David McAuley

---

summaries of his appointment in these committees, and we will have these items in our agenda until these are completed. Any questions here or comments? I see none.

So moving on. Item seven, we have updates on ccPDPs. We have the written updates. Any questions? I see Stephen's hand up. Yes, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you. I appreciate that, Alejandra. We, Review Mechanism Working Group, met yesterday. I'm trying to figure out a way forward on binding. So I just want to let everybody know about that. And Bart may want to weigh in with some additional comments on that, which I appreciate. I do want to, however, express my concern that we are now about five months out from the completion of the Retirement Working Group, awaiting a Board decision. My question is how appropriate is that to be five months pending plus? I guess basically what I'm saying is look, community volunteers participated in this working group. We came up with a proposal. Council was endorsed by the ccNSO community, it was presented to the Board, and that Board has been silent for five months. Is that appropriate? Just putting that one out there. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Stephen. Well, what I can tell you is that I will reach out to Patricio to see what's going on and I'll get back to you with what he tells us.

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. I appreciate that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Any comments or questions on this item? Stephen, I see your hand is still up, but I'm guessing it's an old one.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It's an old one. I'm trying to find where to take it down. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No problem. It happens. And buttons get stubborn sometimes. Okay. Moving to item number eight, it's updates from liaisons that we will have in written form. And item nine, it's updates from chair, vice chairs, councilors, regional organizations, and secretariat. And we have two sub items that it's the other group on prioritization and round table results. So, for the first one, may I ask Chris and/or Irina to give us an update on pilot prioritization, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry. Found the mute button here. Can you hear me?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Excellent. Did you ask me to do an update on the prioritization?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Hi. Hello, everyone. Well, it's over, basically, five calls. The fifth call, it was just to take stock of what we've done and how things worked and how it would work in the future. So what's happened now is that everyone's gone away, the staff is going away August, going away with our suggestions or priority 1, 2, 3, and 4 for the recommendations. And we'll do some work and then come back and tell everybody what they've come up with.

So I would say that it went reasonably well as a pilot program. Pretty impressive, really. Hopefully, it will lead to a refined process in the future that will enable us to prioritize both review recommendations and policy recommendations. Just a little reminder to everybody that we've got the plenary session at ICANN in The Hague precisely on this on prioritization. So that's it in a nutshell unless Irina wants to add anything.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Chris. Irina, would you like to say something else? I'm not sure. Is she on the call? I don't think so. So thank you very much, Chris, and also for alerting regarding the plenary. During the plenary, we're expecting to have a summary from ICANN regarding this. Any questions or comments from anyone? Yes, Kim, thank you for letting me

---

know that Irina sent an apology. If no comments or questions, then let me move forward with the round table.

So the round table was supposed to be in-person meeting in Los Angeles, but due to the COVID status back then and according to the advice from the CDC and the lifted measures in Los Angeles, it was reverted to a virtual one. Göran did say that they wish to be overly cautious than deadly wrong. So that's what happened. And instead of having this in person, we got two days with two-and-a-half-hour long sessions. The agenda was a little bit shrunk but not too much.

So we discussed a little bit about concerns regarding volunteers on their available time, the eventual versus ongoing activities, and also the high rotations that some communities have, and therefore, lots of newcomers coming and the struggle of putting up to date quickly. We talked a little bit about the prioritization pilot. There was a summary. And there was a comment made that they would now move forward to the FY24 Operating Plan and Budget process and that they were going to ask us, as in the communities, the SOs and ACs, to appoint a member by the 1<sup>st</sup> of June, preferably the same as in the pilot, but we have not received any formal request. I was wondering, Chris, if you have picked up anything regarding this appointment during your conversations?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

No, no, no, nothing at all. It hasn't been mentioned. I think you guys are the only people it's been mentioned to as far as I know.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Well, thank you very much, Chris. I believe until we get a formal request, we cannot do any appointment. But we'll look into this. Also, there was a conversation regarding enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN multistakeholder model, and this is Giovanni's thing, who provided an update. They will focus on improving the communication between ICANN and the community, which I think is great. Also, they will focus on consensus representation and inclusivity. And for that, they will target the Consensus Playbook, the Fellowship Program, and ICANN Learn resources. There was also a conversation regarding the future of ICANN meetings and how to increase the retention of beginners at ICANN, again, with the focus on Fellowship Program, NextGen, and ICANN Learn. Again, during this update, it was expressed the need of actually bringing beginners up to speed with really complex topics because that's some struggle that communities have.

In the end, there was a conversation regarding health and safety measures for ICANN74. I did make a comment regarding the waiver, that we understood that it was a needed document. But it was felt by some community members that the language was too strong and that it could have been better written. The response was that due diligence was done and the Dutch lawyers were consulted. And from that, well, there were expressions from other SOs/ACs, whether people will not participate due to the waiver. But that remains to be seen. And that's it. Any questions regarding this item?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think you're good. Thank you.



ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Okay. Then moving on, item 10. It's update charters in terms of reference. This will be a standing item until it is completed. We know that the progress will be made after ICANN74 because that's when some committees will meet and review their charters or even after ICANN74. Any comments here? If not, I see none.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think if I can, with regards to Tech Working Group, we intend to discuss it at The Hague. So I think we'll have something updated for you shortly thereafter. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Excellent. Thank you, Stephen. So for items 11 until 17, now we will go through the discussion or substantive part of the meeting. With item 11, we have the timelines of nomination process for Board seat 11 and Council election.

So in your pack, you will find a set of timelines. What we need to decide, it's on the timing of the Q&A session by the community because both the Council election and Board nomination guidelines refer to an ICANN AGM as the meeting for the Q&A. But now, ICANN75, that it's the AGM for this year, is the scheduled for mid September. The timeline is provided, given an indication of the impact of the September ICANN75 meeting on the Board nomination and the Council election process. At this stage, the details are not very relevant. For example, there are a couple of glitches there regarding dates. But what is important is that

---

they show the impact of having the Q&A at the September ICANN meeting or not.

If we try to go for a Q&A for the Council election in ICANN75, it can be done but it will put a lot of stress on the process. And with respect to the Board nomination, it shows it's almost impossible, assuming that we need to take the Q&A after the background check is concluded. So the alternative is that we do the Q&A session virtually after ICANN75. So this is not something that we have not done, as in having a virtual session, so it can be easily done. What we can see from the timeline is that the deadlines will be easily met if we do this.

Another thing, if we do the Q&A after ICANN75, we will be actually more in line with previous nominations and elections timelines as we have done them in the past. And we avoid the issue of the holiday season for the northern hemisphere as well. So today, we will not approve timelines. There is not resolution to be approved, but we need to agree on timing of the major milestones, the timing of Q&A with the community. So far, is there any question regarding the topic? I see Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Alexandra. If I understand you correctly, moving on two separate issues, one is the Board's seat and the other is Council seats.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes.

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. I think traditionally, the Council seats, particularly in North American region, they've been sorted out pretty informally. Well, at least North American region has been. Do you see any change to that issue? I guess with regards to the timing of the Council seat, it looks to me like we're unscheduled to do what we've done in the past, if I'm not mistaken. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. North American region has an advantage of having few members. I think that's why it is not a huge problem. But for other regions, it might be the case that it will be difficult to have them participate during this time of the year where there's usually holidays and people are off. So it could be an issue. And that is the reason why we have always tried to have this process by the end of the year and not so close to August or July.

The other question, yes, we could meet the deadline by ICANN75 but it will be really complicated, as in having to do things really fast to achieve it. So I don't see the need to run for this, and that's why it would be best to keep it as we usually have. Those are my comments.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. I agree with you. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Stephen. And Sean?

---

SEAN COPELAND: I suppose Stephen and I are in agreement. I mean, I went back and I looked at all of our meetings back from ICANN44, and the November date seems to be around when that meeting usually happens. So maybe we should actually decouple the process from the date on a going forward basis officially, with it being a preference for taking place in the final ICANN meeting of the year. I'm not too sure. If you look at September and you look at people taking their seats in March, that's six months for councilor Board-elect to be sitting around, basically doing nothing, and I'm not sure that that is effective for those people. That's my comment.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Sean. Anyone else? Okay. I don't see any more hands up. Okay. We need to make a decision on the timing for the Q&A, and I will ask you two questions. So the questions will be, if you are in favor for a Q&A after or during ICANN75 in September. So for the first question is if you're in favor of a virtual Q&A after ICANN75, which will be in October, early November, please use your green ticks now.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I am in favor of it being after.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. Noted. I see lots of green ticks coming up. For those in the call, this question is for the councilors.

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No super hurry.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. And now please take them down so we can move to the other question. Okay. Now, the second question is, if you're in favor of a Q&A during ICANN75, please use your green ticks. I don't see any green ticks for councilors. Stephen, okay. Did you vote twice, Stephen? What's your preference, if I may ask you directly? Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That's a yes for me.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes for the after ICANN75 or yes during ICANN75?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, after.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: After? Okay. Thank you very much.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. I see no reason to push so far forward. So that's an after thing.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you very much. So, we will do it after reading all the green ticks. So the secretariat is requested to devise a proposed timeline for both the Council election and Board nomination to be after ICANN75 with the result of today's polling, that it's what we have done. So thank you very much. And with this, I would like to also note, Sean's observation that it might be needed to review the guidelines to maybe detach this particular part of the process from the ICANN meeting itself and put it more on the time of the year as it demands, at least to be considered. So just to review it from the GRC point of view, please.

SEAN COPELAND: We'll add it to Monday's call on the GRC.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Sean. Okay. Thank you very much, everyone. And now we move along to item 12. So, here we have item 12 as the impact of upcoming change Article 10 and Annex [B] to include IDNs ccTLDs in the ccNSO that we have talked a little bit before. It is my understanding that the GRC is working on updating the various internal procedures and processes and that this will be part of the conversation in The Hague. So, Sean, can you provide us with an overview?

SEAN COPELAND: Well, obviously, this PDP precedes my work. I know staff, in particular Bart, has been working on language for over a decade on this, just to give an idea of how long this takes. Hopefully, no reflection on any other PDPs that are waiting for approval, Stephen.

---

So we are discussing this in the GRC. And you guys all know I look at it under the light of esoteric conflict of interest, which I do believe we are doing our utmost to maintain transparency in the spirit of 5091 on the FOI. To that, as early as next week, we may be in a position to forward to council what looks like three administrative changes to the rules for action. As a result, that's why we canceled then the session in the upcoming ICANN conference to discuss this with the community. In a perfect world, this will result in the ccNSO being well prepared for the inclusion of the IDNs.

Bart, if I've missed part of that, let me know or let us know.

BART BOSWINKEL: No, no. Go ahead.

SEAN COPELAND: I believe it is three items that we are looking at from an administrative change.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, that's correct. Yes.

SEAN COPELAND: Thanks, Bart. Alejandra, back to you.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Sean. Okay. Thank you for the overview. However, as you may have noticed, there is one document for which we as Council are responsible. That is the member application form. In your pack is the initial draft. Again, the Council does not need to decide on it yet. But the suggestion will be to adopt this new application form at our June meeting. For this, may I ask Joke to go through the proposed changes and maybe display the document, please? Thank you.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you, Alejandra. So you can see the Google Document with track changes of the current membership application form. That is the form that you can reach via the ICANN website and via the ccNSO website. So any ccTLD manager that wishes to become a member of the ccNSO needs to fill out this form. There are some checks that are being made after that before membership can be completed. But a membership application form only foresees ASCII ccTLDs at the moment. That is also because the Bylaws, as they are currently published on the ICANN website, are not yet the ones that were recently at the start of May approved by the Board, of course. The rejection action petition period has not been completed yet, but based on that version of the Bylaws, assuming that this will be indeed a new version of Article 10, made some suggested changes to the application form, including, of course, the list of ccTLDs that you can see. Kim, if you could scroll down a little bit, please? Thank you very much. Also a little bit further down. Thank you.

There are some minor changes regarding the contact information of the representative in the form and also some additional notes that provide



---

clarification to the applicants on who exactly is the applicant, who is the ccTLD manager, so everything is a copy-paste from the new version of the ICANN Bylaws. If we scroll down a little bit further in note two, there's information about who the representative is. Currently, we use the word "primary contact," but it's that concept. I've also added a short copy-paste from the new version of the Bylaws on who the emissary. Emissary is a new concept that is being introduced with this new version of the Bylaws. It's important regarding the role in voting procedures that ccNSO members might have.

So, that is, in short, a high-level overview of the changes to the application form. I'm happy to answer any questions.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Joke. Any questions for Joke?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Joke.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you very much again. Please remember to have a look at this Google Doc and add your suggestions and comments. We will have this for adoption on the June agenda.

And now moving on to item 13. It's the update on the Triage Committee Work Plan FY23-25. Jordan or Bart?

---

BART BOSWINKEL:

You have to deal with me. Jordan is on the airport. He's not able to speak. The Triage Committee is looking at updating the work plan and taking into account the strategic note that you've agreed upon, so with the three pillars and the foundational work. These were the buckets to delineate all the work items over the next two years. That's one.

The second point is that the work plan—and that's a change from the past—will start and will be aligned with ICANN's fiscal year, so starting the 1<sup>st</sup> of July, and for two years. So it will be rolling forward. The only reason why we couldn't present a first draft is I didn't have the time to fill in most of the work items.

One of the things is you will see a detailed view around and best guesstimates around the progress of PDPs. You heard Stephen about the PDP3, but also implementation work will be required and the role of the ccNSO. Then the usual work items like the responses to the strategic—so the work of the SOPC and other groups, preparation of ICANN meetings, and the administrative work as well. That will all be included. So you have a fair idea and hopefully detailed enough to make it worthwhile to look at and to maintain and to use in setting the priorities of the ccNSO. Unfortunately, I can't show you a draft yet, but there will be definitely one in June. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Bart. Looking forward for the draft. Any comments, questions?

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bart, give my regards to Moses.

BART BOSWINKEL: Let me open the camera, Stephen. I don't know if you can see him. There he is.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hi, Moses. Thank you, Bart.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Dogs are important.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Tell me about it. Mine is right here by my side. Okay. No more comments on Triage Committee. Thank you, Bart, and the Triage Committee for working on this. Looking forward for June.

So now we move along to item 14. That is the ICANN74 meetings. For the Council, here you will see first that there will be a prep meeting. The proposed date is the 7<sup>th</sup> of June at 12:00 UTC. So this is for us to get together and have a walk through what we will do in ICANN74, and to have our usual rapporteurs for the meeting. The idea of having that date is because people will start traveling later and we want to have the most people as possible in that prep meeting. So I would like to know if you think that's a good time and date for us to meet or if it's really bad for many. To me, silence will mean "Yes, we like this date and time." Thank you. Yes, Stephen?

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think I can make it. I'm actually flying that day. But I think not until noon.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And that will be early for us.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It will be—I don't know—6:00 AM for me.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think I can make that. I would like to make that. I will do my best to make that. All right. Cheers.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Okay, anyone else? Sean, yes, my band sucks. Sorry. We are the early, early birds here. But today we have some really late birds. So thank you for joining in at this time as well.

Okay. So we've settled then, we will have our prep meeting that date and time. Thank you, Jenifer.

---

Now, the second item, it's the informal Council meeting on Monday, 13 June. I don't know if Kim might have a better connection now. If not, I will go through it.

KIM CARLSON: Can you hear me better now?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: A little choppy.

KIM CARLSON: Did you want to go ahead and give that update then?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, you are okay now.

KIM CARLSON: Okay, great. We're looking at doing an informal Council get-together. It's informal because you won't see it on the public schedule. We're looking at doing a coffee—maybe have some snacks or something prior to block one on Monday. It's not confirmed but we're working on it. We have a contingency that if we can't have this as a ICANN thing that we just find a restaurant or some place and push some chairs together and do a coffee or breakfast prior to block one on Monday. But this is something that's in the works and we'll have more details as it becomes—

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Kim. So please be aware of e-mails coming your way regarding this informal Council meeting. I'm personally very looking forward to it. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I said booked in, yeah, absolutely looking forward to it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Okay, and so now you have a potential time from 8 to 9 AM, Monday. Book it already for us. Don't plan anything on that slot, please.

Moving along, the rest, we have seen it a couple of times now. There have not been any major changes. We will have our Council meeting bilateral with GNSO. And we will move to ccTLD relevant sessions at the ccNSO webinar for newcomers, if I'm not mistaken. Just to give you fresh news, it will happen on the 31<sup>st</sup> of May, 12:30 UTC. So if you know anyone who will benefit from going to that webinar, please let them know. But an announcement will come to your inbox soon.

Regarding ccTLD new session, we had the first one today. Please be aware that we have the second one on the 24<sup>th</sup> of May. If you can attend these or watch the recordings, I really recommend them because it's a very nice way to know others ccTLDs and members of our community. So please join.

Then the usual meetings that they have not changed. Unless I'm missing anything, I will ask Joke if I'm missing anything. I hope not.

JOKE BRAEKEN: No, I don't think anything is missing. This looks complete to me. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Joke. Well, our next Council meeting will happen in ICANN74. I'm looking forward to see as many of you in person as possible there.

Now I'll go to AOB. Does anyone have any other business? If not, I have one quick one. We received an e-mail from Peter Koch regarding the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee known as RZERC. He has a question for us regarding consensus and our advice regarding full consensus or rough consensus. Unfortunately, he could not be in the call today, but I wanted to flag this so we can have a conversation on our mailing list and give him a response. So please have a look at that.

With that, if there's no any other business, I think this meeting is adjourned. Safe travels, everyone, to ICANN74. I'm looking to see you there. Bye.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Bye all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Alejandra. Thanks, everyone.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:           Bye all. Thanks, Alejandra.

BART BOSWINKEL:               Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**