ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the last council call of the year. It's our council meeting 178 on December 16th 2021 at 18:00 UTC. Please, as a kind reminder, do not forget to add ccNSO council or councilor to your tag name in Zoom so we can find you easier. And if possible, and if you feel comfortable with it, please do turn your camera on so we can see each other. I think it helps a lot to see faces.

And with that I will post here in the chat the link to all the background material that we will be using in today's call. And with that, I would like to ask Kim if we are all quorate.

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

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Kim. So moving on, we have link of the relevant correspondence. There's nothing to be highlighted for today's agenda. But you have the link anyways. Moving on to minutes and action items. The minutes have been circulated and published over our last meeting. We have some action items listed here. The first one is regarding the ICANN hybrid meetings and how to address them. But the proposal is to defer them until later since as we were discussing previously, unfortunately, ICANN 73 will not be a hybrid meeting. So do have some time to think about. So it will be postponed.

We have an item that is ongoing regarding our strategic workshop in February. And the last one, it's completed, a list of current working

groups and committees' charters to see how are they and their review dates, and we will discuss them on items 16. Then there was one to do, regarding the tech working group and we will discuss it on item 17.

With that, moving to item four, we have our intermeeting decisions. And the decisions that we took on the recommendation of the triage committee. I wonder if there are any comments regarding this.

I don't see any hands or nothing in the chat. So I'll move along then. So now we have the items five through nine that are written updates. And is there any special developments? Are there any questions or comments on the written updates? Or is there anything we should be aware about that is maybe the last minute?

I see no hands. Okay. So one small thing regarding ccPDPs. as just to to make note that we have the ccPDP on retirement now through a public comment as it is in accordance with the ICANN bylaws and it will remain open until January 12. Additionally, the bylaws also request for the Board to ask [GAC] for any advice. So that's still open.

Then I would like to ask the vice chair if they have anything to report. Jordan, do you have anything to say? No. Okay. And nothing from Jordan. Okay. Any councilors have anything to report? No. Okay. Any regional organization present, would like to say anything? Right, no hands up. Secretariat, anything to report?

BART BOSWINKEL: No, we don't.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Well, for me, I have a couple of things to let you know. One of them is that we updated the dashboard regarding the implementation review and regarding the Work Stream 2 implementation. I will post the link in the chat, let me just copy and paste it. Here you go. So the ccNSO review finally closed. And that led us to review and update this dashboard. So it's already published, so you are able to have a look at it.

And also yesterday, there was a round table with a SOAC chairs and vice chairs. And one of the topics was, again, the implementation of this Work Stream 2 Coordination Group. We have been receiving this topic recurrently. And this time, we received a document with description of this coordination group, it was discussed during the call. And it seems that all the chairs seem to be in favor of this coordination group, but still decision is pending on making it official. And that was it. I don't know if Pablo has any other comments on the round table that you would like to add?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Not really, besides the fact that they're really concerned about what's happening with the COVID-19 and how it's affecting us. It's pretty much an honest interest in trying to find ways of how to get things going. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. Okay, any questions? I see no hands up. Okay, so now we are going to go through the topics that are for either information, discussion or decision. So item number 10. It's regarding the selection

members panel for the ICANN Excellence Award 2022. As you know, we were approached to appoint members that should serve in this panel. Currently, we have [Margaret] and Stephen, who have served at the minimum two years. The requirements said that ideally, panelists will serve two consecutive terms before stepping down, but it's not a hard requirement. But we have now launched a call for volunteers that is open until December 22, or the 22nd. And what they are looking is to get the panelists names, as in ICANN is looking for these appointments to be made by January 24. So this is just to recall of that decision that we made and I wanted to make a suggestion when time comes that we need to select these candidates that we should look for candidates that have an active participation in ICANN and for a long period of time, because that will make them able to understand and appreciate the contributions of the candidates who are up for this Excellence Award. Joke, do you have anything to add do this, update or information?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thanks, Alejandra. I think that was a very nice summary. There are two applications that came in so far. And as you mentioned, there's ideally the instruction to limit the term to two consecutive terms before stepping down, but it's not a hard requirement. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much Joke. And any comments or questions in this? Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	Thank you. I'm glad to hear that we have some volunteers. I served, I believe at least three go arounds. So that's why I withdrew my hat from the ring. So let's see what we get from our volunteers going forward. Thank you.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Thank you, Stephen, and thank you for being part of this panel. We appreciate it very much. Okay, and moving on then. So we have an update on changes to the ccNSO ICANN Learn course. So may I ask Svitlana to please fill us in on this?
SVITLANA TKACHENKO:	Yes, thank you. So we revised the course. We considered two big audiences, the newbies who have never participated in ccNSO activities. It may be new staff of ccTLDs, or people who just have an opportunity to participate in online meetings now. And the second audience is people from other ICANN communities who already have some expectation of ccNSO but sometimes they're wrong or not complete. So we revised the course and tried to emphasize some very important points. And to make this course more entertaining, more alive, we introduced control questions and quizzes. The quizzes sometimes are not very easy to answer and you need to revise previous course. Yes, even I myself sometimes need to read more carefully some sentences.

And the main purpose was to make this course more easy. Usually, during this meeting with volunteers who also helped to revise the course, we usually use expression to translate bylaw into human language. Yes, because as new people are not very involved in the

domain business, and they don't need to know all this bylaw stuff, want to find their way to participate. So just need through this course to show them how to participate, that it's not very difficult. it can be interesting, the organization is developing and it's good to join ccNSO. So it would be interesting, challenging.

So I think Joke had more information about this, because Joke organized our meetings and changed the text and added these quizzes and control questions. So actually I myself read this text with much pleasure. And I also ask our colleagues to read this course after it would be translated into other languages. That's all from my point. And I think Joke can add some more details. Go ahead. Okay. Thank you.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thanks a lot, Svitlana, for the detailed overview. And thanks to you and to the other members of the small team that helped to make this revamp of the course. As Svitlana mentioned, the small team looked really into various aspects, not only the content but also accessibility and other aspects. The next step is an initial review by ICANN staff. We're waiting for feedback if they flag any issues or concerns. If there are any, the small team will meet one last time, and we'll discuss if further changes are needed. And otherwise, suggestion is that the proposal of the revamped text together with the quiz section and the resource section goes back to the outreach and involvement standing committee that will then pass it on to the ccNSO Council. And if there is an agreement regarding the proposed revamp course, the translations can start as well into the official languages that ICANN provides translations in. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Svitlana and Joke. It has been very hard work that you have put into this. So thank you so much for it and to make it very appealing and to invite people to actually participate and know more about the ccNSO. I think it's a very important opportunity that we have not only for the people who are already within our community, but from outsiders too. So thank you so much for that. And Joke, I know this might be an unable to respond question. When we might see the final draft of this course, maybe February, March, or too hard to tell?

JOKE BRAEKEN: I hope much sooner, that hopefully by the end of January the latest, the course should be your inboxes. Fingers crossed.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. Any questions from everyone else to Svitlana or Joke regarding the ICANN Learn course?

SVITLANA TKACHENKO: If I may add something, it would be very useful to update this course, because it's much more interesting to read about current achievement of ccNSO. So we need to plan, revise this course once a year, maybe should be enough, and add some new information.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you very much, Svitlana. We'll take that into account to have a review period of the ICANN Learn course. Now moving on, I see in the chat that there are now some curiosity to go through the course once it's ready, so it will come to us.

Okay, moving to item 12. It's the closure of special Council election on the European region. As you of course remember, on our last meeting, it was announced that Giovanni will step down from Council by 31st of December. And as a result, we decided to run a Council special selection process for the European region to fill the remainder of his term until March. So for this, we appointed Joke as an election process manager to run through this election. And we have a report that it's been attached to our background materials. Joke, do you have any observations that we should be aware of?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you. In the report, I've added some observations. We were contacted by one ccTLD community member that asked about the affiliation of the individual that was nominated and seconded during this process. So there was a nomination and secondment process as usual. And one candidate was nominated and seconded, Chris Disspain. I asked Chris then whether he was affiliated to a ccTLD manager, and if so, if he could specify which. Chris responded that he was currently not affiliated to a ccTLD manager. And in the election report, you will see two quotes. One regarding the ICANN bylaws which clearly specify that the elected councilors are individuals. And secondly, there's also a quote from the relevant guideline, which refers to the fact that individuals are elected in their personal capacity, that they serve the

ccTLD community and that they do not represent the views and interests of their employers. Thanks, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Joke. Any questions regarding the process? I don't see any hands up. So may I ask for a mover? I see Stephen's hands up. Yes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Just quick question. This means that Chris is still eligible, correct?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, it means that there is no problem with him being nominated, seconded and elected as a councilor.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No problem. Yes, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: I'm moving.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. So Pablo moves. Do we have a seconder?

JAVIER RÚA JOVET: Second.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Javier seconds. Thank you very much. So we have a decision in front of us. the ccNSO Council adopts the Council special election report for the European region for the year 2022, notes and observations. Thanks, Joke Braeken, for her work as a special election process manager. By this adoption, the special election process for the European region FY2022 is closed. The ccNSO Council congratulates Chris Disspain who will take his seat on the 1st of January 2022. And the chair of the ccNSO is requested to inform the ICANN secretary and Chris accordingly. Any questions regarding the resolution? I don't see any questions. So let's go for the vote. So please select your green ticks if you agree.

Okay, I see a lot of green. And just for good measure, because we know that sometimes these green ticks tend to disappear, if anyone is abstaining, or if anyone is not in favor. I see none. So this has been approved. Thank you very much. Now we go to item 13. So this is the closure for Council elections 2022. So in this case, I do need to make an observation that the we have a small mistake in the agenda. Nick is from .uk not .eu. So please, let's correct that afterwards.

So we will have reappointments for the councilors. So congratulations all for staying for a while. And also, I would like to highlight on having elections in one of the regions. I think that it's very enriching. And that also shows that there is additional interest, I would say, on participating in the Council. I don't mean that the other regions don't have that. But

it's good to see these elections happening. And if we recall from our last conversation regarding elections, we are looking forward to get more people involved. And we have, all of us as Councilors, the duty to start seeking out for people who would like to participate or get more involved or get more knowledge on how to become a councilor or what it takes to be in the Council. So it's good to keep that in mind. Joke, do you have any observations for this election report?

JOKE BRAEKEN: The election report was sent out on Monday this week, if I'm not mistaken. It mentions indeed that there was one person nominated and seconded for four of the regions except for the Asia Pacific region where two candidates were nominated and seconded so an election needed to be held there. And regarding that election, it closed 24 hours later than originally planned because the ballots were sent out with a delay. There was no issue with reaching the quorum. There were sufficient votes submitted. And there was one clear candidate elected in the election process. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. Are there any questions regarding the process? I don't see any hands up. Let me check. Okay. So may I have a mover? I see Pablo's hand up and I see Irina's green check. So we will take Irina as a seconder. Is that okay? Okay, thank you very much. So, we have a decision, and I will read it. It's the ccNSO Council adopts the Council election report. FY2022, notes the observations and thanks Joke Braeken for her work as selection process manager. By this

adoption, the election process 2022 is closed. The ccNSO congratulate the elected candidates, Biyi Oladipo, Jordan Carter, Nick Wenban-Smith, Demi Getschko, Pablo Rodriguez. And the Council notes that the elected candidates will take their seat at the end of the Council meeting at ICANN 73. The chair of the ccNSO is requested to inform the ICANN secretary and the candidates accordingly. So congratulations, everyone, and may I ask for a vote before congratulations on that? So all in favor, please, green ticks. I see a lot of green ticks. Good. Any abstentions? Any objections? Okay, then this has passed. And now Congratulations, everyone.

So, moving on. Item 14, it's the appointment of Chris DIsspain to the strategic and operational planning committee, the SOPC. So, for this. It is quite plain. So any questions regarding this topic? Or comments? If not, then let me go to a mover. Do we have a mover? I see Irina's hand up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll second.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Stephen seconds it. Thank you very much. Any questions regarding the decision? The ccNSO Council appoints Chris Disspain as member of the SOPC and the Council request the secretariat to inform the chair of the SOPC accordingly and Chris accordingly. Yes, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:	I'd like to say that I'm very pleased with that decision, because as we all know, Chris Disspain has a lot to offer to that particular group but to the entire ccNSO. So I'm very, very pleased that he's back into the fold with all of us and we can all benefit from his extensive knowledge.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Thank you very much. Pablo. Anyone else? Okay, then let's go for a vote. So if you agree, green ticks, please. I see a lot of green ticks. So thank you very much. And for good measure, let's ask the question. Does anyone abstain? I don't see any hands. Anyone objects? No. So this has been passed. Thank you very much. And it's very good to see new members joining the SOPC. This is one of the committees that is very well regarded not only in the ccNSO but throughout the ICANN community. And I know that now, since Giovanni needs to leave the committee, we need to seek for a new chair. And I hope that soon that will happen. Maybe Giovanni, can you please? If it's not too much to ask, can you please tell us, in order to motivate anyone to apply for being chair, what's the necessary time commitment or something that you can encourage people to go for the chair within the SOPC?
GIOVANNI SEPPIA:	How open should I be?
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	I would say as much as possible.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Okay, we are going to have an SOPC call next Monday, we'll discuss the next steps, especially because there is now this fiscal year 23 open public comment, and it is quite a commitment, I must say. So if you commit to do it, you should really make sure you have some hours in the agenda every month to look after the different documents, to look after the updates that are shared by ICANN planning and finance team.

I think it's a role that requires also quite a lot of patience to make sure that during the public comment period, there is enough and sufficient coordination among the different members that provide the necessary input and feed it into the open public comments. So I think that I would really encourage somebody to step up and be the next chair of this, as you said, Alejandra, a really prestigious and very much acknowledged by other constituencies, Committee.

But again, at the same time, you need to allocate some hours every month to this job. And I call it a job, because at the end of the day it's sort of a job. To go through the document is really time consuming. And some of the documents are quite monumental. But it's a very rewarding job because of the way again, the committee is seen by the other constituencies and by ICANN Org. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Giovanni. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. I have a question for Giovanni because he's leaving very large shoes to fill. He's done an incredible job as the chair of SOPC over

the past few years. I just want to know your shoe size, is it just under a meter or over a meter? Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Over a meter.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That's what I thought. This is going to be a tough one, you're going to be tough to replace. Thank you for everything you've done.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: My pleasure.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. I just wanted to mention that Giovanni, you forgot to mention how much one's getting paid for all the work on the SOPC. But we got to keep it a secret. As Stephen mentioned, it is a tall order. It takes a special individual as yourself. You have done a fantastic job. I recall. you working throughout Christmas, on everything else that was done there. I will never forget that one. And it takes commitment. It takes understanding of everything that it takes to do this. It's not by accident that ICANN came after you, because they know your commitment, your seriousness about what you do, your high standards of professionalism. And I want to thank you for your exemplary work

and for giving us an example, a model of what that chair should look like. So for everything that you have done in the ccNSO, for everything that you have done in the SOPC, for all of us that consider you a friend, very good friend, thank you. Thank you for everything you have done. And while I'm at it, I want to wish you a very happy, healthy, Merry Christmas as well.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you Pablo. And definitely, Giovanni, as already expressed, you are leaving a huge seat that needs filling. But let's also remember that it's not only the chair who is responsible for doing everything. There is a committee for that. And this person will not be alone. And I encourage especially all members of the committee who are councilors that support this person and help to find someone to guide this committee. Just so you remember, there's Pablo, Stephen, there's Biyi, Irina, Seun, even Jordan as an observer. Please, I do expect that you would support this person if you don't want to maybe step up for it. But do please take action. It is a very important committee, as we have stated for the ccNSO and for the rest of the ICANN community, and we need to make sure that it continues to be as such. So thank you, everyone.

Okay, with that, let me move to the next item, 15. Unless, of course , there was any other comment by previous one? I don't see any hands up. Okay, so moving on, we have the update and redesign process of the ccNSO website. And even though it sounds a bit like a dream, it's coming through. We have some kickoff meetings with ICANN staff. And

we had some interesting conversations. And we had some homework to do.

So they required us to find what content should we prioritize to migrate to the new website. And for this, the small committee that volunteered to seek this task, we decided to go a bit out of the box, that means out of our own heads, and to search for community members who can actually tell us what they need. So we basically identified various users or profiles of users. And we conducted some interviews with the aim, of course, getting this special content. Because we all have our own, let's say, favorite pages that we see each day because we are very involved, we are very into the work of the ccNSO. So we do have that knowledge of those contents. But we wanted to see, let's say for someone who is new to the ccNSO, what would they like to see there? Or for someone who is already in a working group contributing to the ccNSO, but what would they need to see there? Or someone from outside of the ccNSO? So let's say from ICANN staff, from the GAC, or maybe somebody that we know that is very active in the region, but maybe not so active in the ccNSO.

So we search for all these different profiles, and then we did some analysis. Still, the interviews are not done yet. We will continue to do them until mid-January so that we can finalize our analysis, but we do have a preliminary ranking of the priorities that we have for the ccNSO website, On the next council call, I hope that I will be able to show it to you once we have all the interviews done so we can polish and finalize it and to see whether you agree. Is there any other comment maybe from the members of this small committee that would like to add something else?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Alejandra, did you wanted to give a report back on the timing, which we were told about by the ICANN web team?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you for the reminder. Unfortunately, this is not going to be as fast as we want it to be. ICANN is waiting on this audit taxonomy process that they're doing through all the content of the ccNSO website, and that requires for them to tag each and every single document for it to be searchable also, and they have told us that it will be—they're hoping it will be ready by June. So we won't see anything before that.

But what we agreed is to go through this content analysis, they will review the preliminary results that we shared, we will have a call with them to see if there are any questions or anything else that we want to add. And they will also show us if there is a good possibility or not for adding some new features and functionality to the website.

For example, there was a discussion on having maybe content for members only, as in having a login, user and password to see specific membership content. And they told us that they were looking into that, but we don't know if that's even on the table to be added. They also told us that to be able to have something in parallel and not just stop until June, we could also see if there was any content that could be archived or deleted, as in this is information that we just don't use or it's not useful for us. So either we archive it, or we delete it. But that's what they told us that we could do in parallel. Does that answer your question, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Given that they told us the other day that nothing really is going to happen much before June, I think it's probably realistic to expect that nothing is really going to happen until the third quarter of next year. The other point I wanted to make is the small group continues to hammer back at the ICANN web people about all the broken links for all ccNSO documents and how that needs to be addressed. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, that's correct. We won't see anything happening anytime soon. But yes, what we are trying to achieve here is to continue the conversation and don't lose this connection that we already have on how to do some work in parallel. I do think that after June, things will start moving faster. And hopefully, well, I don't have any information on dates or planning but hopefully we will see some changes maybe or a prototype maybe by the end of the year, but it's my guess. They haven't said anything regarding that. Or maybe that's my wish. And yes, we will follow on the broken links also to not let that slip on us.. Any other comments or questions?

Okay, I see none. So let's move to the next item. So this is the progress on the process to change the rules of the ccNSO and the next steps and what the Council should expect. So we had a webinar and the GRC subgroup asked the community to have any final input or feedback to be sent to the mailing list until the 23rd of December. So far, at least I have not seen any comments been set, and we are assuming there are

no fundamental issues to be discussed. So if that is the case, then the draft will be sent to the GRC. And GRC will send it to us for review.

So what we need to do is to see the proposed text by January, and then after we adopt it, then we send it to the member for a vote. So we will use the method that is course available right now with the current rules, so this new draft must be circulated 21 days before any actual voting starts. And so we sent it for reading, then 21 days after that, then we can start the voting. And this voting will maybe start at the end of February, if nothing happens. And then the voting needs to stay open for 14 days. Right now, the requirements are that the supermajority of the votes. cast needs to be in favor. We need at least 50% of the membership to vote. And if the quorum is not met, then we have a second round with no quorum. Are there any questions or comments on this? Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I just wanted to put David on the spot and ask him if he has any comments or observations because he's done a great job as the chair of this group that's been working on this. So David, you're on the spot.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, David.

DAVIC MCAULEY: Thanks, Alejandra and Stephen and Council for letting me speak. Alejandra's summary was very good. There is one clarification I'll make, I'm going to pass around to the subgroup, probably by tomorrow and to

issue to membership before the 23rd. And that's simply that when the vote is for picking a Board member, the consequences of failure to reach a quorum will not apply. That is, the members will continue to retain ultimate control over selection of Board members. But other than that, that's perfectly right. And the timeline is right. Thank you, Alejandra. Stephen, thank you for your kind comment.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, David. And I agree that you have been a really good chair with this subgroup. So thank you very much for guiding us through this process. Any other comments or questions? Okay, thank you very much. Then let's move to item 17. So this is a review of the charters of the working groups and committees and their next steps. First, I would like to start with the tech working group, that it has not been updated since 2009. And it's very, very outdated. There is a list of members that is no longer accurate, and there are some work items that are obsolete in the IANA stewardship transition. So, I note that there is a draft that's been going on. And please, Stephen, if you could tell us of any updates.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, if I may address that as the Council liaison to the tech working group. There is a replacement draft I think is probably the best way to describe it. Because as you pointed out, what's there today is really ancient, out of date, and most of it is not applicable. It's been circulated to the chair. I've not heard back yet from the chair. I'm going to turn around and give him until the end of the week to provide comment

back. In lieu of that, I'm just going to put it out to the entire tech working group mailing list. I don't think there's any big issue with the draft language that's been proposed. But I'll keep Council posted via the Council list. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you very much, Stephen. So just to recap and see if I got it correctly. So you will wait until the end of this week for the chair to respond, otherwise, you will send it to the full working group. And we will wait for feedback, input comments until when?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm thinking no later than the end of the year, this has been dragging on for a while.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Considering the date and it's almost the holidays, maybe we can give you the until maybe mid-January, just to give everyone the chance to read it. What do you think? Or is it too late?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: If you feel that's appropriate, I'm happy to do it, stretch it out. It's just been dragging for a long, long time. I'll nudge the chair after I get off this call and see if there's any serious objection from his end. And if not, put it out to the membership. I don't think there's going to be any big blowback from any of the members on this charter revision. So I'd like to nudge it along and I'd like to get it wrapped up by the end of the year

to tell you the truth. But if you think I should stretch it out to the middle of January, I'm happy to do so. Chair's discretion. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Stephen. Well, let's have it ready by the next Council meeting. Would that work?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Fair enough.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So circulate it and then when whatever feedback it gets by, I would say mid-January, it would be incorporated. If not, then that would be the final draft. And we will get it for the January Council call.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That works for me.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Stephen. And with respect to the other charters, we received in our inboxes a list of the due dates for the review of the working groups and committees. And while some are on time, others have passed their due date for review, but all of them need to be reviewed. So if you agree or don't have any objection, shall I request all working groups and committees to review their charters and suggest if necessary, any changes? What do you think?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I don't have an issue with that. My concern is that if we don't stagger these review processes, every few years, there's going to be this tidal wave of charter reviews that needs to be completed across all the working groups. And I'm not sure that's the way we want to proceed going forward. It's just a concern.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Not to have them all expire at the same time, right?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Right. Exactly. And maybe the new chair of the GRC could weigh in on this.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Sean.

SEAN COPELAND: I do agree with the staggered approach, just because of the workload across the volunteers and the staff. If you're prioritizing it, I would argue to you that we stagger them based on new chairs coming in, if that makes sense, because it just gives that opportunity. Obviously, we went through a process with the GRC, that looking back at it, we probably could have done an extra session actually ended up with this process being done for us just as a nature of rolling over the chairmanship, or

chairpersonship of it. So something to think about, but yes to the staggered.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I see in the list that there are some that are overdue, and some that need to be done, but are on track. So maybe we should go by both filters, let's say, like having new chairs, plus seeing the date that they have been overdue. So that way, they can be staggered so they don't all expire at the same time.

SEAN COPELAND: Yeah, if we ended up with two a year, that would probably be really good based on this list. If we could get to that point on the staggering.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you, Sean. I see Bart's hand up.

BART BOSWINKEL: man I also suggest there is a difference between review and update? Review is, first of all, most importantly, whether the purpose still fits with, still maps on the activities of the working group. I also know ex officio almost, that some of the working groups are already in the process of reviewing and update. It's more that it happens. Good example is—Nick's put his hand up—is the triage committee. GRC is working on it, just checking the box and then going forward, then we know it happened. So first, just a review before we do anything like updating, because that's a different ballgame. And that's where most of

the effort will go into, most of the consultations. But a review just to check whether the purpose still fits. The work of the working group should not take too long. It should not take too much effort, either. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Bart. And Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, just to say that, like Bart mentioned, certainly with the triage committee, most of the terms of reference have a review date as part of their own terms of reference. They should be self-regulating. And I think, just from my experience on the triage committee, that date went overdue and we kind of didn't even realize it was only that we were looking at it for some other reasons that we realized, actually, we should have looked at it for now anyway.

So I guess, to try to bake into the ccNSO processes such that it's automatically flagged, say, six months before, look the review date's coming up. So whether that's to ask the secretary and we just maintain, what the GRC looks—just checks that the review dates are scheduled and in the diary or in Council meeting agendas to be raised. So the chair of the committees know well in advance that it's up for review, and can schedule it into that committee's work program, is probably where we need to go. It shouldn't be complicated; it should happen sort of automatically without us having to intervene as opposed to the current, kind of drifted into going past the review dates, which we should have

been following according to our own processes, which is sort of disappointing.

So the second point, and I was going to say that my experience with all of this stuff is that it's much easier to maintain it. It's like doing the garden. A little and often is much easier than ignoring it for a long period and then having to do a big piece of work to bring it up to date. So I suppose yeah, I guess I agree with a sort of continuous just good housekeeping to regularly review all of our terms of reference, little and often. That'll hopefully make it quite a lightweight piece of work rather than a sort of heavy piece of engineering. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Nick. I agree that it should be a continuous process and something that should be part of the activities of the working groups and the committees. Unfortunately, they have slipped away a little bit. So I think that if I send an e-mail to the chairs, just to request them to review their charters, I think that would be a good kickstart just to put things in motion. And when they do review it, and then they would see if it needs updating or not. And with that, we kick start that, let's say, automatic process, as to keeping it in their calendar for the next time to review. Does that make sense?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, I think so. And I think that just on a single page somewhere, have all of the different committees and working groups and just a sort of an easy reference for the next review date so that we can all see kind of a

rolling calendar going forwards, which ones are up for review, and what's next.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, I think that it's part of the strategy that the triage committee will come up with. But I agree with that. Stephen, were you going to say something else?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Makes sense to me.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you very much. So let's do that. Let's request for reviews and we go from there. Thank you. Okay, now we move to the item 17 that it is ccNSO and DNS abuse, and what should the ccNSO do. For this, I will ask Tatiana to share with us what has happened.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Alejandra. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. I hope that you're all well. I'm going to present the results of the small group which is working as to what exactly ccNSO should do in terms of DNS abuse, and what we did based on the results of the ICANN 72 session and also on your efforts during the workshop on the 17th of November 2021 which allowed us to work with data which you identified in terms of priority.

So what we asked you and also some of the community members who joined this workshop to do is to identify which of the suggestions at the ICANN 72 sessions match in terms of high or low effort and also high or negative, sometimes low value and benefit.

Based on the data you identified, based on these priorities and impact and efforts, we created some sort of what you see on your screen, which is a raw matrix. This is the matrix which shows all your input. For example, you identified manage expectations about ccTLDs as low effort but high impact, or creation of voluntary Code of Conduct as negative impact which means high risk, while it will require a lot of effort.

So, this matrix was the first step for the small working group to take the next step. And next slide please. So when we first thought about the classification of these items, so they will not be just on the slide with axes. But what does it mean for the ccNSO community and the ccNSO Council?

So basically, what we decided and discussed is that the project with low effort and high or low impact [are] projects we want to consider. Also the projects with high effort and high impact. And anything that has low impact but high effort is perhaps too tiring and too less of a reward to do, but still something that you might consider as you don't want to do. And also we identified the projects which bear high risks with either low or high effort as the projects you really don't want to do.

For example, at the bottom of this matrix, you will see such projects as create a global database of abuse names or [cooperation] audit mechanisms and especially voluntary code of conduct. That raised a lot

EN

of concerns as far as I understand in the ccTLD community and also during the small group discussions. So those were just basically if you see [inaudible], these would be cut off the matrix completely, cut off prioritization.

In the projects you may want to do but probably not, we saw them as gray area and something that has quite a high effort, but the impact is low on certain—would be using existing definition or promote DNS abuse statistic [inaudible].

Everything that is covered in green on this matrix is something that we want to consider. And the first and foremost of the priority is something that doesn't require a lot of effort, but we will have from low to high impact, like considering educational role or managing expectations about ccTLDs or promote one size does not fit all. And on the top of this matrix on the right corner, you will see the efforts or the outcome that will require a lot of effort, but will also have high impact. Like for example, the highest would be share the processes and create understanding of process with end users, share the facts. So something that will take additional steps, additional effort, something that is not really a low hanging fruit, but perhaps something to consider.

Then based on this matrix, we decided to put everything into a prioritization matrix starting with the first step, so low hanging fruit, which has high benefit and low effort, then something that will have high benefit and high effort are big bets, something for us to investigate. Low effort and low value, some maybes, something that we might want to consider but perhaps not because there are some low

effort and high benefits things. And also something that has low value and high effort probably is not worth the effort.

So this is the last one, I will stop torturing you with matrix. Basically, what we can suggest to the Council and to the community is low hanging fruit to proceed almost with certainty are on the left top corner. So remind that ccTLDs are not gTLDs. Use ccNSO as information sharing platform. Manage expectation about ccTLDs. Promote one size does not fit all solutions.

We also suggest to investigate some big bets. They require high effort, but they will also have high value and high benefits. So there is some sort of gray area for some of us. We were talking about an orange and DAAR. We do understand that not everybody would be in favor of this. So this is something that is not obligatory.

Other than that, there are some clear high effort high benefits solutions like using existing definitions, supporting community voluntary framework, share the processes, create understanding of these processes with end users. Big bets, something that is probably not immediate, but we want to investigate how to proceed with this.

On the low effort low value list, but something that we want to consider, is to consider educational role of the ccNSO. And not worth the effort is promoting DNS abuse statistic carefully. Not clear are what the value and benefit is probably low, but the effort is going to be high. So Alejandra and Nick and Pablo, and whoever was there, please correct me if I'm wrong. The next steps for this working group is not only to use this matrix, which is now up for discussion with the ccNSO Council, but

EN

also to see how all these elements are connected to each other and how they interact with each other and reinforce each other.

For example, the investment in something, how it will increase some other element or the benefit of some other element. So this is what we are going to investigate further in addition to of course taking into account your input during this Council meeting. And yeah, so this group is still working and is going to work further on this. Alejandra, probably over to you. But I would also like to ask anybody, be it Nick or Pablo, or maybe David McCauley, who is on the call, if they have anything to add. Have I missed anything? Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Tatiana, for such a nice summary. Please, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, thanks for that really nice summary, Tatiana. The only thing I was thinking of adding was this sort of maybe slightly subtle change, which is to try to properly distinguish which of these are things which we already kind of do, like the educational stuff, and the reminding people that ccTLDs are not gTLDs. If I had a pound for every time, I've said to community members a ccTLD doesn't follow ICANN consensus policies, I'd be a very rich man by now.

So we already do some of this. And I suppose I wanted to maybe just tease out the differences between the suggestions which are essentially a re-emphasis or continuing emphasis on things that we already do, and

which are new initiatives which will require some sort of change as opposed to continuing process. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Nick. Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. Thank you, Tatiana. Excellent presentation. I must say that as much as we continue to pound on ccTLDs are not the same as gTLDs, and on and on and on—And we think, we're convinced that we have done a lot of work and we have put a lot of effort, it doesn't reach to as many people as we would like. So, Nick, as much as I do understand what you're saying, and I absolutely agree with you, I do not dispute it, it is not a wasted effort to continue to doing so, because new people are coming on board into the ecosystem. We need to continue to pound on this because not too many people grasp the idea. There are still people that believe that we are all under contract like the gTLDs. And at least this is one way in which we can present, define some of the topics that we're dealing. What is that path that we need to follow? Determine which are the priorities and which are not and where should we focus our effort.

So, you know, it seems to me that this is a very good effort. And it is frustrating for the reasons that you mentioned, Nick, and for the reasons that I also agree with you that sometimes I feel that we've done a tremendous amount of work, and we have, and there are people that ask .pr, well, what is that .pr stuff? And I'm like, what are you, kidding me? You know how much work, how much money we have put into

this, how much effort we have put into this? How dare you ask me what is .pr. You would think that everybody would know about it, but it takes a lot of work and takes a lot of continuous beating of the drum. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, just to add, I actually do agree with Nick that a lot of the things are already going on, and educational role and trying to manage expectations and explain that ccTLDs are not gTLDs, although I agree with Pablo. If we take the large community—I don't mean At-Large, I mean the ICANN community—people are changing, especially governmental representatives are coming in, At-Large people are coming in, GNSO people. And there is a constant need to remind about this.

But I think the value of this is not like only to create something new or some new approaches, but to structure what you already have. And I think that this is very important. So if there is any question or any need for coordination on DNS abuse or any need for education, you can just say, okay, this is what we're doing. This is our priorities; these are our next steps. And we are not going here and there because we discussed it and we decided that the risks are too high. And I think there is value in everything here because you can structure this information, you can prioritize, and if there is any question, any inquiry or any discussion within your community or outside of it, you can always say, we went through this, we don't have to reinvent the wheel. Here it is.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Tatiana, Nick, and Pablo. Just to add, one last thing is that we as the small committee are still considering also the proposed TLD abuse working group. There's no name to it yet, but it's something that we are also considering. And for our next update, we will hope to show you how these efforts, how they influence each other and how the dynamics of them work. Because that will also help us set our priorities and where to invest our efforts. So we are also looking forward to prepare a webinar for the broader community to let them know on this analysis, maybe by the end of January or early February, between the January and February Council call. So please do attend. And, more on this to come.

Thank you everyone. And because of course, I was forgetting something, now I see my notes, we as a Council need to agree on the roadmap that we want to seek on this topic and to be able to present it to ICANN 73. So this is where we are. And work is in progress. But I think we are in a good motion, in a good pace.

So now moving on to—I believe it's almost last item, it's on the ICANN 73 meetings. This is a tentative schedule. It's only to give you an overview and to make you aware of the different sessions that are in the making so you can prepare and to see whether you want to participate. It is very important in ICANN 73 that we will have our prep meeting. And in this session, we need to agree on the roles and responsibilities of all of us as councilors. And we need to adopt them at the Council meeting later in that week. So start thinking about this already. And this also includes the annual election of chair and vice

chairs of the CCNSO Council. So give it a thought. It's early, but do start thinking about it.

Then during our Council meeting, we of course will then elect the chair and vice chair. And we will have an initial presentation of the ccNSO workplan. There's also some thoughts on bilateral meetings like the ccNSO and GNSO. If you have any suggestions for topics, please do send them to the mailing list. If you have one now, you can put in the chat. But please, we need to already start thinking of this.

One of them quite evident is the CSC review. But other than that, please. Any topics you can think of, let everyone in the Council know here the mailing list. Also here, I have a question for you on your preference for us meeting with the Board. Shall we have a full joint session with the ICANN Board or should we have a more cozy session on ccNSO-related Board members?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: I prefer the more cozy, closer Board members meeting.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. Anyone else?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm assuming that other Board members would be welcome to pitch up and participate. But what you're proposing is a small session with our Board members. Do I understand that correctly?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yeah, they're the two possibilities. And now I'm asking which is your preference, to have this smaller one—of course, all our sessions are open, so any other member of the ICANN Board is welcome to join and participate. But the planning and setting is different. So that's why I'm asking to see which is the preference.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'd go for the smaller.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Anyone else? Okay, let's do it the other way around, since we have two in favor of the smaller one. Are we in favor of that? Shall we go with green ticks hust to see if that's a good preference for all of us or for the majority? Okay, I see many green ticks. Thank you very much. Does anyone object or oppose this or prefers the other one best? Yes, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I wouldn't say I oppose it or prefer one or the other. I just suppose there's a bit of a danger, I think, that we spend a lot of our time talking to people who agree with us and people who are from our own community. And the meeting with the ICANN Board is an excellent opportunity to re-emphasize the differences between ccTLDs and gTLDs to some of the people who might not be aware of this. Talking to our own board members is a great conversation because we all speak the same language as it were. But part of the challenge is to make sure that

we do that outreach point and talk to the people who don't come from our communities and don't understand this, and new ICANN Board members will come in from the Nominating Committee and whatever. And we would lose that sort of quite unique opportunity to have those touch points. That's my only reservation. Otherwise, I agree with the smaller meeting. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Nick. Just to make a quick comment on yours. It's not the only chance that we have to meet with the Board. There are three ICANN meetings of the year. So of course, we should think about this when we do actually want to meet with full ICANN Board as one maybe of our topics or not. Yes, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you, Alejandra. And this is exactly my point, that this depends on the topics. If I have topics which require the attention of the whole ICANN Board, then we need whole ICANN Board. If we don't have such topics, then there is no need to invite all the Board and we can spend time in our cozy nice company.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. Irina. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Nick's convinced me that it may well be a good thing to have them all there. Or at least invite them all. See how many pitch up. Because of

that continuing education effort that he emphasized. And that's particularly true with noncom members but it's also true with the ASO and GNSO members as well as ALAC, for goodness sake, based on what happened a couple of meetings back. SO I'm retracting my earlier opinion and subscribing to Nick's. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, but Nick is in favor of these smaller group, though made a comment on maybe not losing the opportunity. And so would you be in favor having the small one, but open to everyone?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Small and open to everyone. But if we've got—I think is continuing education effort with the Board. I don't think we can rely on Katrina and Pablo to carry the water for us with 20+ Board members. I think we need to be sure we're meeting with them. Not every meeting maybe, but at least I would say two out of the three meetings, just making certain that they understand we're not gTLDs.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you, Stephen. I agree with you. And just to clarify, I did mention that we have all ICANN meetings to meet with the ICANN Board, but it's not true for the middle one, the smaller one, the forum. So we do have two opportunities, at the beginning of the year, at the end of the year. And in my opinion, I think it's best to do the full Board meeting at the AGM. That's when big things happen. And that's

when we can of course make sure we get these messages across. So as an alternative. Biyi.

BIYI OLADIPO: I think we've always had meetings with the full Board and also with our own Board members. So really, I don't think there's any problem whichever we choose. However, there is no need to have a meeting just for having a meeting's sake. If there's something to discuss, if there's an issue to raise, yes, let's decide on which one. But like Nick said, I don't mind us having our own cozy little meeting. We have three meetings a year, we can always have a full Board meeting if there's something to discuss. But if there is nothing to discuss, there's no reason for us to have two meetings with the Board. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Biyi. And I completely agree with you. So for now, from what I understand, we will keep the small cozy with our ICANN Board members meeting for ICANN 73. and really consider for the full Board and ccNSO Council for the ICANN 75 meeting. And as Biyi says, if we do have some topics to discuss with them.

Okay, moving along. And because we have just two minutes, I want to mention one more thing. And yes, Giovanni. Today, you're very popular in the Council call. But since you are leaving, you have also the role of being our agenda liaison with the GAC and for this, we need a successor in this role. I would like to request for anyone who is interested in this role to self-nominate in the mailing list, or otherwise, we will pick you

for the job. Giovanni, in 30 seconds, can you tell us if this is a challenging role to fulfill?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: No, it is not. It's not like the SOPC. So it's very easy. It's just a matter of spending 10 minutes just before ICANN meetings to discuss with the GAC and the ccNSO secretariat some topics for the agenda. So it's something really easy to catch up and also manage.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Do they pay well?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah, they pay better than the SOPC.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you very much, Giovanni. So as you see, this is not a very challenging role, but we do need someone to be in that role. So please self-nominate online. And then the agenda, will have the ccTLD relevant sessions, we will have webinars, ccTLD news, Tech Day, the members meetings, there are some plenary sessions, and today in about two and a half hours, there's a planning call for ICANN73 so I will expect to have more on these plenary sessions for the next Council call.

The next item is our next meetings, and I need to make a note that the times of the meetings have been updated. This is to follow what we agree upon on the timings that we will have, 12:00 UTC, 21:00 UTC,

12:00 UTC, 18:00 UTC, and so on. So they have been updated and these are the correct ones. So we will meet in January 27 at 12:00 UTC next time. And does anyone have any other business?

Okay. So no any other business. With this, I would like, again, to thank you, Giovanni, for everything that you have done during the ccNSO Council and your participation in all the working groups and in the ccNSO. I wish you all the best in your new role in ICANN.

This is our last meeting of the year. So let me also wish to all of you and your families very happy holidays and that the 2022 bring you a lot of peace and energy to continue with the good work that we have done so far. So thank you all very much for joining this call. And the meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]