ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. I'll welcome everyone to our Council meeting 191 on the 19th of January 2023 at 21:00 UTC. Welcome all guests as well. Happy new year. As we say, we will keep saying happy new year until February maybe.

Please, all councilors, remember to put ccNSO Council to your Zoom ID. That will help us very much with voting. As usual, let me share with all of you the wiki with all the documents that we'll be using in this meeting in the chat.

Kim, could you please let me know if we're a quorum?

KIM CARLSON: Hi, Alejandra. Yes, the call is quorum.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. With this, let's go to item number two, it's relevant correspondence. Today we just have the confirmation of the nomination of Patricio Poblete to the ICANN Board.

Moving along to item three, its minutes and action items. The minutes were just shared a few minutes ago. We have some issues with the transcript from the previous meeting, but now they are in your inboxes so please have a look at them. If there are any comments, please let us know.

Moving to the action items and to-dos. Most action items are completed. But as you can see in the bottom of the action items, some

previous action items that remain open from previous meetings were added. This is for us to remind ourselves that we are still pending on them, and some of them we'll touch upon them in this call. For example, one action item was the chair and/or secretariat to reach out to Peter Koch regarding mentorship and succession plan. But this is related to the following open action item that it's the Council to discuss the succession plan, and in a broader context around the roles and responsibilities, possibly in a workshop at ICANN76.

Then one more, for Stephen to reach out to the Tech Working Group regarding a possible presentation from our RSSAC to the cc community. This needs to be checked. We will discuss some of them today.

So with this, let's move right along to item four which is intermeeting decisions. We were going to have an online decision regarding the adoption of the Council 360 Review, but it was deferred until this meeting so we will deal with that today. So that's item 11 and we will address then.

With this, moving right along to updates. We have written updates already shared. I will move item by item, and if there is anything any of the liaisons would like to share, let me get to the item first. So in item five, we have update from ECA, CSC, and [TSC] Review Team. Any additional information that we need to know?

BART BOSWINKEL: Sean, I believe, yeah, there is no additional one. We're scheduling the first meeting this year and it's a bit hard. But then they will start working on assessing the public comments. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Bart. Now moving along with the updates from the working groups. Any other updates besides the ones in the written updates?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Alejandra, just to give everybody a quick update, the working group at ICANN76 for the Technical Working Group, which I'm the liaison for, is underway, no particular focus yet, getting proposals and topics. I'm sure it will come together as it always has. I remit. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Jordan, you have your hand up.

JORDAN CARTER: Hi, Alejandra. Sorry about the delay. I just lost connectivity, I think. Can you hear me?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, we can hear you.

JORDAN CARTER: Are we doing the workgroup's written update?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, exactly.

JORDAN CARTER:

Yeah. Sorry. There was a late update from the Triage Committee. So it wouldn't have been in the written version that was initially circulated. Just to fill in, we had done the review of the priorities for the Council on a regular quarterly basis, had a meeting earlier this week. And we're suggesting no change for the January, February, March quarter, which is still the two PDPs that are underway and the DNS abuse priority. But we think that from the start of April, there will be some changes to those priorities with more clarity about upcoming work and reviews and so on that we need to be involved with. So just segueing that no change recommendation again now, but there'll be changes coming in the next quarter. That's all.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Jordan, and looking forward to those changes. Moving along to item seven. Jordan, you still have your hand up and I'm believing it's an old one.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Alejandra, if we're into item seven, with regards to this PDP3 Review Mechanism, we've got less than a week to go. I think it's six days now. With comments, last I looked, we still only have three but I expect a flurry of comments right at the end, as per usual. I have scheduled a meeting of the working group for the 25th to take a preliminary look at community comments, and then ICANN staff will categorize and sort them out, figure all that out. So we should be in good shape at Cancún. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Stephen. Any other updates regarding ccPDPs besides the ones that are already in the written updates? Okay. I don't see any hands up.

Item eight is the update from the liaisons. We got them by e-mail.

Now we have item nine that is the update on the ccNSO website redesign. For this, I would like to tell you that the other working group has been working hard and discussing and reviewing the content of the website, as well as the initial taxonomy proposal that will be used to classify each current and future documents and webpages to make them searchable in an easy way. This taxonomy is a collection of attributes that describe a document and it will be evolving through time. So once that it's defined, it doesn't mean that it cannot be changed, it will. And we will be adding things as much as the website might be growing or evolving. After this first version of the taxonomies defined, the current content will start to be audited, and later the new website design process will come. We don't have a precise timeline, but those are the high-level steps that we will follow.

Nick, Stephen, or Pablo, would you like to say something else regarding the website process?

NICK WENBAN SMITH: The only thing I'd say is that I'm quite excited about the project. It's been a long time coming but my expectations are optimistic and I'm really looking forward to 21st century website.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. Regarding Nick's comments, I thought we had a really productive meeting yesterday. It's going to take a bit but we're going to get there, I think, in my lifetime, so that'll be nice.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I yield.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Okay. With this, I am moving now to item 10. It's update from chair, vice chairs, councilors, and regional organizations and secretariat. I have some updates to give you. We have a monthly SO/AC chairs call. And in the last one, Sally Costerton came to say hi, introduce herself as entering CEO of ICANN. We had a very nice conversation. It is important as well that I let you know that soon there will be also the one on one with her that Jordan, Biyi, and myself will have with her. This might be a really good opportunity to invite her to join one of our next Council meetings, maybe the one in February or the one in April, depending on how the agendas are evolving by then. Because I believe that she might be really busy catching up with all the work. Also, an opportunity to invite her to meet with the ccNSO members, either in Cancún or in Washington, again, whatever works best with the agendas or the impact such introduction may have.

Also, I wanted to let you know that we're working on the Achievement Report of last year. Soon it will be finalized and shared with the community.

Does anyone else have any other updates that they want to share? No? Okay, then moving along to item 11. Here we have the Council 360 Review Terms of Reference. This was discussed in our last Council call and we had some time to review it and we received some comments. I would like to ask Nick to tell us about his comments in the mailing list. Please, Nick.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Thanks, Alexandra. First, I want to make it clear that I completely agree with the principle of 360 degree reviews. But because I think it's important, there were a couple of things which I felt quite strongly about. I made some comments in the draft procedures. The first thing is that the Council I think has now 18 members. So to do a review for 18 people is quite a lot for everybody to do in theory, right? So I know that there was a two-week period for the review process to take place. So I think I argued that this period should be longer.

So I'm pleased that in the redline we now have an extra week. But I'm just saying, depending on the timing, everybody's phases of work are different. And if you have a week of vacation or the thing comes through in a bad time, then you might be doing this kind of in a hurry. So an extra week, I think, would be useful. I suppose from a personal perspective, when I've seen these exercises done before in the context of Board review of internal effectiveness and these sorts of things, it's

usually done over a longer period of time than what we're attempting to do. So that was my first point. I'm pleased that we've got some more time in procedure.

My second point was that—and it's partly my fault, I suppose, but it's also partly because of the pandemic. I had COVID for the Hague meetings, I didn't go to that one, and I couldn't go to the KL meeting. But the fact is I haven't been to an in-person Council meeting since Montreal in 2019. Speaking from my own perspective, I don't know people that well. So when I read that there's a quorum for the review to be effective, that you need to get N or something members of the Council to complete the reviews, I worry that I would find it difficult to complete reviews on all of the other Council members, particularly the people who I don't know because they're from a different geographic region or because they haven't been on the Council for very long. When I say not very long, I mean for two years since the COVID days. I just was worried that it would be difficult to meet the quorum and that I wouldn't want to feel that the members of the Council who are completing this review on other Council members, because quite a personal thing. I wouldn't want to feel pressured to have to complete a review and effectively kind of make up your assessments or references based on incomplete information. And I didn't want to have the pressure to meet a quorum by filling in reviews on people who I wasn't in a very good position to judge. Because if you look at the document, there's quite an extensive list of the types of things that they're asking you to assess. So I'm a little bit sensitive about that and I made a comment about it. I know that there's mechanisms for dealing with the review if the quorum isn't met initially, but I just wanted to put that

point of view across even if it wasn't thought by others to feel important. That was my point, basically.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Nick. Well, regarding the first one, having to evaluate the 18 councilors at once, I don't think that will be the case because we will evaluate each councilor one year after they took their seat and then at six months prior they're ending. So they are going to be staggered as all terms in the Council are, so I think we will be evaluating six councilors for a period at a point. So that's going to lighten up a little bit on the amount of evaluations that we have to do.

But regarding your point on not getting to be able to know all the councilors due to pandemic and all, I think it's still valid that you would put—I don't know what NA will mean for this particular—Not Available. You're not sure, you cannot assess.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Not Applicable.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Not Applicable. Thank you. I think that will be really helpful as a feedback as well because this is for improvement. It started off by trying to give tools for the NomCom to evaluate councilors that they have appointed and maybe that they would like to reappoint, but it extended and expanded to the rest of the Council as well to help us improve in what we're doing, in what we're working. So even to me, if an evaluation comes with lots of Not Applicable, that means that, okay,

maybe there's something to encourage this councilor to either be more vocal or to do a kind of activity to get to know each other. I don't know. But all feedback to me is valuable. I see Chris has his hand up. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Ale. I appreciate that next point about the number. I think from memory, that with the Board ones, we had to have—it was 50%, which I think would be nine. And if you actually take the person who's being reviewed out, 17. Nine is slightly more than 50%. If it makes a difference to adjust it slightly is the number of responses that you want to get. There are always going to be people who don't fill them out. And as I suspect, we will learn it'll be the same people who don't always fill them out. But we could, I think, certainly reduce the number required for it to be effective. It would be just as effective if it was nine or eight that it was 10. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Just to add to the point around the quorum, I think I understand Chris or Nick's concern. However, at the same time, if you receive feedback, especially around the NomCom appointees from only a few councilors, that is probably just as bad. So you want to avoid this type of reviews with less attendees as well. Therefore, that's one argument or one point.

The second point is I think this is really looking into the internal organization of the Council and how you interact and be fair and frank about it. Not meeting a quorum is also telling and probably you have another issue at hand. I can say this from being relatively outside. So after discussing this with Alejandra, we suggested to keep it as it is. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, I appreciate that. I appreciate the response and I understand exactly where you're coming from. I appreciate, of course, having to write Not Applicable on somebody is not very nice now. Personally, I would never try to do that if I possibly could avoid that, right? So I try to avoid it.

I suppose I have just a prejudice against the sort of quantitative exercise. I much prefer qualitative. So I'd like, for example, the chair of the Council's opinion should be more weighted and staff and things like that are also to be taken into account in a more sort of purposeful sense, rather than just looking at it as sort of—the ICANN way I know is just sort of crunch numbers and, "Oh, what a surprise. This is the outcome," even if it's a slightly odd one. So it's a good idea. Let's take it as it is and see how we get on. I think it's a good thing to start. Unless we start, we won't learn anymore.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Nick. I agree with you. We should experiment and see how we go. And if we need to adjust it in the future, we certainly can. I see that your concerns have been addressed. I would like to ask

anyone if you have any other questions or clarifications needed for this topic.

BART BOSWINKEL: Please note Irina's comment in the chat. It will be addressed in the final version that will be published. Thanks, Irina, for noting.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Thank you very much, Irina. Okay. With this, may I have a mover? Anyone?

SEAN COPELAND: I'll move that.

TATIANA TROPINA: I'll move. Oh okay, I will second.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Sean moves and Tatiana seconds. Thank you very much. And now we have a draft resolution in front of us. Any questions regarding the resolution? Okay. I see none.

So now let's go to the vote. So please use your green ticks if you are in favor, or your red crosses if you abstain or against. I'm just giving some more time. I see all green ticks. Thank you very much, everyone. You may put them down. For good measure, is anyone against? I see no hand. Thank you very much. This has been approved.

Okay. With this, we move right along to item 12 which are the updates on adoption of ccNSO internal procedures. And for these two following sub-items, may I ask Sean to give us a summary, please.

SEAN COPELAND: Okay. So the GRC was pretty busy last year. I was very aspirational and thinking that we would have the SOI and COI all done before Christmas. So I apologize that we have not actually put that to you fully for table. Saying that, the issue is about readability, and we'll be looking at that this coming up Monday.

The best exercise, if anyone is curious, if you go back to the SOI document and you read it backwards, as an English speaking person, it's really complex. The goal or the objective would be to get it reading forwards and backwards in English understandable so people understand it that way. And at that point, if we're able to achieve that—and I'm looking at my English-speaking cohorts, David, Stephen—for Monday, hopefully by February, we'll get back to you and present that fully, completely to the community in Mexico.

Moving along, the implementation policy, we had a very productive call about that this past Monday. So we have a predefined, I think, group of principles, a nice-to-have items that we'll be presenting to you guys hopefully by the next Council meeting as well. I do want to note that the document that Bart sent around for Jordan with the Annex 1, some of the items in the Annex 1 I think might be relevant to what we are talking about over on what we're doing. So we'll probably discuss that as well

on our first meeting in February. And that just, in my mind, will keep everything very tight. That is my update.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, thank you very much, Sean. Any questions or comments regarding these updates? I don't see any hands. So thank you very much, Sean, and keep up the good work.

Next item, it's update charter's Terms of Reference. To this, we don't have any charters under review so we will move along to item 14. It's the appointment to the working groups and committees. We do have appointments for the Effectiveness Review Team of the OISC. That's the Outreach and Involvement Standing Committee. As you remember, we decided in previous Council calls that this committee needed to be reviewed and we finally have volunteers to do so. Any questions or comments about this topic? I don't see any hands. May I have a mover?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I move.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. May I have a seconder? I see Irina's hand for seconding, right? Okay. Thank you. I see you nodding. We have a draft resolution in front of us that it's to appoint these councilors to review the OISC. Any questions regarding the resolution? I don't see any hands.

So let's go right to vote again. So please use your green ticks if you are in favor, or your red crosses if you are against or abstaining. I see only green ticks. Nick, may I ask, you're red?

NICK WENBAN SMITH: I'm just abstaining. I'm just abstaining.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Looks a bit weird to vote for me to get appointed to something.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: To vote for yourself?

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Yeah, exactly.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No problem. Noted.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I do as well.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Just for good measure, anyone against or abstaining as well? No? Thank you very much. This has been approved.

Now moving right along to item 15, we have the Review Council Workshop that we already discussed in the last meeting. But we were pending some additional discussion on the results. I see that we are right on time, Jordan. So if you could please tell us about that.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Alejandra. Hi again, everyone. Bart, do you want to put the document on the screen, or Kim or whoever's driving? What happened here is that Bart pulled together some refinement of the thoughts that we discussed at our last meeting on what came out of that workshop. I had a light review and tidy up a bit. They were following the four themes that we had identified from that workshop, which was about a bit of debrief on the recent PDPs and how we might make them a bit more timely in the future and what Bart has really proposed as some process improvements in each of the areas that we had done. Bart, can I hand it over to you if there are any particular ones that you want to identify? I know this was circulated quite late in the meeting.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, but that was because we could only touch base very late as well.

JORDAN CARTER: I was on my summer holiday. So I'm just saying that so that we identify that people might not have all had the chance to read it.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, that's fine. So the main improvements—and they should be no surprise—in today's planning and scheduling policy work, but in a broader sense, also other activities. I'll show you in a minute how the Triage is looking at, for example, the work plan and at some of the PDPs. But I'll run through the document first.

So more preparation of the ICANN Board, that was one of the major suggestions. Knowing from my support role regarding the adoption of the retirement process, I know especially Patricio and Katrina but also Becky, we have really been pushing to get an outline ready, that the Board has a committee ready before the policy is submitted to them. So they're very aware of the issues, and the other Board members as well, they're very aware of the issues that have arose in around the retirement policy and they found a way to deal with it, again, especially because of Katrina and Patricio's influence on this, of keeping the ccTLD community abreast of what they're doing. So, that topic is really handled in a way.

So, as you can see, meeting formats and working group methods. So, meeting format. This refers to the meeting format, so working groups themselves and the methodologies they have developed. Again, you see some suggestions here, and this is for more discussion on the next meeting.

Participation—it was encourage meaningful participation versus spectating. I think everybody agrees but there is a bit of nuance there to be made is not everybody can participate in every meeting. And there is

always, especially in our environment, which I, for example, notice that very much in the IDN group, there is always the language barrier which is a issue for some with really active participating. So that really flows back to meeting formats, etc., as well. In that sense, Zoom and Zoom tools do provide a good opportunity to increase participation. I think we've learned this over the time. Whatever you think of the pandemic, it had its good size that we had to learn how to deal with only virtual meetings. So I think if you would look back at the pre-pandemic sessions and the current sessions, there is a world of difference.

Then a final one, self-evaluation working group and committees, this was also suggested. This is just a suggestion that came up in preparing this meeting. Why not try to introduce something like a 360 self-evaluation of working group and committees. What was meant is very structured approach or systematic approach that is prepared properly so you can really start to see some trends and compare various working groups. Then there is a final line, if you agree, and it's not for today because it's new, then it's clearly something for the GRC to develop for broader use.

These are the results from the workshop. So let me scroll back. I see your hand, Stephen. So before I go into this bit in scheduling, because there's really links with some of the work the Triage group is doing, Stephen, go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bart, how do we not repeat the mistake with regards the retirement policy with the Review Mechanism Policy that is forthcoming?

BART BOSWINKEL: I think the Board in that sense. So what I see and know, the Board is very aware of the issues that have arisen around retirement. That's why they've produced an internal outline how to deal with ccPDPs. That means at or around this time, they should start looking at creating a workgroup that shepherds the policy through—"shepherds" is probably the wrong word—but that takes on the work of the Board as the Ad Hoc group did once it was formed. So before the policy is submitted.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: What do you see we need to do to help them in that process because their retirement policy ad hoc thing over—

BART BOSWINKEL: At this stage, I think what is helpful, sit on your hands. We're not at the stage yet of submission of the policy. I think by the time the Council approves the policy, that is the time to really start to move from your hands. When the Council has approved the policy, that's the real point when we go into the members vote. That is one or two months before that is concluded. Then the Council needs another decision. But then you reach the real final stages. So at this stage, nothing is necessary.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: But it took a year.

BART BOSWINKEL:	What took a year? What takes a long or longer period or what takes time is for the Board to consider the policy. They have, in that sense, their own duty and procedures and processes. I know some people disagree with the way the Board does the things they do. That's fair. And that's another discussion. But it took some time and that was, I would say, wasted time to get to the Ad Hoc Working Group, and that should have been done before. So once you got to the Ad Hoc group, they will follow Board procedures and that will take their own procedures. And if you have an issue with the procedures, that's another question then that the Board has done it. Say that the timing issue is also—I think this whole exercise started with the notion that policy development takes quite some time. But in the grand scheme of things, if you go back to, for example, the PDP2 or this PDP3, yeah, it has taken, I think, over 10 years. So, all is relative in that sense, Stephen, at least my view. Thanks.
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	Thank you, Bart. Is there anything you think we can do to "educate" the Board on this as we move towards finalization of the Review Mechanism Policy?
BART BOSWINKEL:	Not at this stage. It's only to inform them. Board members are very aware of this policy. Inform them where you are in the process so they know it is coming and the clock starts ticking for them to establish a group that will support the Board in their consideration of the policy.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Is there a mechanism by which we can inform them that it's coming, that they know it's happening?

BART BOSWINKEL: There is the mechanism that I informed the Board. That's one. They see the public comments. That's two. They are informed through the CEO in his or her reports, etc. So they do receive the messaging. And I think, as I said, the moment the Council adopts the policy, that is really a milestone which you can share with the Board and say, "Look, this is coming." And there is this "We are awaiting the membership vote," and then you will receive the policy.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. A great discussion, Bart. I appreciate that. Alejandra, I yield. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Bart, you said you wanted to say something about the schedule?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, I will. But maybe there are other questions.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Stephen has his hand up, but I think it is an old one.

BART BOSWINKEL:	It's an old one. So I'll stop sharing. I'll share with you now—I have to change the way it's—there we go. Share. This is a view of a tool. It's called ClickUp which shows the work plan of the ccNSO. This is used by the Triage Committee to understand priorities or assess progress but also to assign priorities to the various work items. The reason why I wanted to show it to you is so you know this is happening, but specifically for you to know is the policy function. And the policy function, this was the core of the discussion. This was one of the recommendations is where you can see the various PDPs, but also policy-related—this is a new item—is the implementation guideline of the GRC.

So let me first share you how the Triage Committee is looking at, for example, the review mechanism. So, what you don't see, but I will show it in a Gantt chart very quickly or very soon, is you see there is one item in progress. That's a public comment review. And there are still three, four major items open, have not started yet. So that's producing the final report, and then the ccNSO decision-making. They will start at one point. You can also see, based on this, some due dates which are by now fairly realistic, I would say, I hope at least. Then you got the Board. And then the adoption of the policy by the Board, it's a milestone. It closes off the policy development process. So that's a way to look at the review mechanism.

The Triage Committee is also looking at the IDN ccTLD selection process, and it includes, as you can see, the various steps as well. What is interesting, for example, in the initial report, if I would open this up, you can see there is a checklist included of the various items that need to be addressed in the policy. So one is variant management that has been

completed, stress testing is still open, confusing similarity review is still open. A latest one is review mechanism which was closed last Tuesday, and the selection is also closed. So these work items, again, this is an alert for the Triage Committee, but also for the working group to see where they are. By now, we start to learn how this works. So that's with respect, one view of them.

Now, let me show and this is always the most interesting view, if I would pull up a Gantt chart and see if I can align. So this is where we are right now, current month. So that's in January. Implementation retirement process, forget about it. It's more the policy function. The PDP selection—let me open it up—that shows you a little bit more and some detailing and some dependencies, etc. So this is also shared as a PDF especially with the IDN with PDP4 group because they are fairly interested how they are doing regarding the schedule. If you would look at the review mechanism, for example, you see another picture. This is where you can see, and that makes it interesting, the initial report has been completed. Public comment is open now, and the public comment review, that's something for the working group itself. And then we go into final report and ccNSO decision-making.

This way you can look at very quickly, where you are in the process. And going forward, that will be probably something to discuss. Now I'll stop sharing. Using this methodology or using this tool and this view of policy and policy development, but also other activities to start the conversation between first the Triage Committee and the various group on how they are doing with respect to on progress, but also between the Council and probably Triage group, but also between the Council and a working group if there is need for assistance, etc., and to really

work on the oversight role of the Council with respect to progress meeting. So this is the direction of travel the Triage Committee is taking and how they look at the details. I don't know, Jordan, if you want to add anything, but this was the details I wanted to share. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: No. Thanks, Bart. I don't want to add anything. That's just given a little teaser to you all about the planning tool that we're using and some concrete ideas. So we sort of welcome any comments on any of it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Any questions or comments for Jordan or Bart? Yes? Stephen, I couldn't hear you but I think—

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I said it looks solid to me. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you, Stephen. Yes, indeed, very, very good job to the Triage Committee. I see that we definitely will need an agenda item for next meeting to go over all these suggestions in detail and see how the role of the Triage may change or evolve to interact with the other working groups and committees. Also, it is evident that we can confirm that there is a need for self-evaluation by the PDP working groups, and the suggestions that the GRC might develop these guidelines to aid these working groups on doing that, it sounds very promising. So, there are some things that we will discuss in the future. So, keep tuned on that.

Thank you. Thank you very much, Jordan, for these updates, and Bart. Thank you.

With that, I will move then to item 16. That is the review of the Council workshop on ccNSO and Universal Acceptance and the next steps. So, we had two workshops using the [NACKing] exercise, one was in our last Council call in December, and the other one was yesterday. We know that these workshops, their use is to get with this outcome will be further assessed by the small ad hoc team to analyze all the information gathered and then do value effort analysis or impact effort analysis, and then they will present it to us. As far as I understand, the goal is to make consultation with the community in Cancún and to see where we go from there and what the next steps are. But besides that, I would like to ask you if you have any feedback regarding this [NACKing] exercise. It was a different type of exercise. Did you find it useful? Was it better than others or not? Or any further suggestions? Yes, Irina? You are on mute, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Oops. Sorry.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No problem.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you very much, Alejandra. I think that [NACKing] exercise itself was a good one. It's an interesting approach and it all worked well. I want to repeat the concern I mentioned, actually, during that exercise.

While I fully appreciate the work that Ad Hoc group is currently doing, I want to stress the importance to find the way for ccNSO if we decide to go in this direction, not to duplicate the work that is already being done in many groups and initiatives dealing with Universal Acceptance, but find the areas where ccNSO could really help and improve the process.

The message I sent yesterday to the Board list had the same intention. I said maybe looking in particular on what is currently missing and what are exactly the needs of ccTLD managers might help to find this right approach. Because at that workshop yesterday, there were only four IDN ccTLDs presented among—I believe there are maybe 20 or 30 ccTLD managers who are running IDN ccTLDs and more who have IDNs on the second level. Because in our case, Universal Acceptance is IDN Universal Acceptance, we do not have three or four or five character TLDs. So we are talking about IDNs. And only four of them are there. Why was that? Isn't it really important for those who did not attend? What was the reason? My suggestion would be a little bit more dig into real needs of ccTLDs before we go to further decisions. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Irina. Olga, you have your hand up.

OLGA CAVALLI: Hi, Alejandra. Hello, everyone. My comment is around the same comment that Irina made. It caught my attention yesterday that we were kind of few and maybe those ccTLDs could find relevant usefulness and the Universal Acceptance could be more motivated to participate.

I'm new to the Council so I cannot speak from the past. But it's just that caught my attention. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Olga. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. Maybe, again, to stress from yesterday, this exercise was part of a longer journey to get some recommendations to the Council in the format of a roadmap, and the roadmap will entail some next actions. I really understand and appreciate and support effectively Irina's comments not to duplicate all the current existing efforts. That's why if you recall from the ICANN75 session, we started asking people what they would suggest to the ccNSO, not just from ccTLD manager or IDN ccTLD manager, but also others who are outside of the ccTLD managers and who are related to Universal Acceptance.

One of the more interesting ones, if you recall, was from Dejan who explicitly said, "Don't do anything. There's so much going on." He just made people aware of what's going on and maybe just limit yourself to sharing information. That's it. This was more trying to understand what people thought about the suggestions made at the time. That's the first one. That's why the next step would be for the Ad Hoc group to do the impact value or impact effort analysis because you also don't want to end up in work areas. And this was a concern that was raised by Nick yesterday, very clearly. He said you don't want to put a lot of effort into something nobody wants, where there is no need, etc., looking at the

priorities and looking at, for example, the workload already there. Again, this is part of that process as well.

This goes to the next steps, the Ad Hoc group will propose, first to the Council, just to seek feedback, "Have we captured the right things, etc.?" Then use ICANN76, the ccNSO and UA session, to present what they think is a potential way—if they believe the ccNSO should be involved, how the ccNSO could be involved in the area of UA? Hopefully, a lot of people will be in the room, both virtual or in person, who have experience and are affected by Universal Acceptance issues. This is definitely not the end. And hopefully, the process that is followed includes some safeguards against pushing a bad role for the ccNSO where it's not wanted. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. Olga, you have your hand up but I'm not sure if it's a new hand. I think it's an old hand. With this, thank you, Irina and Olga, for your comments, and Bart for the clarification. Definitely, the small team needs to analyze not only the suggestions made but the further conversations that came up in these workshops. And yes, we would have expected to have more people but sometimes schedules are not ideal. There will be another face-to-face session in Cancún where more people will be gathered. Well, it's been noted that it would be nice to address those ccTLDs who have more experience and knowledge in this to actually contribute to the feedback needed to see if there is a way forward or not and definitely not duplicate efforts where they are not helpful.

All of these will go to the Ad Hoc committee that it's looking at this to take into consideration and we'll take it from there. We'll see what suggestions come up and what the community says about it. If I'm not mistaken—I need to confirm this—I'm not sure if we are going to share through the cccNSO members' mailing list as well the suggestions before Council adopting any steps forward to see if we get any more reactions from those who could maybe not attend to the workshops and now they will like to say something else. So if we're not doing that, I suggest that maybe that could be an additional step to gather information from everyone. Thank you. Any other comments regarding this? I don't see any hands.

Let's move along to item 17. That is ICANN76 in Cancún. First item, it's the ccNSO 20th anniversary. For this, I will give just a quick summary that we are doing some preparations through the year. There will be a special celebration session in Cancún. There will be a cocktail party to start the celebration. In Washington, there might be two networking events, one from ICANN and one from the usual ccNSO cocktail. As well as in Hamburg, cocktail party, it's already been planned with DENIC, and in Mexico with .MX. There will be other surprises so this will be a very happy year.

With that, let's go to the business part as in the ccNSO-related meetings. For this, Kim, may I ask you to share the block schedule and maybe give us a quick run through to it?

KIM CARLSON:	Alejandra, would you mind doing it? I've got a puppy in here who is making a lot of noises back here.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	No problem at all. Here we have the ccNSO draft block schedule. You can see on the weekend, we have all the working group meetings and we will have our ccNSO Council Prep Meeting. It's for 90 minutes. That's where we will squeeze the workshop that we've been talking about. For these, it is also important that everyone is aware that at this meeting is where we will again review the roles and responsibilities of the councilors. It would be nice if you could take a look at that document already to see where would you like to spend your time as a councilor or change roles or do something new. Just take a look about that. This document on Roles and Responsibilities, we will go into detail about it in February, in our next Council call. So just be ready. Also, another thing that I need to remind you regarding that is that in Cancún, we also need to select the leadership for the ccNSO Council. So that's something to also start thinking about.

Okay. With this, on Monday, we will have Tech Day and our joint session with the GNSO. For this session with the GNSO, we have four topics that we will discuss. One is the outcome of the CSC Effectiveness Review. The other is the review coordination of ccPDP4 and the GNSO EPDP. Another topic is improvements on PDP process. And finally, the DASC survey results, the DNS Abuse Standing Committee survey results.

On Tuesday, we will have policy updates, ccTLD News, the general version, where we hear from our ccTLDs around the world. Then after

the geopolitical forum, there will be the governance session where GRC again will update us and maybe get feedback regarding the SOI and COI guideline and the implementation of the ccNSO policy. This is the special session that I was talking to you about regarding the 20th anniversary. Then we have our ccNSO cocktail party.

On Wednesday, there will be the session regarding the ccNSO and the Universal Acceptance as we just spoke about. Plenary and ccTLD News with the topic of the digital divide. Then the DASC will have a session as well, where I'm hoping to hear about the survey results and next steps. Then we have the ccNSO and ccTLD-related Board members session. For this, I do need you to think of the topics that we would like to discuss with our ccTLD-related Board members, ours and not ours, because we need to prepare this session. So if you have any suggestions right now, I would like to hear them. You can type them in the chat, you can raise your hand. But if not, keep this in mind and send it to the mailing list because we do need to prepare for the session.

On Thursday, we will have our usual ccNSO Council meeting after the public forum and there will be the Meetings Program Committee Working Group call/meeting where they will review everything that happened during Cancún and kick-start the planning for Washington.

Any comments regarding the draft schedule? Any particular topics you would like us to think about for discussion with Board members? Okay. I don't see any hands or anything in the chat so I will send an e-mail reminding you about this. Please think about it.

What I would like to ask now, if you feel ready for it, is for a couple of councilors to help plan the workshop for the prep call, especially in the part of the succession planning for liaisons. Does anyone volunteer? No? It won't take much time, I promise. Okay, I see Sean. I see Irina. Thank you very much. With that, I think we are done with this topic. Thank you all.

Let me move forward. Now we are in item 18, Any Other Business. Does anyone have any other business? I don't, and I don't see any hands.

With that, we go to our next item. It's next Council meeting. We have a call on the 16th of February at 12:00 UTC. That's our next Council call. Thank you all for joining today's call. I think it was very productive. Good to see you all. Have a great 2023. See you again next time. Bye.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bye, everyone. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]