
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hello, everyone. This is our Council Meeting #188 on the 20th of October 2022. My name is Alexandra Reynoso, and I'm the ccNSO Council chair. And welcome, everyone, to our meeting.

Please, for all councilors, I kindly request you to add to your Zoom ID, the word "councilor" or "ccNSO Council" so we can find you easily while doing any voting. And as usual, let me share in the chat the Wiki for today's call where all documents have been uploaded. And may I ask Kim if we are quorate?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Yes, Alejandra. The group is quorate right now. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you so much, Kim. May I ask if anyone has any other business at this time so I can keep track on that? If you do just raise your hand. If not, I will ask this again when we get there.

Let me note that there has been a slight change in Agenda Item #16 regarding the Holistic Review Drafting Team. The public comment period has been extended and the Drafting Team is suggesting to take a little bit more time to work on the draft. So it's not available yet, but we will still have some summary to discuss further.

Moving on to Item #2. It's the relevant correspondence. There we see the correspondence regarding Holistic Review and our request seeking

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.

an extension. Also, we have a letter from the GNSO Council appointing Desiree Miloshevic as their GNSO liaison. Welcome, Desiree.

And there will also be published a letter to ICANN Legal regarding the interpretation of Section 8.8 of the ICANN Bylaws.

And moving on, regarding minutes and action items. Unfortunately, the transcript is not yet available so we don't have it to fill this in. But later the action items will be taken from the notes that were done during the during the call and they will be shared.

Moving along, inter-meeting decisions. Our only decision was to agree on the request for extension for the public comment period on the Pilot Holistic Review.

And now we move to the updates and questions and comments. So unless there's anything additional to what's written in the document per the updates, I would like to go through them really quickly. And regarding PDPs, we do have some updates there. Updates from ECA, CSC, CSC Review Team are written updates. Anything additional that you would like to be shared now? Okay, I don't see any hands.

Then updates from working groups. Any of the working groups listed would like to share something else? For example, GRC, you do have items in the agenda. So let's wait until there. Any other working group?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Alejandra, do you want me to discuss PDP3 now or later? I'm confused.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Almost there. I'm at Item 6, only working groups. And then Item #7 is ccPDP update. So I'm almost there, Stephen. I don't see any hands for working groups, so let's move on.

And now, yes, Stephen. We have arrived to 7A, update on ccPDP3. So could you please give us your update?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes. Great news. We met yesterday. We got consensus on the second reading. We actually have policy text, and it's coming to the Council for its first look-see. I'm not quite sure of the mechanics of that, and I'll defer to Bart on the mechanics of that. But our timing is to hopefully get it out for public comment mid-Novemberish and have that run into early next year for community public comment.

Bart, you can correct all of my mistakes.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Bart, I see your hand up.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. So there is no role at this stage, just to be clear, for the Council. This is just to inform you. You'll have a role with the final report. Once there is a final report, then you will receive it. And that's expected, hopefully, by March. If not, by ICANN76. Otherwise, by ICANN77. This depends very much on the public comments the working group will receive on its initial report. So we have between now and March 2023.

So I hope, Stephen, that captures this point for you as well.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. That's where we are with that. So great progress yesterday. We've even canceled our upcoming meeting because we really don't have anything talked about just yet. So we're moving along on it. Thank you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, thank you, Stephen. This looks like great news. May I ask you if the questions from the Council were addressed with respect to the Review Mechanism and the IRP?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I guess for the most part. I'll let the documents speak for itself at this point. And certainly, Council will have an opportunity to express themselves yet again on that. So I revert. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Bart, would you like to add something?

BART BOSWINKEL: Alejandra, maybe as an addition. It is addressed in a specific section of the proposal. Section 9, if I believe. So it reaffirms the position, in principle, of the Council that there should not be any use of the IRP with respect to decisions, nor of the reconsideration process.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. I believe that is Section 9 [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. So have a look at it. Otherwise, we can share this to you as well. So that is a response to the Council question.

Stephen, that might be an action for us from the working group so that you and Eberhard as chair and vice-chair respond to the question from Council and yes, it is addressed and, yes, it is included [in]—

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. Let me—

BART BOSWINKEL: —Section 9 and that we've got no loose ends anymore.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Excellent.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. Now I'm making a note to actually formally correspond to the Council [as chair].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Stephen. That will be much appreciated.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You'll get that shortly.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Okay, moving along we have here an update from IDN ccPDP4. May I ask Ai-Chin to let us know how it's going?

AI-CHIN LU: Okay.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, please.

AI-CHIN LU: Yeah. Regarding ccPDP4 IDN Working Group, we have held 32 Zoom meetings and made progress. The most recent on this Tuesday focused on reviewing and updating the Variant Management Subgroup's proposal. And additionally, advice to the IDN ccTLD manager on IDN variant table and registrations and their IDN ccTLD variant which will be included on Annex C.

And regarding the timeline, I think after ICANN75, we have some major steps including [inaudible] and the Confusion Similarity Subgroup. We will do reviews and the stress testing. That will be expected in December of this year, and the initial report will be expected in next year Q1.

And I think that the other part is the progress in coordination with the GNSO EPDP Working Group. I think that we want to align the Confusing Similarity Subgroup with the EPDP subgroup so that we can share and reference each other on confusing similarity issues. But now it seems like the EPDP Working Group needs to spend more time discussing hybrid model-related matters. So the two working groups should find the right time to have a joint meeting or seek another way to exchange views.

I think that this is my update. Maybe, Bart, do you want to add more?

BART BOSWINKEL: No thank you, Ai-Chin. That was a very succinct overview.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Ai-Chin. And Bart, I see that it's—

BART BOSWINKEL: Oh, maybe one more point.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, maybe one more point I forgot. So again, this working group will look at the Review Mechanism and they will look at it from a perspective to use the ... And that's the good thing. It is now a fairly

stable proposal to build on the proposals of the PDP3 Review Mechanism. So if feasible, they will try to refer to that. And again, excluding the IRP and excluding the reconsideration. So there are no changes needed to the PDP3. It will build upon it and they will define ... Yeah, the decision is subject to the review.

Stephen, go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. Ai-Chin, what can we do ... I'm speaking now as chair of the PDP3. What can I do to facilitate communication with your group on this matter? Thank you.

And I guess my second question is are you going to be in Muscat next week or the week after? Because we could chat there as well. Now I'm not hearing anything from anybody.

BART BOSWINKEL: Alejandra, may I answer Stephen's question?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yesh, of course.

BART BOSWINKEL: Ai-Chin, do you mind if I answer Stephen's question?

AI-CHIN LU: Oh, sure. Go ahead.

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen, I think you gave the ... [I would say] what was really helpful is the update you already provided during ICANN75. I think what would be helpful is once the Review Mechanism has defined their decisions, etc., that the working group would check whether that would dovetail with the proposed policy to check whether any adjustment is needed either under the IDN policy or on the Review Mechanism to make this really work.

So they will use the same structure that was used in the Review Mechanism Working Group. First identify the decisions that should be subject to the review, and then divert or refer to the Review Mechanism. But it should work that way. A second pair of eyes would be very helpful, but that's later on in the process. Thanks.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, all. I see that the ccPDP3 is progressing very well, so that makes me really happy. Moving along, we go to Item #8. It's the updates on liaisons, and these are written updates that we will receive by e-mail. So let's move on to Item #9, update from chair, vice-chairs, councilors, regional organizations, and secretariat. Does anyone have any updates to share? I see that, no.

I do have a couple. One is regarding the governance session that we had in ICANN75. There was a little issue with ICANN Legal, but fortunately it has been resolved and the recording has been published. So that's done.

I have done a summary of ICANN75 to LACTLD, and next week I will be doing so as well with APTLD. And I have also been invited to the Virtual School of Internet Governance, to their legal session to talk about the ccNSO. Those will be my activities soon.

Anyone else? Okay, I see no hands. Then let's move on to the administrative matters that we have for discussion or for [decision].

I see Javier. Javier, do you have your hand up? You are muted.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET:

Sorry. Yeah, you mentioned the Virtual School of Internet Governance. I will also be running a session there on resilient Internet. For those of you that don't know, the Virtual School of Internet Governance in which Pablo is also involved is an initiative that was really started by Alfredo Calderon from Puerto Rico and Glenn McKnight and some others. And it really took off during Coronavirus, for obvious reasons. So keep an eye out for it. Our sessions are in November.

But Alejandra, thanks for collaborating, also.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

No problem at all. Thank you, Javier. Okay, moving along. We are now in Item #10, adoption voting report amendment/ccNSO internal rules. So the voting concluded on the 18th of October. The numbers are now

available and were shared in the mailing list. We passed the [poll], so that's great. The process manager did not observe any issues with respect to the voting, so the new rules are supported by the members.

And as a final step, we as Council need to adopt the voting report. When we do so, the report and the new rules will be published. And upon publication, they will become effective.

So are there any questions regarding the topic? I don't see any hands. Okay, may I have a mover?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: I'll move.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I see Pablo's hand and ...

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll second that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. So Pablo moves. Stephen seconds.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That's an important moment.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Since I don't see your camera, I don't know. You don't have it on. Then it's difficult for me to locate you. Okay.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You do not want to see me on camera at this hour.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No worries. I know it's early.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Or indeed ever.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Any hour. Right. Thanks, Chris.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, that's not true. Okay, so we have a decision in front of us. Any questions regarding the resolution? I don't see any hands. Okay, so let's go to the voting. You know the drill. Green ticks in favor and red crosses in case you abstain or object.

And for those who are with us, just a clarification. This is for councilors only. Okay, I see only green ticks. Thank you very much. You may now put them down.

And for good measure, may ask if there is anyone abstaining or objecting? I don't see any hands. So this has passed. Thank you very much.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yay. Very momentous.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Agree. Yay.

JORDAN CARTER: This is the first change to the rules since they were put in in 2004. Isn't it? The first big update.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, no, no. This is the second one.

JORDAN CARTER: Second?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Second?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Remember that we changed the rules dramatically and now we are updating them to the ICANN Bylaw change to include the IDNs. So this is the second time.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Ah, yes. The IDNs.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, but it's the first time since we changed them in 2004. Right?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, the second.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. When did we they get changed before this one then?

BART BOSWINKEL: In June this year.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, okay. Sorry. [inaudible].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: We just did it and then we are changing them.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's the same change. Sorry.

BART BOSWINKEL: No. We knew this would happen, but it was building on the Bylaws, awaiting the Bylaw change. And then we needed to do this. We knew this was forthcoming.

And maybe as an observation ... May I, Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, of course.

BART BOSWINKEL: What really paid off this time is taking in account the growth of the ccNSO. So now we have 173 members. And then adjusting the quorum to 33. So we're way past 33. But under the former quorum of 50%, we would have had to take a second round of voting. So that really started to pay off. And there is still, I would say, solid support for the new rules. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Bart. Okay, so moving along. Now we're on Item #11. And this is the review and update on the NomCom job description and ccNSO skill set criteria. And for these, may I ask Bart to introduce this for us?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes. The secretariat has been approached by the NomCom support staff with a question. And this is what they do now every year with a question to review the job description and the criteria for selection. As some of you will recall in the past, not using the criteria turned out to be a bit of an issue. So now it's part of their procedure to reach out and to confirm whether the job description and the criteria are still up to date and supported by the Council themselves. This just happened last week.

So what we've done, from the secretariat we circulated the job description and we circulated the criteria—which are the same as last year—for your review. And probably it's not a good idea to do it on this call on the fly. I suggested this to give you a few more days to check whether you support the current job description, or the proposed job description and the criteria.

And the criteria is mainly just to detail ... This is not about skill sets, etc. This is more about the background of NomCom appointees. They should not be associated with a ccTLD manager in whatever capacity, nor with a regional organization. If some of the old hands will recall, we did have some candidates who were associated with a ccTLD manager or a regional organization. And this would upset the balance within the Council. That was the background of it. Thanks. That's all.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Bart. Do we have a due date when we need to send this back to the NomCom?

BART BOSWINKEL: The call for nomination will go out by the 10th of December. So in two weeks would be very nice to get feedback. So by the end of October. So we'll make it the end of October. So then we'll know if there is any feedback. And if there is no real feedback, then we'll consider them supported by you and we'll informed the NomCom.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. I see Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: So I don't remember seeing this material either, but I get a lot of e-mails so I might have just missed it. So that refers to Chris's comment in the chat.

And Bart, before I what I think I'm going to I just want you to recap. What is the concern that you were identifying. I zoned out a little bit. Was it the ...

BART BOSWINKEL: The criteria for NomCom appointees addresses the situation which we have seen that, in the past ... So NomCom councilors are directly related or indirectly related to a ccTLD manager. So therefore think about it. So the Council was carefully drafted in that sense. You had 18 counselors, 3 from every region, from ccTLD managers.

So imagine that you have a NomCom councilor who is related to a ccTLD manager but who is in a NomCom position. That all of a sudden would bring some imbalance in the structure of the Council. This similar situation we had in the past with a representatives or general manager, effectively, of a regional organization. And a regional organization, yeah, it's clearly either from the European, African, Latin American, Caribbean, or European region. So that in a way would, again, impact the balance of the Council as well. And that was a major concern at the time.

JORDAN CARTER: But we haven't worried about other connections like people who have been GAC reps or people who are associated with gTLD registrars or anything like that.

BART BOSWINKEL: No. This was clearly ... Because NomCom appointees do have a background, one way or the other. But this was clearly the makeup of the Council itself because [inaudible].

JORDAN CARTER: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. That was the reason.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry, I was only going to that, yes, if you have a situation where you've got an employee of a ccTLD appointed to the Council as a NomCom appointee, that is troubling to the geographic diversity and the regional split of the Council. You could end up with a situation—and we almost did, if I remember correctly—where you have someone who is in fact in the same company as a counselor. So, yes ...

But I thought we'd already sorted that out, Bart. Is that not sorted?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I thought we did, too, Chris.

BART BOSWINKEL: It's sorted in the criteria, but therefore the NomCom ... Therefore they ask reconfirmation that this criteria still applies.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, okay. I see.

BART BOSWINKEL: They do this annually, and if there is a change.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. I was with Chris on that. I thought we'd sorted that.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. It's been sorted, but you need to reconfirm every year. And they asked. And they did it in the past.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Super.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, that's why.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And then now I have a question, Bart. Does this affect whatever we receive back from ICANN Legal regarding our question on Article 8.8? Or is that's something completely separate?

BART BOSWINKEL: That's something else. This is about the people the NomCom committee selects to be on the ccNSO Council. And one of the criteria clearly is that the NomCom cannot appoint somebody who is on the NomCom. That's a no-brainer. And the question to ICANN Legal is about the role of a counselor on that NomCom committee.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Exactly.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yep. So that's a different—

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I just wanted to clear that up.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you very much. Any other questions on this matter? I see none.

Okay, then let's move on to Item #12. Update Charter's Terms of Reference. Here, what I can tell you is that the MPC will soon start to review its Charter. And so far, being only a committee, if I recall correctly, that is pending some sort of review, is the OISC. It has been dormant for a while and something needs to happen there.

So a way to do this is to review the Terms of Reference and see if it still fulfills what we need from that committee, if the scope is okay. And for this, I do suggest that we start doing that as soon as possible with the hopes of perhaps some sort of guidance on this committee by January at the latest.

For this, do we have any volunteers that would like to join me in reviewing this committee?

BIYI OLADIPO: [inaudible].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Biyi, okay. Noted. Pablo. You're joining the volunteers? I thought you had a question. Okay.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: He stepped over the line. I'm a glutton for punishment, so ...

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: You too, Stephen? Okay, thank you very much. The committee is the OISC, the Outreach and ... What was the "I"?

BART BOSWINKEL: Involvement Standing Committee.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And Involvement. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: That's the reason why you need to review it. You don't even know the ...

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And Sean. Okay. Thank you all. Then we have, just to recap, Biyi, Stephen, Pablo, and Seun. And myself, of course. Thank you.

Okay. Moving along, we have appointments to working groups and committees. We have here that the SOPC is seeking confirmation of membership of current members. No further updates nor a decision required here.

And we do have another point here that was added on the 14th. It's the selection of candidates for Root Zone Evolution Review Committee. So the secretary was informed that Peter Koch's term will end by the end of 2022. He may stand again, but we still need to call for Expression of Interest and use the general selection procedure to select a candidate. And we have a resolution to make this happen. Are there any questions for clarification? Okay. No? Very well.

May have a mover? I see Chris moves and Jordan seconds in the cameras. Okay, thank you. Any question on the resolution itself? Okay, no questions. Very well. Let's go to the vote.

Please use your green ticks if you are in favor or your red crosses in case you abstain or object. I'll give you a couple seconds there. I see all green ticks. Thank you so much. You may put them down now.

And for good measure, is anyone abstaining or objecting to this? I see none, so this has passed. Thank you very much.

Now we have another item that was also added on the 14th of October. It's candidates for the ICANN Academy Leadership Program. So we have been approached for seeking candidates to this leadership program that

will be held in the meeting in Cancún. And we now need to see who we want to send to this program. I've been part of it and some of the councilors here have been part of it. I think it's very good program. Through time we have been trying to send a councilor and a chair of a working group so they both can attend, together, this program.

Well, we did have some people appointed for the last Cancún meeting that was cancelled due to COVID. But it has been almost three years already and the status of the people have changed, and I think it would be wise for us to consider what we have now, as in the current situation.

For this, I want to suggest that a small committee could take on this. So it would be, with me, maybe one of the advisors—Biyi, that has already been in the program—and maybe another councilor from the NomCom to help select the candidates.

Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Ale, how many seats? How many people can we send?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Two. And usually we try to send someone that has some experience and a new arrival to leadership to balance it a little bit.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Super. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So this is one way of doing things, with a small committee. And I think it's the best way. Alternately, we can do a call for volunteers. But it would be more time consuming and it would require a little bit more work. And it's important to note that for this program, there is no travel funding either. So it's just for the program. So it can be complicated if we do a call for volunteers and people think this might get them there, in a way.

So Biyi, may I voluntell you to join me?

BIYI OLADIPO: It's okay, Ale. Interestingly, I'm actually a facilitator on the program.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Exactly. That's why, since you've been there. Okay, so [inaudible].

BIYI OLADIPO: No. I mean I'm facilitating at this one.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I cannot hear you then. You're facilitating.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. He said he wants to participate.

BIYI OLADIPO: I said I'm a facilitator on the program.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Ah, I thought you already were on the program.

BIYI OLADIPO: I'm not participating as a ... I'm not a participant. I'm a facilitator at the program.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Ah, yes. Okay, so what does that mean? That it would be a good idea for you to be in this committee or not?

BIYI OLADIPO: I'm agreeing with you that [I can join you].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you. Just to be clear. And someone from NomCom. Javier? What do you think?

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: Okay.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, so we're set. Any questions/comments on this topic?

SOULEYMANE OUMTANAGO: [inaudible].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Souleymane? Okay. I think that was an open mic. No problem. Okay. Well, thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: [Thank you].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you all to stepping up.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thanks, Stephen. Very well then. Okay, so we have Biyi and Javier and myself. And we will keep you posted. I note, Irina, that you said you're interested.

Yes, Jordan. This is ... No. It's a committee to help select the two people that we will send to this program. Okay. Very well.

So now moving on to Item #14. Progress on the ccNSO Council elections. Yesterday, there were the two sessions with a Q&A with the candidates. The recordings will be posted. There is no election needed since there is only one candidate per region. Joke, in her capacity, will prepare an election report for adoption. And after adoption the Council elections

will close and councilors will take their seats after the Cancún meeting. Any questions regarding this item? I see no hands up. Okay.

Next one is Item #15. Progress on Board seat 11 nominations. The due diligence check was completed and there were no issues to be found. There will be a Q&A with Patricio. That is on November 3rd at 13:00 UTC. And the week after that, starting on the 6th of November, there will be an election for this. As you know, even though we only have one candidate there will be two options in the voting. One is the candidate or none of the above. So that's what we need the voting for. Are there any questions regarding this item? I see no hands, so let's continue.

Now we are on the items for discussion and decision that are not necessarily administrative. Update on the draft of ccNSO Council response on the Terms of Reference in the Holistic Review. For this, may I ask Jordan to start with the summary of the Drafting Team? And then any other member of the team can chime in.

JORDAN CARTER:

Sure, Ale. Hi, everyone. The team has had two calls. And some heavy lifting on writing has been done by Bart and Chris Disspain. So thank you to both of you. And we haven't shared the draft. Have we? Because it isn't ready yet. And the reason it isn't ready is that the SO/AC chairs got together and agreed that they would share draft statements among the Drafting Teams.

So we have a statement that is currently four pages long. It's reasonably critical in a fair minded way and basically argues that we need to decide the scope and approach to this review before piloting it. And I think

that's the essence of it. And we want more clarity about a bunch of the stuff that's there, including participation. Otherwise, it's going to turn into a fight about our representation and fights between stakeholder groups and so on.

So that's what I would describe as the very pithy essence of it. Chris or Bart, as drafters and participants of the working group, do either of you want to any more or is that a fair enough very brief summary?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. Stephen, if you allow me, I'll let Chris first and then questions. Yes, Chris?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Ale. Yeah, that's a perfectly fine assessment, Jordan. I just wanted to add that the Registries Stakeholder Group is working through their comments and are very interested in what it is that we intend to say.

And what I've just done about it—and I will hopefully finish tomorrow so that we can send it out to the Council to have a look at—is to actually draft some very specific comments on specific areas of the Terms of Reference so that we've got a general overarching picture, the clear evidence of the fact that no one has a clue what this is supposed to actually do. And then referring very specifically to some of the Terms of

Reference and saying that these demonstrate, a lack of understanding of what a pilot's meant to do.

So I just wanted to say that. And hopefully everybody will be able to get this in the next day so and we can move forwards. So thanks very much.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I guess my question is, has this train already left the station? Based on what I saw from the ALAC comments, and to a lesser extent the other comment that was sent from the GNSO, I hope it has not. I concur with our feelings about this. But that's a question for Jordan and, I guess, also for Chris. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Chris, would you like to address this?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure. No, I don't think it has left the station, Stephen. I don't think GNSO has made a comment. I think it's SSAC and ALAC. You would expect At-Large to be supportive because it—

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It was SSAC, thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

—it opens up a more significant role for them. No, I don't think it has left the station. And I would refer you to the meeting that we had in ICANN75 in KL with Larisa and her team when they made a presentation to us. Certainly my takeaway was, “We recognize that this is a bit of a mess. Please, please, please come back with clear comments as to why you think it isn't workable.” And so I'm hopeful that we can achieve a goal which would be ...

And I'm being very simplistic here, but launching a pilot review is a review. Whether they pretend it's not a review or it is a review, it doesn't matter. It is a review. And if you actually look at the Terms of Reference, some of the Terms of Reference imply that it is a review. Some of the Terms of Reference imply that it's a structural exercise.

So my suggestion to us is going to be that we recommend the setting up of a Holistic Review structure, Cross-Community Working Group, which would be a sensible way of actually figuring out what the recommendation from ATRT3 means—how it can be done sensibly, what the guardrails are—so that it doesn't step outside. It is a nonsense to have the pilot itself actually deciding what the pilot does. That just doesn't make any sense.

So I'm hopeful that their comments will be treated as sensible. And providing a way forward, of course, is critical in order to work for the comments to be useful. But, no, I don't think it's left the station, Stephen. And even if it has, then we'll find another way of blocking the track.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Chris. Any other comments or questions regarding this topic?

JORDAN CARTER: Just briefly, Alejandra. I also don't think it's off the track in the sense that no changes can be made. We're not going to talk about what happened in the Board and the change of chair and stuff in a forum like this, but I think there are some signals that pushing on with things that are not quite formulated in a way that's practical is not going to be done in the current climate, which I think is good. Sorry if that was cryptic.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you, Jordan. Any other comments? Okay, there's still some work to do. Fortunately, we did have the extension so let's keep at it. Thank you very much, everyone in the Drafting Team, for this.

Moving along—

BART BOSWINKEL: Alejandra, may I just for a moment?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: So the Drafting Team will complete their work hopefully—sorry, I'll put on the camera—by early next week. So Chris and I will work on the

draft, circulate it to the Drafting Team, and the Drafting Team will circulate it through the Council. However, your approval or support of the drafting statement is needed.

So please, please stay on the alert that it is coming. We'll pre-alert you as well because this needs to be clearly a fully-supported statement from the Council and not just the Drafting Team. So read it, and if you have any comments, please do it as quickly as possible after you've received the draft. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes. Thanks, Alejandra. I agree with Bart. But just to say, without wishing to put pressure on anybody, this will be more powerful the earlier in the process that goes in. In other words, if we can get it together ... We've got the extension. I'm not wishing to rush anybody. But it would be great if we could get our act together relatively quickly and get it out so that it's known and it's on the record. People can ask us questions, and so on and so forth.

I did miss one other update for you, which is that in the same way that Larisa and her team came to see us about this, they are having a Zoom call with the Contracted Party House of the GNSO, I think, next week. Just to let you know.

And obviously, Alejandra, once we've got this draft in a format that we're comfortable with, you would return the favor of the chairs of the

SOs and ACs and send them our draft so that at least they will know what it is we're planning to say in the same way that ALAC and SSAC did for us. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, Chris, indeed. So when we are ready to share it, I'll do so. Thank you. Very well.

Okay, let's move on to Item #17. This is the update draft ccNSO Council response on initial report of the CSC Effectiveness Review Team. So as you may know, the public comment period has been extended until the 1st December, and we have the draft statement in the e-mail. Note that this is a draft that now I will ask Irina to share with us the summary. And it is very relevant for ccTLDs since they are the direct customers of the IANA Services. So this is Council and members statement.

Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you very much, Alejandra. Indeed, there was a very small Drafting Team. There were only two volunteers, [inaudible] from that .za and me. So we did our best, but we definitely want more people to read it and to identify whether they are in agreement with what is written. At least we would like to have the support from the Council for this statement.

We agree with the observation of the Review Team and the recommendation it makes. We found that it was just a really good work done. And basically there are two main issues to focus on. These are

findings and recommendations regarding meeting attendance and regarding their Service Level Agreements review.

So with regard to the meeting attendance, there is a tricky situation. From one side, the Charter of the CC says that there should be meetings every month and that the members must attend at least nine meetings per year, which is 75% of the meetings. In reality, we see that there were 10 meetings per year, and the lowest attendance was nine out of 10, which is like 90% of the meetings.

So while it doesn't seem a big issue currently with the member attendance, hypothetically it may have a big impact on the effectiveness of the committee. Therefore, we'd agree with the Review Team recommendations. And also we dared to say, on behalf of the ccNSO, that in accordance with other recommendation, ccNSO will track the attendance of the members of CC who are appointed by ccNSO.

I personally wouldn't really care that much about the attendance of liaisons because I consider that it is more the opportunity for a SOs/ACs [inaudible] obligation. But in terms of their members, I agree that it's important to keep a high level of attendance.

And the second recommendation was regarding Service Level Agreements for IANA which actually need to be reviewed from time to time. But currently, there is no mechanism to do and there is no single entity in charge of this. So we support the recommendation of the Review Team that says, "see develops a framework for regular review of the SLA' s."

That's basically all, but I would really appreciate if the Council reads this draft submission and provides its comments or at least the level of agreement. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Irina. And, yes, I agree with you. We should all express either our support or send any comments or observations that we see in this draft. And for this, I would suggest maybe a week from now. So by the 27th of October if, please, everyone could read the draft and send anything to Irina and [inaudible] and Joke, that would be great. Any questions regarding this? Okay, I see no hands up. So thank you very much.

Yes, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: The draft is quite short. It's just two pages to read.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So that should make the homework easier. So please read it, like, today if possible. But still, one week from now tops. Thank you. Okay.

Then moving along, we have Item #18. Update and follow-up on the development of the ccNSO and the Universal Acceptance roadmap. And a summary of decision has been circulated. Are there any questions on the outcome or comments from the session by now since we had some time now to digest what we heard there. No additional comments? Okay.

Yes, Jiankang?

JIANKANG YAO: Hello.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hi.

JIANKANG YAO: Yes. I have some about UA. So, UASG has decided every year [inaudible] February UA Day for a promotion for IDN and EAI and related things. So UASG has a hoped that every ccTLD in ccNSO can join these UA Day activities. So the [inaudible] have some comments or suggestions from our ccNSO. So ALAC has shown a great support for UA Day. So maybe ccNSO [inaudible] to UA Day.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jiankang. Yes, yes. For the ccNSO to be able to do so, we need to have a clear way of doing so. Right now the ccNSO has no specific role regarding the Universal Acceptance. And that's what we are seeking from the recommendations that we received from the session in ICANN75. And if there is a role there, then we can definitely pass this task to a future group if it's [inaudible] or not to do so.

So for this, there's some work that still needs to be done. Very similarly, as we did with DNS abuse, we got these recommendations on what the ccNSO could good do or what it shouldn't do. And it would be best to

review them in a more specific way because during the session it was a little bit too fast. We do have a small team that is going to lead this effort, and maybe it would be wise to have a webinar or use the December Council meeting to see progress on what the small group has done.

By the way, are there any updates from the small group regarding this? Or is it too early to ask? Yes, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

At this point, we'll begin to take a look at the documentation that was shared. I believe that we still have a little bit more time to get together and do more work on this. But without a doubt, it seems to me—and I believe that my colleagues will agree—that perhaps a webinar at some point in December could be helpful to us in the community. We'll get together and discuss it with Ai-Chin and Jiankang.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay. Thank you, Pablo. And keep us posted on what needs to be done. Thank you so much. Okay, then. I see thumbs up.

We have an unnumbered item. It will be, let's say, 18.5 maybe because it's in between 18 and 19. It's progress in introduction of the SOI and COI guideline and amendment guidelines on the Board seats 11 and 12 nomination and Council election procedure.

I see Biyi is saying good-bye in the chat. See you, Biyi. Thank you for coming.

So we have, first, the guideline on ccNSO Statement of Interest procedure and procedures with respect to Conflict of Interest. And for this, I would like Sean to give us a summary, please.

SEAN COPELAND:

Thank you, Alejandra. On the SOI, you guys will recall in Kuala Lumpur, David gave a presentation to the community. It was fairly detailed. And there was a temperature of the room that was taken on the SOI process and it was positive. So I'd like for you guys to consider that when you are reading the documentation.

Moving on to the Conflict of Interest. For those of you who were able to attend the conference or listen live because I don't think ... Well, I think it got posted last night. I didn't focus so much on what we were working on as much as the reasons why we are doing Conflict of Interest for Council [inaudible]. It's going to be up to Council itself to adopt what [inaudible].

So I would like for you guys to pay attention to the documentation and come back with feedback. We're not trying to control your ethics and morals, nor question your integrity. It's just to give guidelines or guardrails, if you will.

And I also want to bring your attention to the fact that there will be a confidentiality or privacy that's coming down the road that you may think is lacking at this moment in time. There was a method to the madness, and I'll explain that to you now. Had we done confidentiality first, it would impact across the Board and make concluding this process

plus the Board seat 11 and 12 in Council election ... It would have pushed it back, consequentially.

Anyways, I do appreciate that there's a lot of reading there. Please pay attention to it. I would appreciate it very much.

And I do want to point out that the GRC has actually worked pretty hard for you guys. They've met consistently as a subgroup or the main group every Monday pretty much all year. And I appreciate the members actually doing that. So that's on A.

On B, noting the reading material I want to draw your attention to maybe reduce your reading material on the seat 11 and 12 documentation. I would like to draw your attention to Sections 3.1.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.9. If you look at those, it's a lot lighter reading. That's going to be your changepoint.

And then on the Council election document, the language around "emissary" and Section 3.4 are your focus points.

Mark, if I've left anything out, let me know. And I would also like to thank staff very much for their work with us on this. It's been a long haul.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Sean. And maybe I see that [Souleymane] is asking, for this list of sections that we need to pay more attention to, would it be possible to have a redline version to see the actual changes so it makes things easier? And that's a question for Bart.

Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. I just wanted to say I will circulate a compare version. Then you will see it's all about the emissary or the changes, effectively, to the rules and to the ICANN Article 10 Bylaws that are reflected in the two documents, the guidelines. The SOI and the Conflict of Interest are definitely new documents. So B is all documentation needing to be updated. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. Irina.

IRINA DANIELIA: Thank you, Alejandra. And thank you, Sean. I want to compliment the Drafting Team for the big work done. And I've read the COI and SOI document and trying to feed it back to myself. My understanding is that I would be expected to provide Statements of Interest both as a Council member and as a working group member. And I was not certain what I should mention there. So maybe some example would be helpful to add just a clarity for the potential users. Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND: Okay. Thank you, Irina. That's helpful.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yeah. I think that's very good feedback because some people are used to this and maybe some have never heard of a Statement of Interest before. And it is easier to say, "These are the parts that you need to include there." So thank you very much.

Any other comments or suggestions? No? Okay. So by now, we have a lot of homework to do. And I think I will send you a list of every material that we have, even though we have sent them today, just to make it easier. But, yes, please do invest this week in reading all of these things because they're all very important and we do have one week to submit our comments on these very important matters.

Moving along is Item #19, Any Other Business. Does anyone have any other business? No?

Okay, so for the next Council meetings. Please note that the next one is November 17th at 18:00 UTC. And it's two hours, this meeting, because it will include ... We'll split it in two. It will be one hour for the meeting and one hour for the workshop on Improving the Effectiveness and Efficiency of the ccNSO Processes. So be aware of this.

On the December meeting, we should be there considering whether we will need, or not, a workshop as well on Universal Acceptance as we were discussing. So please, for the team that is reviewing that, please let us know as soon as possible to know if we need to take two hours there so everyone knows in advance. And I see Pablo's nodding. Good. Thank you, Pablo.

And we have some additional dates there for the start of next year already—January, February, and March. And they follow the usual time

change that we have, like 12:00 UTC, 18:00 UTC, 12:00 UTC, 21:00 UTC. And then we start again. Please add them to your calendars. Of course, the March meeting will be in Cancún, so that will be determined later.

And additionally, staff is proposing a Council preparatory meeting and workshop for the roles and responsibilities during ICANN76 for this Sunday before the meeting starts. So take that into consideration as well. I will remind this because it's a little bit ahead of time, but still, if you're already seeking on what to do for the next year, keep this in mind.

If there is nothing else from anyone—and I don't see any hands—let me thank you so much for joining today's call. I think it was very productive. It was very nice to see you and hear you. And I wish you all a really good rest of the day. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Alejandra.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Ale.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]