
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much and welcome everyone to the ccNSO Council meeting 189 on the 17th of November, 2022. My name is Alejandra Reynoso and I'm the Chair of the ccNSO Council. Again, please, quick reminder to our councilors to add ccNSO council or councilor to your Zoom ID. As usual, I will share with you now in the chat the wiki where we have all the documentation necessary for this call, so you can have it in one place. For the record Kim, are we court?

KIM CARLSON: Hi, Alejandra. Yes, the council meeting is court at this time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. Okay. One quick note. This council meeting is scheduled to finish at the next stop of the hour because we will have a second part that is workshop. We have guests and members of the ccPDP3 and ccPDP4 have been invited, and all people that are present in the call are more than welcome to participate. So please keep that in mind. May I ask if anyone has any other business I should be aware of as of now? If not, I will ask this again when we get there, but I will tell you that I do have one, and it's regarding Brett Carr's email on his change of job. So we will discuss this then.

So moving along to item two, we have relevant correspondence, there's the link, and there are two items that were put there because they're going to be mentioned during the meeting, but there were more correspondence than those two. Let's move along. So we have item

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.

number three, minutes and action items. The minutes were adopted, there were no comments, and all action items are completed, and many of them will be tied to an item in this call. May I please request that while you're not speaking, if you can mute your microphones, just not to hear background noise. Thank you. Okay. Moving to item four.

We have intermitting decisions since our last call. Here, we adopted the nomination criteria for the NomCom appointee for the ccNSO council. We have a council support on the ccNSO council comments of the pilot holistic review. We requested the GRC to develop the ccNSO guideline on how to relate to implementation of ccNSO policy. Also, the appointment of members to SOPC, DASC, Tech Working Group, MPC and IGLC.

There is the selection of Sean Copeland and Pablo Rodriguez for the ICANN Leadership Program. So all these things have been done, and well, the pilot holistic review was submitted as well. I did mention that, but I wanted to emphasize it. As well -- sorry. Now we are moving to items five through nine that are updates Q&A. Here, we have a little delay on the written updates, but they will come soon. In any case, we always have the mailing list if we have any comments, so no worries about that.

Regarding updates on ECA, CSC and CSC review team, we have an item regarding the CSC review on the agenda. As I told you, there is another business regarding our CSC appointee. Moving along on the working group updates, as I told you, we will look forward to any comments by the mailing list. Any updates that are necessary to be mentioned now on updates on ccPDPs?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Alejandra, with regards to PDP3 and the review mechanism, I believe we're ready to ship it out for public comment. I leave it up to Bart to figure out the mechanics. I think we got, as you saw distributed earlier, the initial, well, basically, the final document, there's one appendix I think that needs to be filled in, but other than that, with regards, if I may at this point mention with regards to the retirement process, which was approved by the board as you well know, I talked to Kim Davies today and PTI IANA is actively at work looking at their procedures and adjusting your procedures to incorporate the work of the retirement group. So I'm happy to hear that.

I was wondering if that was going to have to hold off to the next fiscal year, but it does not. So that's where we are on that. Bart, if you have any comments on the mechanics of getting the review mechanism out for public comment, feel free. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Not really. I expect hopefully post to week after Thanksgiving that it will be published for public comments.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Excellent. Thank you, sir.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, thank you both. Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you, Alejandra, and hello everyone. I mentioned that SOPC has submitted comments regarding IANA and PTI draft operating plans and budgets for 2024, and in general, we are fine with the proposed plans, and our concerns are only regarding the scheduling, the implementation of the ccNSO PDPs, and regarding the personal costs. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Irina. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe just quickly for on PDP4. That working group or any subgroups have been making considerable progress I would say since the Kuala Lumpur meeting. They have now adopted the-- so the full working group adopted the recommendations with respect to variant management. So that's included in the overall policy. That was a major gap. They've nearly completed the basic discussion around the use of the review mechanism, which will go out for public comment shortly.

In principle, they will refer to the review mechanism for IFO decisions when a IDN ccTLD string needs to be deselected. There will be, however, a special review mechanism around confusing similarity, which is now already embedded in the Fast Track Process, which is called the Extended Process Similarity Review [EPSRP]... something. I know I made it up years ago and I forgot about it. That will be a special review mechanism under the review mechanism under that policy.

So they've completed the second reading of the basic review mechanism, so there's still some details, and they will also respond to the questions from council. The final point is the confusing similarity group. We'll meet Tuesday, so that's next week, again for a second reading on basic text, and hopefully, and the next week, the 29th, that group together with the full working group, and that's why I'm raising this. You are kindly invited, of course, we'll have a meeting with the GNSO EPDP group specifically around confusing similarity to discuss and coordinate.

In the past, they were tasked to coordinate with the GNSO EPDP, which is part of their charter of the full working group at the request of the board, and I think, Ai Chin, I'm looking at you and other members of the council. I think that coordination is going fairly well, both with respect to the variant management and confusing similarities. So to major topics under the PDP. That's all for the update. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Bart. Steven, it's good to hear that there's a lot of work going on and a lot of progress being made, so thank you for that. Are there any questions or comments regarding these updates? I don't see any hands, so I will continue with item eight. It's update from liaisons. These are written updates, so they will arrive to the inbox. Now I'll go to item nine, which is update from chair, vice chairs, counselors within our organizations, and secretary. Does anyone have an item here? Okay, I believe here is where I will ask Kim to tell us about the planning call for item 76, if that is correct, or if I should wait for item 19.

KIM CARLSON: Hi, Alejandra. I think maybe we can wait till item 19.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay.

KIM CARLSON: If that's okay.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, no problem.

KIM CARLSON: Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, let's move forward then. Okay, now we enter administrative matters for discussion and/or decisions during the meeting. So we are ready with your buttons to vote in favor or abstain or object to the following items. So we have in item 10, the adoption of the 2023 election report ccNSO council. Joke circulated the report with us, and I will ask her if there are any issues. Joke.

JOKE BRAKEN: Hi Alejandra. Hello, everyone. No, the report was indeed circulated, but there are no issues that stood out in the report. There's a number

of minor observations included in the report, but no concerns. There were no elections either for the ccNSO council election procedure since there was only one valid candidate that accepted as her nomination per region. So therefore, there have been no elections for the ccNSO council for the next round. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Joke. Any questions regarding this topic? Okay, I don't see any hands, so may I have a mover? Pablo maybe. May I have a second there? Okay. Thank you.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Can you hear me?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I see you in the cameras. Yes, Pablo. You were saying?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Can you hear me?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Finally. Woohoo. It's fixed.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Different computer.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, so recapping. So Pablo moves and Demi seconds, and we have a decision, the ccNSO council adopts the council election report as proposed, which closes the 2023 council election process. The council thanks Joke Braken for her work as election process manager and congratulates Molehe, Ai Chin, Chris, Alejandra and Steven with their election. This decision becomes effective upon publication.

Any question regarding this resolution? I see none. So now, for the voting, I will ask you to use your reaction buttons for green ticks if you approve and the red X if you abstain or object. So please use them now. Okay, I see all green ticks. For good measure, is anyone abstaining or objecting? None. So this has been approved. Thank you very much. Now you may lower your green ticks. Regarding this, I would additionally add a to-do here to ask the secretary to set up an onboarding call with our new councilor, Molehe, in January, please.

Okay, moving along, we have item 11, and it's the adoption of ccNSO comments in initial report of the second CSC effectiveness review. As you remember, we discussed and adopt these comments in the latest calls, and we circulated with the membership to see, because this is a joint statement, and there were no comments, no objections on this statement from the members. Do we have any questions regarding this topic? I don't see any. May I have a mover?

OLGA CAVALLI: [00:15:56 - inaudible].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Olga. And second, there? Irina?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll move.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. I said Irina. Sorry. Need to be faster, Stephen, for the next one.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No problem.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So Olga moves, Irina seconds. Thank you very much. We have a decision here, in accordance with the guidelines, ccNSO statements, the ccNSO council adopts the final statement that was sent to council for adoption. The council thanks Irina Danelia and Molehe Wesi for their work on the statement, and of course, the chair to submit as ccNSO statement adopted by the members and council. This decision becomes effective immediately upon publication. Any questions regarding this decision?

IRINA DANELIA: My surname needs to be corrected, please.

BART BOSWINKEL: I wanted to raise this, Irina. I apologize.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sorry. It's Danelia, not Daniela. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: The letters are correct.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Just a little bit of dyslexia there. We will correct this. Okay. If no questions, then we can proceed to the vote. So please use your green ticks if you approve or your red crosses if you either abstain or object. Okay. I see lots of green sticks. Thank you very much. I will ask if there's anyone abstaining or objecting, just in case. I hear none. So this has been approved. Thank you very much again to Irina and Molehe. Let's move forward. Now we are on item 12, update and follow up on the development of the ccNSO and the UA roadmap.

As you recall, we discuss a little bit of this in our previous call, and it is my understanding that the other group has met to discuss the next steps. Does any of those members would like to speak to the next steps or part? Yes, Ai Chin.

AI CHIN LU: Okay. I think for this issue, I can update a little bit.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, please.

AI CHIN LU:

I think the ad hoc team has been Jenifer, Jiankang, Pablo and myself. Of course, we also have Bart, Kim and Joke as the secretary helping with many things. We had our first meeting on second November to discuss the report of the discussion from the ICANN75 session on the role of the ccNSO and the UA, and the report has also previously been shared with the council, and the small team approved the report at the meeting.

As the next step, we plan to hold a workshop at the December council meeting to discuss the possible impact and the implementation effort of the various suggestion from ICANN75 sessions, and to further determined the value to the community. Based on the workshop's outcome, the small team will prepare a draft roadmap for consideration by the council. If the council agrees, the draft roadmap will be presented to the community at ICANN76 and adopted at the ICANN76 ccNSO council meeting. Yes, that's all my update.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Ai Chin. Any questions or comments? Okay, if not, then let's already take into consideration that the next council call will include this workshop. So please look at your schedules as well. So moving along now, we have item 13, it's updates on the ccNSO internal procedures regarding the updated procedures for ccNSO appointees, the guideline on ccNSO nomination process, and ICANN board seats 11 and 12, the guideline on ccNSO account elections, and the update of the guideline regarding ccNSO SOI and COI. So the GRC has been very busy

with this, and let me just check on the call if-- I don't know if Sean would like to tell us a little bit on this or I can give a brief summary.

SEAN COPELAND: Okay, I'll see what I can do for you here.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND: Yes, no worries. Going backwards, the SOI COI is coming forward nicely. I'm happy with the progress, I'm happy with the feedback that we've been getting, and I'm really happy with the work that the GRC has done on that. In terms of the nomination process ICANN board seats 11 and 12, we are going to be addressing that actually, or working on that on Mondays coming into our agenda, as is the council election. So it's moving along is what I'm trying to express to you guys. We have been very busy and we are updating and modernizing things, I believe. I do believe that we have the support of the community, and I appreciate the continued support of the council on all of this stuff. That's my comment.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Sean. So, as you see, GRC is very busy, they are doing a great job. Soon we will need to make a decision probably online regarding the two guidelines that have been updated. If you remember, they needed to be updated regarding the change of Article 10 to include

IDN ccTLD's into the ccNSO . So, I want to know if any of you have any questions now regarding these guidelines or anything that you would like the GRC to know now? Yes, Patricio.

PATRICIO POBLETE:

Hello, everyone. I was meaning to send a short comment, and I realized that the window for that closed yesterday. So, I'm really ashamed that I didn't take notice of that in due time, but anyhow, you may feel free to ignore what I'm just going to say then. In the call for candidates for, well, for obvious reasons, I've been paying a little more attention than usual to the election for CD11. So in the call for candidates, it says that the call for candidates must include a closing date, which will be at least two weeks after the call. That's perfect.

In practice, if you look at the emails that are sent, there is also an opening date, which is not mentioned in the guidelines. It seems to me that at least in one case a nomination that was submitted before the opening date was not considered, was discarded because it was before the opening date. So if that's going to be done, it should be based on something mentioned explicitly in the guidelines. So that was my comment.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Well, thank you, Patricio. I think it can be taken into consideration. Sean just said in the chat that he will take notice of what you said. So thank you very much, Patricio. You may lower your hand unless you want to say something else. Okay. Thank you so much.

Okay. One last thing is that, it is my understanding as well that if you remember that we consulted regarding the Article 0.8 on the NomCom, and we received a response from [00:25:24 - inaudible] legal, and this has been shared with the GRC, and they have been updating the corresponding guidelines to reflect this as well. So just to make this final comment that the GRC is working on this. Okay. Moving along, we have item 14. Yes, I see Bart has his hand up.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes, maybe one more point, I don't know, Sean, if you want to talk to it, but say the GRC will start the discussion on, and this goes back to the point Stephen raised, implementation of policies. So clearly the ccNSO is responsible for developing policies; however, after the board has approved a policy, it will go into retirement.

Although there is no real role defined for the ccNSO with respect to implementation, it might be useful to at least set expectations together with ICANN Org and try to define a role and points of interaction, so that there are no surprises if at one point ICANN Org or whomever is responsible for implementation gets back to the ccNSO and say, okay, what did you mean with this, and how should this work, et cetera. So that work will be starting and kicked off at the upcoming GRC meeting if I'm correct. Maybe Sean, you want to speak to this as well?

SEAN COPELAND:

Yes, thanks, Bart. Actually, I'm very excited about this because we are going to have people that are "outside" the ccNSO, but within the community coming and talking to us, and it's sort of in my mind

anyways, the first tentative steps to where I'm hoping the GRC ends up. It's going to be a learning process for us, and I believe that we can't work in isolation when we're looking at this, so having advice coming from other areas, I think is going to be incredibly beneficial to us. So, knocking on that it works.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I'm sure it will. Yes, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe one additional point, and I don't know of whom of you might be interested, and still it's open for discussion by the GRC whether this, again, will follow the structure of a subgroup. If you are interested, then please respond to the call for volunteers. Otherwise, if you're interested, just join the call either as an observer, et cetera, just give us a hint and we'll ensure that you get the invite. It starts upcoming Monday with an introduction on how the GNSO and ICANN Org are, yes, organizing their work. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. So please, if you're interested in taking part of this conversation, you know what to do. Okay. Moving along. Now we are going to item 14, and this is update charter stems of preference. We will start with Amended charter MPC for Council consideration. So recently the MPC review, its charter, and if Joke would do me the favor to explain to us its main changes of the guidelines, I would really appreciate it.

JOKE BRAKEN:

Hi, Alejandra. Hello. Yes, happy to do so. So the MPC revised its charter, and what I did basically was to make sure that the purpose and the scope of the MPC indeed reflects reality. So not only the what, but also the how is has been adjusted. Also, the MPC charter overall has been streamlined with charters of other committees and working groups to make sure that we use similar procedures, similar language for those parts that the various ccNSO working groups and committees have in part in common. One new practice, for instance, that has been introduced is the annual check of current members whether they wish to continue to serve on the committee or not. That was previously not included yet in the charter, and those changes have been made. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Joke. Do we have any questions regarding this topic? I see none. So now I will ask for a mover. I see Chris's hand up. And seconder? Irina was first, Pablo, sorry, it should be you. Next time. So Chris moves, Irina seconds. Thank you very much. We have a decision, and the decision is, the ccNSO council adopts the amended charter of the ccNSO meeting program committee as proposed. The secretary is requested to inform the MPC accordingly and post the amended charter.

This decision becomes effective upon publication of the decision. So any questions regarding the decision? I see no questions. So now we can go to the voting. So please use your green if you're in favor, or your

red crosses if you abstain or object. Okay, I see only green ticks. Thank you very much. Is anyone abstaining or objecting just in case. I see no hands, so this has been approved. Thank you very much. Now we go to the next one. It's the terms of reference for the review of the effectiveness of the OISC, it's the Outreach and Involvement Standing Committee.

If you remember in our last call, we decided to review the terms of reference of this committee. It was PG, Pablo, and myself that volunteered, and we agreed to organize the review in a similar way as the CSC review, which means that we will use the terms of reference to check whether this committee meets the stated objective and it stacks. Also, we are suggesting that the current members of the OISC should not be involved in the review. So it can be a more objective review. So the draft template was circulated to you, and now I will ask if there are any questions regarding this topic. Yes, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Maybe it was mentioned at previous call and I just forgot, but I wonder what is the reason to make this review and what is the reason to make it right now?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, the reason for making --

IRINA DANELIA: Is there any specific reason?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, this charter or this standing committee has been a little bit dormant, and we have it there in the background. So the question arose as in should we keep this committee still or not? So that was the main reason, but to determine whether it should continue or not, then that's why we are proposing to review it. But as in, does it need to happen right now? Why not. It's not that difficult to do, but yes, that's the main reason. Yes, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: In addition to Irina's point. So what also has happened in the past, maybe you recall there was something called the Travel funding Committee, and I believe one or two other committees, which all have been incorporated in the OISC. So it is also a question whether, say if you close the OISC, what are you going to do with the travel funding aspect and the other two tasks that will continue. So it's not just a matter of closing the committee and say why it was created can stop. So you need to really ensure that some of it activities continue. For example, the travel funding, which is important for everybody on this call, at least. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. Any other questions or comments? Okay, I see none. So may I have a mover? I see Pablo. Very well. May I have a seconder? I see Ali. Thank you very much, Ali. So we have a decision. It's the ccNSO council adopted the proposed template for review of the ccNSO outreach and involvement standing committee.

The secretary is requested to seek volunteers from council to review the committee, excluding current participants. This decision becomes effective upon publication. Any questions regarding this resolution? I see none. So now let's go to the vote. So please use your green ticks in Zoom or your red Xs if you object or abstain. Okay, thank you very much. I see only green tick. Does anyone abstain or object? Okay, I see none. So this has been approved. Thank you very much.

Next one. It's Appointments to Working Groups and Committees. In this case, we have the selection candidate for Root Zone Evolution Review committee. This one, it's quite easy since Peter Koch was the appointed member, and he's the only candidate now, so I think it's self-explanatory, this item, but still, are there any questions regarding this topic? Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

It's not really a question, it's an observation. I talked to Peter today, and he suggests that we start looking soon for someone to groom to be in a position or groom several people really to be in a position to succeed him, because he's term is limited out apparently on this last go around, and it's a rather unique skill set. So we need to start thinking about that soonest rather than later. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Stephen. I think that's a great idea. It would be good if anyone has any recommendations, some people we could approach, and then of course we would need to ask Peter to mentor these potential candidates. That would be a great idea. Yes, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Alejandra, that's right. A good starting point would be to ask Peter to give us a skill set. What does he think required baseline skill set is that he can then work with to develop into somebody who could take over. So we should ask him to provide us with that. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you, Chris. So if we could add this as to-do to ask Peter of this list of skill sets so we can help in this task to find a potential future of people for these position. Yes, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thinking about it, and I really like the approach, so whatever, it really doesn't matter whether I like or not, but may I advise that you look at it say, not on this call, because I think RZERC is the first one, but this approach might be useful for all the external committees. So this is something to discuss say in a more broader context, either now or maybe at the workshop in Cancun where you talk about roles and responsibilities around this. So get this, prepare, identify the various groups and then come up with a plan on how to groom people. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you very much, Bart. I think that's an excellent idea, and of course, all these appointments have written skill sets that are required from us, but what I would emphasize on asking the people who are already appointed is any additional thing that they think it's maybe

not mentioned there, and that they notice that it is very helpful for these positions. Yes. Chris, I see your hand.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

You're right, but there's a difference. The skillset part is what you would expect somebody to have when they take over. What I'm talking about is what is the minimum skillset that Peter feels he can work with over the next year or two years to bring somebody up to speed to be the full skillset? So it's about what do you think is the minimum? Does it need to be a techie? What should be the bare level of expertise? Then that way you've got a starting point for the mentorship to work rather than simply looking for somebody with the requisite skills on day one.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thanks. Okay, thank you, Chris. Noted. Any other questions or comments regarding this topic? If not, then -- yes, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

I had the opportunity in Kuala Lumpur to watch some of the meetings that dealt with the administrative part related to making the decision regarding whether the root server operators should adopt a particular set of rules, guidelines that ICANN was presenting to them, and in addition to that, what it involved to accept a certain amount of money and funding from ICANN, and so on. For that, I noticed that you do not require to be a techie, just like Chris was asking.

I do agree with Chris that there is a minimum skillset that you can have to handle certain tasks related to this. So it seems to me that it should

not be one person only, it should be a number of people that can delve in with different areas of expertise that are required within these groups. Yes, those interested, myself included, would develop whatever skills we have and employ those skills and obtain new ones if necessary, and so on, along with Peter's help. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. Yes, sometimes it's restricted the amount of people we can appoint, but I see your point overall. Do you have anything else or may I request for you to lower your hand? Okay, thank you very much, Pablo. We now need to move on. So may I have a mover?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I move.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. May I have a seconder? I see Pablo; waive your hand. Okay, thank you very much. We have a decision here. The ccNSO council appoints Peter Koch as member of the Root Zone Evaluation Review Committee for a term of three years. The secretary is requested to inform ICANN and Peter accordingly. This decision becomes effective upon publication. Any questions regarding the resolution? I hear none.

So please, may I ask you to vote green ticks in favor, red if you abstain or object. Okay, I see only green ticks. I will still ask, does anyone abstain or object? Hearing none. So this has been approved. Thank you all. You may lower your green ticks.

Now where was I here? So now we are moving to item 16. It's Progress Board Seat 11 Nominations. Please, Joke, can you tell us a bit about the current status?

JOKE BRAKEN:

Thanks, Alejandra. Happy to do so. So the elections have started on the 8th of November. There are elections, even though there is currently only one candidate, which is Patricio Poblete for board seat 11. The voting closes on the 29th of November. There are no quo requirements as per the applicable guideline, and to date 72 ballots have been counted. So there are 101 voters that have not voted yet. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Joke. With this, it's important to note that afterwards, the council will need to adopt the nomination process report and inform the ECA of the nomination later. Okay. Moving along, now we're going to item 17. It's the update of the ccNSO --

BART BOSWINKEL:

Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Nick has his hand up.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sorry, Nick, I didn't see it.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: No, don't worry. On the election, obviously there's only one candidate, so can you remind me why we're having an election, and is it a secret vote? I know it is a secret vote answer. I didn't get the voting paper from [00:46:03 - inaudible], but I understand that we have obviously voted, but why are we going -- is there a sort of reopen nominations option? I can't remember now how it was left. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, yes, the options are either to vote for the candidate or to none of the above. This was reviewed by the GRC at the request of many members that wanted to have this option. As in, even if it's only one, to either double-check with the membership if they agree with this only candidate, that is the reason. Regarding if the vote is secret, I believe so. Joke can say more on this.

JOKE BRAKEN: Yes, Alejandra, the voting is indeed secret in that sense that it's only identifiable by the ballot number but not by the name or affiliation or email address or anything related to the ccTLD Manager. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Okay, perfect. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, so moving now to item 17. It's the update on the ccNSO website redesign. For this, I will ask Nick to please update the council regarding this.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Ah, thank you very much, Alejandra. Yes, good evening, everybody from wet, rainy Oxford. So there's been a bit of a saga around the website redesign. It's kind of stop start, and we had a delay I guess for almost a year, I would say, while other priorities were worked on by the IPT team at the ICANN Org side of things. I can't even remember what the acronym stands for now, but it's basically the IT implementation, and it's the information transfer initiative or some such thing, which is now called the Information Transfer Project.

We had a meeting, must be nearly a month ago now, two or three weeks, with Mike, who is the project manager for the ccNSO new website project. First of all, I think we were all pretty reassured that finally somebody has been assigned to property project managers. However, to set expectations, we were told they are currently still doing some other stuff, but the ccNSO website is the next project which is coming down the track.

So my take homes, we had a small group, we had a little catch up call actually this afternoon, which is very helpful and timely for this call. So

we didn't have any homework to go away with, but we'd previously created a Google doc of the asks of the new website. I think we are going to be asking for the full council's input in the next months about what actually the new website needs to have.

We have another call on the 7th of December with the IPT team, and just so that people are aware and the thoughts can start to, I guess, percolate and you start thinking about these questions. There's a number of decisions which are going to be made in terms of the phase one of a lift and shift, as it were, of the existing website and content onto a new content platform.

So if you saw earlier this week, there was an announcement about the board section of the ICANN website, and this is now the new functionality, which has a much improved layout, and it's a much more, I guess, intuitive experience. There's a proper search facility which works pretty well. So the things which we are going to be looking at if we get into the detailed design and implementation of the new website will be things such as the content management system and maintenance, and to what extent, because at the moment with our current website, it's quite an old set of content management. It requires a technical ticket to be raised with ICANN before any changes can be made.

So to what extent can we be a bit more independent in terms of putting content on and changing the website on our own? So in terms of content management, how much maintenance is going to be required. The other interesting points would be around, well, would we have a members-only section? So for say some of the TLD ops type things,

which we might not want, it's not super top secret, but we don't want it available on the public facing website where there might be a login members only website section, because that functionality is something that we would need to get within scope. I guess my final point is that this is probably a one-off opportunity to get the website that we want.

We can't start with a, oh, well, let's duplicate the current website and see how we get on, and then ask for more changes later on, that's not going to be possible. This is a -time get the full scope right and get it done properly, and then we will be set off and we probably won't be able to make any more fundamental changes for a number of years. So it's really important that we get the scoping of this right. I don't know if anyone else from the group thinks I've missed anything out, but otherwise I think I'll move on from that unless there's any questions.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Nick. I think you gave a very good summary, but I will ask anyone else if they have any comments or questions regarding this. If not, I think it's better to move on because we are seven minutes up starting the workshop. Oh, Jiankang.

JIANKANG YAO: Maybe just some comments or suggestions, because according to my peers, if we have a new website or something, then we'll miss some other stuff. So, my suggestion is to include the older material in the other website. So the second suggestion, we don't need any new technology. So newest technology, maybe some browsers cannot support the new technology, so they cannot visit this new website.

So, this new website can easily access by most versions of browsers. So it will be easy for them to access. So sometimes, a few years ago, ICANN renewed website. Some other browsers cannot access some materials. So I think ccNSO website should be accessed most of the versions or browsers because ccNSO is a bigger family, includes all the ccTLD from all over the world. That's my suggestion. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN SMITH:

Thank you. I think those points are very well made, and certainly there's a full intention to carry over all of the current website, including all of the archives of the ccNSO activity. So that's for sure part of the scope and specification for the new website. Secondly, I think you make a very good point about the user acceptance, the usability of it, and I hope for sure ICANN has spent a lot of money and the expert resources in putting this into place. They obviously have been making a big initiative, UA is a big topic of discussion.

I would be extremely disappointed if there were deficiencies in compatibility with browsers and IDN scripts and all the other sorts of things. That seems to me absolutely critical, and I'd be very disappointed if that was one of the outcome. Thanks for making sure that we make sure that that's included within the scope and specification of the work.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay. Thank you very much Jiankang and Nick, so we will carry your suggestions over. Thank you. Now we are moving to item 18. It's the Peer review (NomCom) Council members. So the NomCom has

suggested that we do a peer review of the NomCom appointees, and it raises a few interesting questions, as in, should we do a similar review of the members appointed, as in the one selected by the membership? When should that happen? Should we in general, as councilors review the performance of her peers? Yes, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Alejandra, I'm slightly confused. Is it right to say that it was a recommendation of the nominating, sorry, of the review into the nominating committee that appointees from the nominating committee, be they on the board or on the ccNSO or whatever, should be reviewed and that information provided to the nominating committee? Is that what we're discussing?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Yes, that is what we are discussing, and then I open it up and to seek if we should open this review to all members of the council and not just in NomCom.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Well, maybe, but certainly in respect to the nominating committee where it's a closed group, it's not an election process. There's no opportunity for the council, for the members to interview anybody. It's simply so and so is appointed by the nominating committee to the council, so and so is then not renominating themselves or is renominated by somebody else, and the nominating committee makes a decision.

I can tell you that it's very difficult for the nominating committee to assess the [00:57:16 - inaudible] input and service of their nominees three years ago, unless there is some sort of input from the body to whom they have been appointed. So my view is that it makes no sense to me that we would have a situation where someone would renominate, but there would be no ability for the ccNSO council to say, confidentially, this is our input. So I think, to me, this makes perfect sense. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Chris. Anyone else? I see Tatiana in the chat stating that she thinks the review is a good idea, and Olga agrees. Good idea. Anybody else? I also agree because this is important information, and I believe that this was informally discussed among counselors like while back ago. So it's good that this has taken place now, and definitely we need to consider how to do this.

Just to let that there will be a meeting between BG, Jordan, and myself, and the NomCom to discuss the skillsets for councilors that they appoint to the ccNSO and maybe there we can also ask how to contribute to this review. As in, is it us who need to come up with the questions or answers? Is it the joint effort? Will they tell us how to do it? I think this is something that we need to discuss with them. Any other comments regarding these?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

My hands are up again.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Ah, sorry. Yes, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, problem. Look, you can discuss it with the Nominating Committee, but remember that the Nominating Committee turnover is fairly rapid, and that you'll be talking to different people, different leadership people every year. I think if this recommendation is something that is going to proceed, in other words, the ccNSO, the GNSO, the board, et cetera, will have an ability to provide input to the relevant nominator committee when a Nominating Committee appointee reapplies.

I think it's for us to decide how we want to do this. And it's a delicate thing. You don't want a situation where you find -- there needs to be an agreement. So then I would argue there needs to be a small group of Councilors who are on a regular basis, meet and discuss it. So what I'm going to suggest is that I don't know if we have an existing committee that currently that dealing with how to do this fits with it.

And if we do, we should give it to that small committee to figure out how we should do this going forward. And if we don't, we should set up an ad hoc group of people to sit to work out how we can do it without breaching the delicate balance of providing feedback on the one hand, but not insulting people on the other hand. And so it's a difficult and challenging thing, but I think it has to be done. And it's really important that it's done properly. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just first of all, time check because we do have other people joining. But secondly is, may I suggest that Chris and maybe one or two others on this call, including one NomCom appointee sit down and check and come up with a proposal for the next meeting. So that's the December meeting, how you want to conduct this. And so there is a clear support for having the review, but we need to find a way of how to do it properly. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you very much, Bart. I see Olga is volunteering as well. So let's do it like this. And, yes, time check. We are going a little bit over the time of the workshop. So in that case, I will try to move faster with the following items. We have item 19, ICANN76. So here, it's just to let you know that the main things that have been going on regarding the ccNSO on its 20th anniversary. The plan is to have a yearlong celebration starting in Cancun, then a formal set up in Washington and a closure in Hamburg. And for the small standing committee of Councilors, we have Jennifer, Katrina as former chair, Ali, Pablo, Ai Chin, Olga, myself, and the people from .MX. So, soon, we will tell you more about the upcoming planning.

And moving to the joint meetings, we are looking with the liaison to seek for if there is a need and an agenda to be had with this GNSO, ALAG and GAC. And a question here that I would like to refer to online discussion is whether we should have a full Board meeting in Cancun or

only ccTLD related Board members. And the other question is, should we do a more standardized procedure since what we have done is that for the first meeting of the year, we usually have a related ccTLD Board members only.

In the forum or the second meeting of the year, we don't meet with the Board or the numbers. And at the last one, it's the AGM. We usually have a full Board meeting. So I will write this in an email and send it to you as in should we ask every time we have a meeting whether what should we do or shall we have a standard plan already? And if there is a need to change it, then we change it. But otherwise, we can always move forward.

And lastly, it's the AOB, and I told you that we have Brett Carr. Brett Carr's email saying that he's changing jobs and we need to discuss if there is a need to take a decision at least regarding his appointment to the CSC and to reach out to the chairs of the working groups and committees where he's at. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you. I actually have another AOB item, which is real quick, but to address your concern, I would encourage Council to keep the status quo with regret to Brad. I talked to him again today. So if we can do that, I think it would be best. Thank you. But please come back to me because I have a quick AOB item myself.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, will do. So again, these questions, since we are running out of time, will be sent to the mailing list, so we can have an online discussion there. And I agree with you, Stephen, there is actually no need to disrupt what's going on right now, but the discussion is open. So we need to come together to that and see what we should do. So your other business, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: My other business is, as you know, some of you know, at least I've been here at Brussels at the DNS symposium. And there is an incredibly interesting presentation by Ken Renard regarding RSSAC and where they're at. And I would just like to encourage that we, not at this meeting, but at the next meeting, obviously, because I think the meeting committee has probably got this meeting, the Cancun meeting, booked. But at the next meeting, get RSSAC in to present to the community, to the ccNSO community an abbreviated version of what I saw yesterday. I think it'd be very illuminating. And after all, at the end of the day, these guys allow us to do what we do. And I think it'd be very educational. And I just want to put that out there. So thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you, Stephen. We will pass your proposal maybe to NTC to consider it. And with this, our last item is next Council meetings. As you know, December meeting will be also two hours to allow for the workshop that we already mentioned. And that's it for today. So thank you very much. The meeting is adjourned. But don't go anywhere

because we need to start the workshop as soon as possible. And for this, I'm handing it over to Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

Hello, everyone. Take your Council hats off and put your workshop hats on. We've got a workshop today for the next 52 minutes on the effectiveness and efficiency of the ccNSO policy development process. I have been told to volunteers to just briefly introduce it. This has come up in the wake of the process that we've gone through with the retirement PDP mainly and a few other recent PDPs. And we felt it was a timely moment to take a bit of a retrospective on how the PDP process is going on. And so the point of that is to simply have a bit of a structured reflection on what has worked well and what we would seek to do differently in future PDPs. So very standard, very low key retrospective, and to do that with some collective thinking and some individual thinking.

So the approach of this little workshop will be to break into groups. Just spend a little bit of time individually thinking about those two questions and then to share them around the small groups that you're in and then to report them back to the plenary. So the goal is to discern if we can in some ways to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the ccNSO policy development process, and just to give you a bit of context before we get into the small rooms, and we're going to look at some data points about the retirement PDP. So I think that's all I need to do in terms of intro. Bart, have I missed anything that you want to add?

BART BOSWINKEL:

No. Thanks. That was yep. So let me go straight into the data points so we got more time for the exercise. And we will collect all your input and report back to you and the broader community. So what you see in front of you is a latest version of the data points of the retirement process. And what is thinking of preparing, say, this overview I started looking and thinking about, okay, when did the discussion start? Because everybody focuses on the PDP as such.

But if you go back in time effectively and that's not even recorded, the first discussion about the retirement policy started, I think it was around 2007 with the retirement of, I believe, why you or even before when the Board took a decision to retire because there was another new ccTLD and Peter Dengate Thrush at the time raised the point, and he was not chair. That's a decision so he should develop a policy first. But the response at the time was, no, we go ahead, if the ccNSO feels like developing a policy, then they should start because of that was the reason why it was created.

So that was even before where I started my overview. It started from a ccNSO perspective with the creation of the delegation, redeligation working group in 2009 in Seoul. And one of the items they needed to address or discussed was the lack of a retirement policy. So that group produced a final report advising the Council to start developing a policy in this area.

But first, the framework of interpretation. Again, you see the overview and other events. So ultimately, this is led into the issue report which started, I believe, in the initial discussion was seven years ago, in December 2015, on the Council, resulting in March 2017. So that took

almost one point five year with the issue report. And with the issue report adopted, the PDP phase started. And again, you see a brief highlight how the PDP fared.

Now, what people consider the PDP probably actually happened between November 2017 and February 2020, when that working group after some fact finding, etc., really started to develop the policy. So in February 2020, a little bit later, so the scenario testing, etc. It resulted in May 2020 with the publication of the initial paper. And this is where you saw the policy as such, and this is when people started raising the point. Yeah, it takes so long to have this policy. And then afterwards, it moved along.

And you know, as already alluded to September 2021, the submission of the Board report, and then September 2022 was the adoption of the policy, and now we're into implementation phase. But this puts, I would say, the whole policy a little bit more in context, say the policy development itself is in the grand scheme of things doesn't take very long. It takes long, but the whole setting goes back to 2007, and we're still not there.

So looking at the working group itself, just a few data points, the meetings, 66 meetings in total. So that's the PDP phase of the working group, including six in-person meetings. So that was pre-pandemic. And so three after the pandemic. So that was 75 and 76. Members 25, in total, overtime 6 stepped down. Not all attended all the meetings. They had a rotation scheme. Participants, so that means people not directly related with a ccTLD, say for example, we had some observers

from the GNSO or people from the GNSO participating. 5 observers, 1 expert, and staff support for that was the usual team.

And there were several community updates, including to the GAC. So I believe the first one major one was in Kobe, when the initial findings of the group were shared with the community and feedback was sought. Montreal was an extensive session, and then we had meetings in The Hague and Kuala Lumpur. So that's the basic overview, I would say, and some data points of the policy itself. So back to you, Jordan. Or shall we just start the breakout session? Maybe here's first some questions around this overview comments.

JORDAN CARTER: I've got one question. What was the delay in the 2015-2017 about the issues report? Was it because we were busy with the transition and decided not to do it, or did something else happen?

BART BOSWINKEL: In the 2015-2017, why it took so long, the issue report?

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: It was, first of all, we had two drafting teams one working on the issues regarding retirement, the other one was drafting and looking at the review mechanism. And there was a discussion that really prolonged it

is whether the two part should be included in one PDP separate and then the order of handling things. So at the time, it was decided to put the main one. And so that's the reason.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL: So effectively, if you really look drill down, I think the drafting teams took about, they started in January until April or something. And then the discussions we had are more focused. They were geared around ICANN meetings because they need to consult the community.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Are there any other questions for that? I don't see any hands up. Do you want to just then run us through what we'll do next?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. I think that's easiest. Yep. So what we'll do will break up in four different groups. And each of you, so we'll have two minutes to reflect on the two questions. You can reflect on two questions. What worked well from your perspective? Even if you didn't participate, you saw the overview, you had a sense of the discussions, and what you think worked well, and what would you suggest we do differently next time? And you will see can you go to the next one, next Jamboard, please, Kim.

So this is what you will see in the four groups, is what worked well. We will put your remarks, your observations with a sticky note. First, a yellow one in one of these two columns. And we'll do it round Robin so everybody on the group can share one thought and we do this for 10 minutes. Then we'll revisit this again because experience has shown that in a second round, additional thinking and maybe additional more considered views will emerge and we'll use blue sticky notes to collect those and then the people who are in say, like, Alejandra and I believe I'm with somebody else on the team will report back on their major observations and what was discussed.

So staff will collect your observations on sticky notes and then the rapporteurs will report back at the end. And then it's Jordan's task to summarize everything and come up with ideas for the next task. Any questions around this process? So we'll do two rounds and then it will be you will have time to consider. You see a clock. I need to put a clock in there as well, and then we start. So Kim, can you do your magic and put us in rooms.

KIM CARLSON:

Just one moment, please. Sorry, Alejandra, looks like there are a few stragglers, but we can go ahead and get started in the two-minute self-reflection portion if you'd like.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay. So as you know, now everyone needs to--

JOKE BRAKEN: Apologies again for the interruption. Could it be that I have not been pushed yet to my room? This is Joke?

KIM CARLSON: I don't know how. I did just open the room for everybody. And plus you're a cohost, so you should be able to move to a room yourself.

JOKE BRAKEN: Okay. Let me give that a try. Thank you.

KIM CARLSON: Alejandra, would you like me to start the timer?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, please. So we have two minutes now to self-reflect in silence, and then we will share what we think about this. 10 more seconds. If you're writing, hurry up. And time. So we had our two minutes. So who would like to start? It won't be me.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Hey. I'm very happy to start.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

So, I mean, I did participate in the group so I think I'm quite well qualified to speak to it. Certainly, my first involvement with this, I remember was the Copenhagen meeting. And we did have a bit of a discussion about splitting of the PDP into the two groups in terms of the review mechanism and then the retirement. I think it was the right decision to deal with the retirement stuff first and separate it from the review mechanisms. But that process in itself took a bit of time. So I think the scoping, and what I'm trying to say is that this project in terms of policy process wasn't given to us. You know, here's a specific policy task go away and do it by this time, already quite complicated, and it needed a bit of simplification and thinking through.

So I suppose it's definitely worth setting it up correctly so that you begin efficiently. And I think once it was up and running, actually, it worked relatively well. I don't think I've got -- I mean, it could have been done. Yes, of course, we could have done it with more meetings quicker and every week instead of every two weeks. But it needed time. And I think the face-to-face meetings were where the real progress was made, actually, is one of my main take on.

I think we had quite a few sort of virtual meetings where not really very much happened. We were reading through the second readings, third readings. No real points of disagreement, and no real contention. So leave that to the one side. I would say the good things which worked very well as I think it was extremely collegial and everybody was very respectful. The professional behaviors were, I think, exemplary. You know, any points of dispute or conflicts were debated with courtesy, and I think that spoke very well to everybody who participated.

That said, I still think we've probably could've done it in about half the time. And I do think there's a really big risk in these projects when they last multi years. You know, people move on. We find it very difficult to get an engagement from the GAC. GAC reps don't tend to stay for the whole cycle of two to three years.

So if you're going to try and do with good community input and multi-community input, especially from stakeholders like GAC, they don't have a very long attention span. And they, frankly, don't have the patience or the time to do things over if look at the time frame of this whole project. I mean, people have died and retired, I mean since 2007 from the community involvement and that is something that I think speak to this work. I think it's very appropriate that we try and look at our efficiency.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, Nick. Just to get one thing clear, so you did say that it would be good to differently next time to set the scope better first. Right?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think once the PDP was started, there was quite a long time defining the PDP, if you see what I mean.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, okay. So that's the thing that needs improvement. And I'm sorry to cut you off, but we have six minutes and everyone else -- So thank you, Nick. So who goes next? If not, I'm calling you. So, Sean.

SEAN COPELAND: But somehow, I knew you're going to do that. Actually, building off of what Nick said, the clarity. I came in, like, when things started rolling along much faster. So when I look back, though, and when you see that sheet and how long it took, that's actually really surprising. And it's kind of unfortunate because I suppose the Councilor of the day gave, this is what we want to do. And I realized it was broad scope.

And then Eberhart made the comment two years to figure out how to divide things. I'm surprised that that wasn't done upfront, if you will, or that there was an understanding that this would happen. But maybe not. I mean, maybe it wasn't a surprise. So that really, that type of work needs to be done upfront, I think, and then since we'll speed up a whole lot better and also the face-to-face much better. When we were doing the face-to-face, a lot happened and Nick is right on that one as well. So the pandemic --

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So agreeing scoping better.

SEAN COPELAND: Scopes and clarity.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Scopes and clarity would be something to put in differently, right?

SEAN COPELAND: Needs improvement. It's something that we have to work on. We need to be able to communicate it much better. It may be a situation where the work group may be after a meeting or to come back and say this is too broad.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you, Sean. Now, Biyi.

BIYI OLADIPO: How did I know I was going to be the next one?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I don't know. To the point.

BIYI OLADIPO: Okay. I watched the process from afar. So I really wasn't in the middle of it like Sean and Nick were. However, from what I could see by could be done differently? So apart from that next time I think, the time it took was a bit too lengthy. So maybe we'll need to find the way of making the time better. I hope you can hear me.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Yes.

BIYI OLADIPO: Okay. So maybe we'll need to set it. If after I've been on the scope, we need to set a timeline from beginning to say we'll finish the process at

so, and so, and so time so we know that we have the clarity on when the process would end, rather than taking so long. I think that's about what I have for that, timing for PDPs to get done.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. And what worked well?

BIYI OLADIPO: I think the community engagement worked well for me, which in addition to all the other things that the other guys have said. The fact that --

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And you took that one from me because that's what I thought.

BIYI OLADIPO: Oh, I took that from you. Oh, I'm sorry.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No problem. No problem. So next --

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I just wanted to add. I think we've got to a really good policy. I think that should go on what worked well. The outcome actually was very good.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Kim, please add the outcome was good. Thank you. And now I will go to Bernard. Or Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTT: Oh, I thought I was going to get away with it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No way.

BERNARD TURCOTT: I'm just observing, really. Well, first of all, yes, we may complain it takes a little time, but, A, comparing to my work with other groups, CC people show up at the meetings. And a lot of them are very well prepared and participate.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: That worked well.

BERNARD TURCOTT: That worked well. I'm not saying it doesn't need improvement, but as we say in French, when you compare yourself sometimes you make yourself happier. And so in comparison to a lot of other groups, I think we get a lot of great participation. People show up at the meeting. The second thing on it takes a while. Maybe, but when we finish, we have actually gone through every objection possible and probable. And we actually rarely get questions that we hadn't discussed or answered

either during the policy development process or during the stress testing when we actually go to presenting this publicly.

So, overall, yes, there is always probably some room for improvement, but one should not forget that compared to a lot of other people, we do end up with some great results that when we publish them, I think the mark is, we don't really have a lot of changes to make, which is not case of other areas, not related to the ccNSO.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And what would you do differently?

BERNARD TURCOTT: Probably go back to some of the things that people were talking about, better definition and things like that so that you're tighter. The notion of things that are too wide causes the PDP groups to take longer to narrow things down into the work they want to do. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Bernie. So we run out of time, but now I'm guessing we need to do a second round. Right, Kim?

KIM CARLSON: Sorry. Yeah. So if you want to do the second round, so the way it's set up--

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: We're still missing Souleymane and myself.

KIM CARLSON: Yeah. So we can use that one minute for self-reflection. The next self-reflection, if you want to make sure that everybody gets heard at least the first round.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Let's do that. So Souleymane. Can you hear me, Souleymane? I think not. Maybe some connectivity issues. So I will be right to the point. I was also tied as Biyi was. So what I think worked really well, it's keeping the community informed. As Biyi said, as the community engagement, I think that was very good because people were aware of what was happening. But what I thought that could be improved on that side note is the clarity on the messages sent to the community. And this might come as well as the scope. Right?

Maybe trying to convey too much information in a short period of time that has been discussed for several months even in 30 minutes might not be the best scenario, but that's what I would say. There is the improvement part, as in, more clarity on what are the messages to the community and what you need from the community? Because sometimes it took a little while for people to like, put themselves again in that mindset. And that's it. That's from me. So before we go to a second round, if we have, if we want to, I would like to ask for a rapporteur. And it won't be me. So either use volunteer or I will choose. You want me to choose. Right?

NICK WENBAN SMITH: I'll happily volunteer. That's fine.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. Yes. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: I was scared you're going to choose me anyway. You are quite a bully.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, I was trying. I don't know what I was going to do if that had been the case. So we have eight minutes. And Kim, set the timer us. Is there anything else that you think we should add here as in something that you think it's missing?

SEAN COPELAND: When we say the outcome, I think we should also say that the printed document, and this goes back to what Bernard said that a lot of work had gone into it. The printed document set a bar. There's no question. It was very well done, very professional, and you would not really see that coming from. And I know we have staff, but from a volunteer organization.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Let's add that. Thank you. What else?

NICK WENBAN SMITH: The Board approval process seems to me could've been better. Is that fair?

SEAN COPELAND: I think it will be very fair.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It is fair. Though we know that they are aware of this.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Yeah, pretty much we gave them fully baked having been fully consulted on, and it still took them 18 months. Right? No. We felt like we dropped the stone and we didn't even hear it at the bottom of the well.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It was not 18 months. But, yes, it was a long time.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: It was more than a year, right?

BIYI OLADIPO: I was going to say before that approval process, but I'm not sure that is within our control. So when we talk about what to do differently next time, I don't know. Maybe engage, if we're going to talk about this, maybe engage more the ccNSO selected Board members to be more involved in the process so they could help speed up things with the Board.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: I think that's fair. I think that's fair, but I think that this process was so long that our Board elected members changed. They weren't the same people, so we could start reaping some people, but they weren't part of the Board, which actually ended up approving the policy at the end of the day. So I think maybe there's a lesson there is around more continuous engagement and communication and getting it clear upfront that this is coming and you should be getting an understanding on ourselves as to who's going to help get it over the line in terms of the Board. I think it's a two way responsibility, but the length of the process didn't lend itself to doing anything particularly quickly. But, yeah, it's a tricky one.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And if we think about it, that was not the lengthiest or what took most time. Right? So these process was quite hard to say.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: But I think it's well said, right? That the journey that takes the longest is the one that is not started. It took us a bit of time to even start it. I think once we got on and actually, I think we would relatively good because it's an even better, I think. But there was a massive delay between the identification of the need and the actually commencing the policy process.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thanks. Let's remember the Board communication issue, I think, is a good one. But in there, somewhere along the process, when they got the retirement policy, they went -- at least, this is my understanding. They went, oh, we need a subgroup to deal with ccNSO policy requests. And then because of the mechanics and everything else, it took a while just to get that part done so that they could process what we had given them for an application. I'm not saying this to excuse the Board. I'm just saying, let's remember the portions. Now why the heck this didn't get done beforehand, and they only figured it out once they got a policy from us. Who knows? They were quite busy as always with GNSO stuff.

And so when they get something from us, it's like, oh, yes, there's the ccNSO also. And so that was certainly part of it. I think there was another part of it that again in the communication side this whole issue with legal about what was to be excluded from the bylaws for the internal review mechanism. And that seemed to be unclear for a while. I think that got confused with starting up this Board subgroup to look at our policy proposal, and then there were some issues with legal.

So this whole maybe normal when you're starting a new group. But this whole communication issue between the CcNSO, the group that developed the policy, and the group that was looking at evaluating it for the Board seemed to me to be one of the issues that at least could have help speed things up quite a bit. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you, Bernie. And yes, but let's keep in mind, I agreed with Bernie on this blaze, but what could have we done differently as Biyi said, is something that we need to address. So maybe it should have we like, pushed more or asked legal to respond sooner. Something like that. But it's important to put it in the perspective of what we could have done better.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Well, I'll tell you what, we did have a bench charts from Bart at the beginning, I believe, which I think showed about an 18 month period. I don't know whether at that point we truly factored in the Board and I think, to my mind, a couple of unnecessary extra periods of public comment.

But the fact that the Board didn't have their own process, if we'd identified earlier on that the Board needed a process to go through in terms of setting up a committee to assess this and approve it. And that could have been done in parallel while we were actually doing the policy work. And then that would have saved, I think, at least six months of the approval process.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yeah, agree. Agree.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: It'll be very interesting now to look back at the original plan after how long this is going to take and compare it with how long it did actually take. I think we'd be embarrassed by the difference.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Definitely. Any additional comments in 24 seconds or less? Nick, do you have everything you need to report back?

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Yes. I think so. I will have this slide with the posters on to speak to. Right?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Yes.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Okay. Yeah, that's fine.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And our time is up, and I believe that people might be joining us soon. Right, Kim?

KIM CARLSON: Sorry. Yes. I've closed all the rooms. We've got a 30-minute warning, so they should be joining at any minute now.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Now the question is, will we let them in? No. Yes. We will. There they are. Welcome everyone.

KIM CARLSON: Alejandra, it looks like everyone is back.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Well, I will hand it over to Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Yeah. I'm on mute, but I'm not anymore. I think that our next job was to just go through and just get a quick report back from each of the groups. Is that right, Bart?

KIM CARLSON: Jordan, do you want to go to in order or reverse?

KIM CARLSON: I don't think it matters at all. So let's go from the top. The first one. Alejandra and Kim.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. So for us, Nick will do the reporting.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Well, hi, everybody, and thank you. Just group 1, I now discover. So, yeah, we had a very collegiate discussion a bit in the nature of the working group itself and the policy process. So I think on the positive side, hopefully, it's quite clear. But firstly, we felt that the spirit and

cooperation of the group was very respectful and positive, and that was very helpful. Once set up, the group actually weighed, that could have gone faster. That wasn't really the main blocker. There was a bit of time at the beginning of the setup, scoping out the terms of reference, separating it from the review mechanism. And that took a fair bit of time, I think.

Ultimately, it was quite a successful quality process. I think we felt in since the documents, the community engagements were good, they were thorough. It didn't turn out that we were pointed out of things we hadn't considered in the public comment period's amendment and then we had to go back and reconsider. And that was all done very well, and in that sense, it was pretty successful. We did some good engagement updates to the GAC, and I think the other communities [01:47:40 - inaudible] we need for these sorts of things that were brought in along the way. And that was very successful. And we had excellent staff support, I think, was also very important.

And you can see that we felt that actually probably, we wouldn't have made such good progress during the COVID years because face-to-face meetings were really important, but actually making this substantive breakthroughs. If you think to the ten years, five years, more than five year default, then not ten years, that was decided in the face-to-face meeting, which is I think the substantive policy change here.

So in terms of the differences there was a bit of confusion with legal, and the scoping, and starting of the project was, I think, probably the bulk of the delay. There were probably some meetings which were held virtually where not really much of difference was teased out. It

probably could have gone faster and quicker over it. I think we thought that compared with the original project plan that Bart presented in Copenhagen in 2017.

I think we'd embarrassed now with how long it actually did take. I think there was a bit of, I think Bart wouldn't mind me borrowing his description, there was a bit of unclarity as to the degree of different rounds of community inputs that we'd need once we thought that we'd had a community consultation and basically got their approval or hadn't had any violent objections.

And finally, the Board approval process. They needed to set up their own approval process for ccPDPs after the fact we'd presented it with them and perhaps had we been more alive to that issue, we would have asked them to have done that in parallel that they knew that this was coming down the tracks and that it would've been ready to be looked at by the Board and that would've probably saved at least minimum six months, maybe, maybe more, have they been ready and prepared to consider it properly once we've handed it over them, as we thought fully baked and ready for approval in two months.

JORDAN CARTER: Nick, can I give you just like a one-minute call? Because we're got get through all the groups.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: I'm done now.

JORDAN CARTER: You're done? Okay. Great. Thank you for that summary. I'm sure we move on to the next group. Group 2, whoever that is. That's our group. Bart is going to give a little report back on us.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. So again, a lot of areas for improvement. I think, what was interesting, again, in this case, people were building on the initial thoughts. And I think one of the most interesting observations I found at least was this reversal or the thought that say, the bulk of the work in the end was done intercessional on working group meetings. And the face-to-face meetings were used to find support. I think if you go back and look at where the real breakthroughs were made, they were at face-to-face meetings, with, say, when we had the kind of workshop three-hour workshop and then use the intercessional meetings to drill down and to solidify the thinking.

But again, I would say the suggestions go in all kinds of directions and they need to be clustered and then reported back and take into account for future reference. And another thing was, yeah, better guesstimating how long the process could do, be more realistic about it. I think that's all. So we didn't have a real discussion of the various suggestions. Jordan, anything I missed?

JORDAN CARTER: No. I think there was a little bit of a vibe there in the end, the output was quite good as well. But I would just said that lightly. And thanks, Bart. It's group 3, I forgot.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

Thank you. Thank you all. This is Pablo, and we're group three comprised of Tatiana, myself, and Joke. We also had a number of other, Nina, Olga, Dr. Lisse, [01:52:36 - inaudible]. We had on the left-hand side on what worked well. We had that it was completed. Webinars and workshops were insightful and helpful. Working methods, whiteboard it worked well, but it was sadly were missed during the pandemic. Good compromise and diverse membership. Good leadership teams and members. Members decided the timing, rotation on a rotational basis.

And a second time, after reflecting the second time on the blue notes, you can see that other ideas came up always two readings at least. So for those members that missed one time when they came back, the second time, were not lost or referred to the mailing list, but rather it was read again, there was a dictionary. In addition to that, volunteers have a day job. And staff support made proposals and the working group members review and refine. Leadership did a good job including motivating members.

On the right hand side on what would you do differently in the next time around? On the first reflection arise the following ideas. Delay in the approval of the issue report. Decisions to break into part 1 and part 2 took long. Calculate delays in future decision making. Not all members are actively participating. Comments during public comment, up to leadership to guide the members. Hard to follow for newcomers. Too much time lost on wording. All PDP working group should meet daily during ICANN meetings. Ensure the timing of meetings it is

convenient to all. Leave the wording up to ICANN staff. Dr. Lisse disagrees, this is up to ccTLDs.

After reflecting the second time around, many comments regarding meaningful participation, meaning that sometimes people just go and rather than participate, they're just spectators, and then they come up with other ideas at the time of making comments, timing of meetings, contributions during meetings, and during public comments. Leadership to liaison with members and encourage participation. And finally, time lost on technicalities, for example, conformity with other ICANN documents, for instance. And that's pretty much the extent of the comments that arise from our group.

JORDAN CARTER:

Great. Thanks, Pablo. We're coming up to the top of the hour. We might get through it. We might not. Group four is providing a summary.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY:

Thank you, Jordan. It's Allan here. We had similar comments of both the delays at the outset and the splitting of the two processes. So I'm not going to focus on those. Stephen and I were the only two people in our group that were actually members of the working group. And we both believe that it didn't take too long. It certainly took way longer than I thought it was going to, but when you asked us, what would you do differently to shorten it? We couldn't come up with any. Okay?

That being said, we could have benefited from more and early participation from the Board itself even for them to understand what we were doing rather than taking [01:56:36 - inaudible] at us for being slow. There is there is some changes you can do to process to shorten it up. Obviously, the duplication of public consultation slows everything down. But we really like the support we got, especially at the outset from the [01:56:56 - inaudible] and IANA that we thought we had after participation from ICANN. And you can always use more support, but Bart was marvelous. So I think I'll just leave it at that.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you, Alan. And in the interest of time, that's all the groups. Isn't it? There are no more. I'll just review of couple of very light themes that I saw. In the positives, what worked well, good engagement. Actual quality work output. People like the rotating times in the two readings process. Lots of compliments for staff support. And people saying that the actual policy development thing the actual policy development part of the process didn't actually take too long. Some of the themes I picked up for a different next time. A clearer process and plan. Sticking to time. More prep for Board decision making. Consider different uses for in-person and intercessional meetings and encourage meaningful participation throughout the process.

So that's a very brief summary. I think what we'll do in terms of next steps is do a bit more of analysis of all the comments that came up and see if we can distill that into a bit of a report for the next Council meeting. Thank you all for the participation. Who am I handing back to?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Alejandra.

JORDAN CARTER: Alejandra. Back to you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, thank you very much, Jordan. And thank you all for joining and participating. I think this was very enriching. And now, the triage will have something to go through, and we'll see you next time. Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]