

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So welcome everyone to our ccNSO council meeting 195 on the 18th of May at 12:00 UTC. So may I remind all the councilors to please add to your Zoom ID ccNSO council or councilor so it's easier for us to keep track of the voting.

With that, let me post in chat the link to the wiki where all the documents for this call are posted. And before I continue, I would like to ask Kim if we are quorate.

KIM CARLSON: Hi Alejandra, yes, the call is quorate.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. This is important. We have two decisions in the agenda. One of them is the application of .EC in item six and some appointments in item 17. Just as we saw in the email earlier, there is a correction regarding the application of .EC. If we do approve that application, they will become member 175, not 174. We will discuss some many other topics such as work plan and the council reviews on the rebalancing of the NomCom. So it will be exciting.

Moving along to item two, there's the relevant correspondence. And today, as I already mentioned, we will discuss the rebalancing on the NomCom. We have a letter from Tripti asking for feedback on this. And moving to item three, it's the minutes and action items. So the minutes were circulated on the 12th of May. No comments so far, so they are

---

*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.*

---

approved and all action items have been completed. Are there any questions regarding this? No, all good. Thank you very much.

Then we will move to item four, those are the intermeeting decisions. We had the appointment of Tatiana Tropina as a member of triage committee. We have the submission of the council statement on the file change article seven. And we have the approval timeline on the selection of the ccNSO appointee to NomCom. So this timeline also included the appointment of the liaison to the NomCom, and we have that in item 17. Any questions regarding this? Nope. Thank you.

Then we will move right along to item five, that's intermeeting decisions of the triage committee. And as you can see, we're already at the request number 14 in May of this year. And I just wanted to mention that in recent years, the triage committee has processed around 50 requests per year, which makes it even more important, the work that they do. And as you remember, this is a new item in the agenda that we were going to have. And one of the requests, number 12, is the input on the rebalancing of NomCom. And this is something that council needs to discuss and we will do later today. But I just wanted to ask you or to confirm if this layout or this way of putting the items in the agenda is helpful. If you think so, let me know with a green tick or thumbs up. I see thumbs up from people in the camera. Thank you very much. I see lots of green tick. So, we'll keep this format. Thank you a lot.

And moving right along to item six, we have the application of ccNSO membership by Ecuador domain. The ccTLD manager for dot EC, that's Ecuador. So we have a resolution for approval. As a bit of a background, yes, dot EC used to be a member of the ccNSO, but at the point in time

---

they change management. So then the current member of the ccNSO and the organization listed in IANA did not match and automatically the membership is removed. But now they have applied and this is where we are. Any questions regarding the application? I see none. Let me say the phrase first. I already hear you, but may I have a mover, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll move.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. And seconder. I see Pablo's hand in the camera. Thank you, Pablo. So this is the draft resolution. The ccNSO approves the membership application of Ecuador domain, the ccTLD manager for dot EC, the chair of the ccNSO is requested to welcome Ecuador domain as the 175th member of the ccNSO on behalf of the council. The secretary is requested to publish this decision as soon as possible. This decision becomes effective upon publication. Any questions or comments regarding the resolution? I see none. So now it's time to vote. So please use your green ticks if you are in favor or your red marks in case you abstain or object. And I will have a look here in the participants. I see lots of green ticks. Thank you. Thank you very much. And just for good measure, is anyone abstaining or objecting? I don't see any, so this has been passed. Thank you very much and congratulations to Ecuador domain for joining the ccNSO.

And now we continue. So now we have item seven, that it's an update on the councilors' 360 review and review of process. So today is the closing date for submitting responses. Earlier this morning my time

---

there were 15 and 14 responses per councilor out of 20 because we have 17 councilors and three members of staff that could submit responses. I would have hoped for all of them to have responded, but we did meet the quorum, which is a minimum of 10 responses. So we're doing good.

And this topic, it's on the agenda because I wanted to secure immediate feedback regarding the process itself, not the content of the evaluation or the results, because that's to be discussed independently with each councilor. But on the survey itself, if there are any areas of improvement or any observations you may have already. So who may I give the floor?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Alejandra, this is Stephen, I think it's pretty solid in terms of the questions posed. I'm just swamped with the fellowship and evaluation process. But I will do it. This is my day is devoted to ICANN.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Stephen. Anyone else? I, in particular, have a couple of observations. For example, I was missing a general comment field at the end because there was a comment box per question. But in the end, maybe I wanted to say something that was not specifically related to a question. So that one was missing from me. Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks. I wonder if there might have been too many questions for the nature of the role. When you get six of these at once and you're

---

answering 15 questions, it sort of adds up. The scale of the task frightened me off for a while. So I know we had plenty of time to do them, so that was a good side. But I wonder maybe as we review them next year, we might see if there are any we could group together to just make it less of a task for people to offer the feedback by maybe a slightly more simplified survey.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Just to get a little deeper on that, was there any question you thought that was like maybe this could not provide any good input?

JORDAN CARTER: No, it's just that in general, they dug into a level of detail to get to the 15 questions. I think it could have zoomed out a little bit and just had fewer questions. I'm not an expert about these kinds of surveys, but just my opinion about it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. I do have another observation regarding the questions. And that to me was a little hard because when we were asked on the view of others about this councilor, it's, to me, challenging because I can, of course, speak on my view and my own observations rather than others, as in how others perceive this councilor. So to me, it's a little bit of tricking because it would be best to speak from my own perception rather than what others might think. So that's another observation. Anyone else would like to comment on this? Yes, Irina.

---

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you, Alejandra. Hello, everyone. I would agree with Jordan, a little bit too much questions. And honestly, it's really hard to answer some of them because it was a tough time when we became councilors. And there are councilors which I have never met in person during all these three years. And so it's really hard to answer. So I put a lot of, I don't know, because we just had not a chance to learn that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: True, true. Thank you. Thank you, Irina. So we will take all this feedback. And if you have anything else that maybe you think later, please send me an email and we will review this for the next evaluation. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Ale. Hi, everybody. Only just one thing to add based on what Irina just said. Perhaps we need to make it clearer that maybe there's no requirement to fill this out if you don't know the councilor or you don't feel comfortable providing this input. And it might be worth making that point next time around so everyone is clear. And equally, there's also nothing wrong with saying, well, I can answer four of the questions, but I can't answer the rest. So I'm just answering the four. So it's very important to make sure everyone's clear about that, I think. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. Completely agree. So with this topic, if there are no more comments, the next steps will be that I will share the results of the survey with each councilor that was evaluated. And I will try to arrange

---

a meeting during ICANN 77 to go over the results and continue the process. So looking forward to that.

And moving along to item eight, we are now in the 2023-2025 work plan and update to the ccNSO purpose and goal statement. So as you recall, we adopted the amendment in terms of reference for the Triage Committee at our last meeting. Jordan and the other members of the Triage Committee have informed us that they are working on the work plan and would be seeking our initial feedback. So now I will hand it over to Jordan to lead us through this part of the meeting.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Alejandra. I hope this will not take too much of our time today. You might remember, if you've been on the council since '22, that we adopted a sort of strategy on a page early in 2022, the purpose and goals of the ccNSO. And that's fundamental for us as a council and for the work of the Triage Committee in particular as well, for the following reasons. It sort of gives us a sense of what the organization is trying to achieve. And it helps the Triage Committee triage the work that comes in to work out whether something should be adopted as a ccNSO work item or not.

Put simply, if we can't see the activity linking to one of the four categories within that statement, it won't be included as a work item in the work plan. And it also helps us prioritize work, either some must-dos or for the things that are discretionary. We can sort of assess them against the goals that we've put into the document.

---

One thing we did do, we worked through this as a council, but we didn't ever really talk about it with the ccNSO membership. So we've done a little light revision of it, and that mainly involved changing the headings. It didn't change any of the substance of the goals. And we would like to have the chance at the meeting in Washington next month to introduce it to the membership, and I think in the joint session with the SOPC.

So before we do that, we wanted to give you a chance to look at the document again and to see if there was any feedback about it. So I think at that point, I'll just pause and ask if there are any comments about this. It's meant to be a statement of what we do. It's not meant to be a statement of a radical change in direction or anything for the ccNSO. Are there any? Let me get the participants list.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Looks fine to me. Thank you for your work on this, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Stephen. It builds on previous work as well. In 2020, in July, the council adopted this sort of purpose statement. So it's part of this broader stream of work.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: As a review of it, all you had to do is change some headings. The work is solid from 2020.



---

JORDAN CARTER:

Yeah, I think so. Okay. If anyone does think of any other sort of feedback on it, please drop me a line by email in between now and the ICANN meeting in Washington. But I might move on to the next sort of area here, which is that we kind of liked this one-page format. And we thought we might have a go at presenting the work plan for the coming year in a similar format. I don't know, staff, do we have that item available? Is that available to show on the screen?

What we've been doing, anyway, while people look at that, we've been reviewing the whole portfolio of activities. You might remember that we've got a biennial work plan process that every year we adopt a work plan that's a two-year span. And obviously, it's a bit more accurate in the first year, but it does, some of our projects take longer than a year. So it is a two-year plan.

And there's quite a lot of work, you won't be surprised to hear, given you're all on the council. And that work is all embedded in the ClickUp tool. I think if we have time, Ale, and it's up to you if you want to give a couple of minutes for Bart to give people a walkthrough, that we use to manage the detail and to get a holistic picture of the work.

But we also thought it wouldn't be fair to make people read a thousand-page chart or a very long planning document, but that it would be good to summarize the work into a one-pager. And maybe more interestingly, that we could then use that same one-pager in the way that's shown on the screen now, with a bit of color-coding on it, to use it as a kind of dashboard about how we're going against the plan on a quarterly basis.

---

So this would not be a full plan of all of the work that we do. But the key items that would be of significance or where there's something to monitor, we'd put on this one-going-on-two-page document and update it now and again.

So any kind of comments on that format would be helpfully received. Because we'd also like to present this as a complement to the purpose and goals doc at that meeting in DC. It's less probably useful to get any immediate feedback on what's in the document, because that's the discussion we'll have during the meeting in DC, I think. But it's whether you find the layout simple enough and useful to try and get it on one or two pages. So I don't know if anyone's got any comments about that, but if you do, I'd love to hear them.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I like those, like, barely two pages.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: In particular, I like it very much because it gives, in a simple visualization, all the work that's been ongoing in the ccNSO. And to me, it's fantastic. So I do like it. And if you want to go a little bit over ClickUp, we do have some time. So feel free to do so.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Again, if you do have any feedback on these docs, please feel welcome to provide it to me or to Bart. And we'll work on that in the triage committee. And we'll get a refined version of the plan ready for presentation to the community at ICANN 77. And then we'll give the

---

first report on or around the 30th of September, which isn't as far away as you might think these days.

So let's take a little look at what's in ClickUp. Honestly, I can't remember if we've shown this to you before. I feel like we might have done at a high level in the council. But Bart, let me head over to you to show how it's done, how you're using it. And I just, before you do that, while you start to share your screen, I really do want to thank Bart in particular and the Secretariat for adopting this sort of more online movable feast method of planning. It's a different tool. And thanks to Alejandra for suggesting the tool. And I think Bart will say without stealing his thunder that the more you use it, the better it gets. And hopefully, if not this tool, then something that has an equivalent approach and functionality of modern project planning will be something that ICANN offers for the whole community to make use of as time goes on. Because this is the sort of simple modern service online that we should be able to use for all of our work. So Bart, over to you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thanks. So I think on one of the, say, two or three months ago, earlier this year, we introduced it, the annual work plan for, say, starting on the 1st of July 22. This is the 23-25 work plan that the triage committee is pulling together. And as you can see, there are, and I want to draw your attention to, I hope you can all see this, these, I would say the lists, that's the way they express. Go one, two, three foundational activities and upcoming activities. And the upcoming activities are not included in the one-page for obvious reasons.

---

But as you can see, the project management tool allows the triage committee to include all the work items along these four major buckets that were included in the purpose and goal statement. And also, and they are also the basis for the, quote, unquote, one-page on the activities itself that Jordan just went through with you and introduced is effectively a summary what you see in front of you.

So let me start with the easy one, which is the policy. Although you wouldn't say so, but say from a work, from a planning perspective, it's relatively simple. As you can see, there is implementation retirement policy, which is external. ICANN Org is doing this. It's a must do. And it is expected to be done by the end of this fiscal year effectively. That's what the ICANN staff communicated or Patricio said during the ICANN 76 update.

PDP IDN selection, you can see where we are. The initial plan is due by the end of this month. It will be delayed slightly, but at least you can see how it is. You can see it's a high priority assigned by the triage committee. And the review, its due date is—and this is 24, and the reason, let me open this up and then you can see the details underlying, is the decision making on the review process, is decision making is expected to be closed by the 29th.

However, board consideration, yeah, that can take as long as it takes. And just using the experiments of the retirement policy, it took about a year. Effectively, it took far less because there were some organizational issues around it. But in this case, probably the review may take a little bit longer due to its nature and due to the feasibility assessment and everything else that is included.

---

I don't know if I can share—yeah, what you can see here as well. I will not do this in detail and the others, but now you can see how this works for the, for each and every of these decisions, or some of them, there is also a kind of checklist included. So first is the public comment to be organized by the board, as you recall, GAC consultation, which is also mandatory, then board deliberations and the ICANN feasibility studies. These are all part and parcel of the board consideration process. And that's what we've learned during the last retirement policy. Yes, go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I hope it's not going to be another year, but we'll see. Talk to me about ICANN feasibility. What do you mean by that?

BART BOSWINKEL: ICANN feasibility, it's the assessment on implementation. Implementation assessment, that's what they've done with—which makes sense in a way. You can see, it's the method they used for the SubPro as well. Not heavy handed, but before the board can take a decision, they need to understand what they take a decision on.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Oh, what if ICANN Org comes back and says it's not feasible? What happens then?

---

JORDAN CARTER: I think at that point we have an argument, but I don't want us to get derailed in this conversation into these details, if that's okay, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, I don't want to get into a rabbit hole either.

JORDAN CARTER: The reason to include it is that it's a known process step. And that's the only one. So the under, what you see as well is, and then I'll go back to the high level one, but it shows you what the triage committee will be looking at going forward and monitor what's going on, what the triage committee will be looking at going forward and monitor where the list of activities at, the implementation of the IDM PDP, again, that will be external, and the implementation of the review mechanism. Once the board has taken a decision, the policy needs to be implemented. And that's part of, and the ccNSO will be interested in how that is working as well.

So that's the, I would say, the policy function and everything around it. I'll save this. Platform, this is another interesting one for another reason. This was a point of discussion. You may have noted this during the one-pager on activities. This is not organized around working groups. This is organized around buckets of activities.

And the reason is, for example, and again, DNS abuse, there are a set of activities performed by subgroup but also by the full group. One is, for example, populate and maintain the DNS abuse repository. You will see

---

this. It happens, creating a DNS abuse email list. This is what they've been working on. DNS abuse survey is, again, a good example.

So each and every of these activities is organized, and let me show them, I need to highlight this this way. This is what you see on the one-pager. Underlying each and every of these activities is a set of sub-tasks or sub-activities and sometimes even detailed to the level of checklists, like the one I've shared with you. So that's the global platform function. If you look at the contributing ICANN, this is mainly focused around planning, as you may have seen. So that should be fairly straightforward. There are others as well. For example, priority framework. There is a bit of a choice to be made around foundational activities. So that's the review and you can see the list here as well.

And then finally, and then I'll hand it back to Jordan, is upcoming activities. So these are, I would say, there are two categories. One is where there is clearly areas which have not been identified, however, they are not yet decided upon. But they're in the pipeline more or less.

So one is the holistic review. It's the best example. IFR as well, the IANA function review today on your agenda is the appointment of members. So you know this is forthcoming and it will start in September and that's about the time you will see this back in foundational activities because it's a must-do, bylaw driven, etc. Then

there are other ones like the review of the ccTLD financial contribution. If you recall, it was agreed upon in 2013 that the financial contribution guideline, etc. would be reviewed every five years. So there was a

---

review in 2018. So you can expect one forthcoming based on previous commitments by the council and ICANN Org.

And then there is the review of accountability framework. Again, that was, I think it was discussed sometime either, I think, at the second Buenos Aires meeting and it was agreed upon that time that as soon as the review mechanism would be completed and understood and defined, the accountability framework guideline would be revisited as well.

So you can see these are clearly activities which are in the pipeline. They're recorded here and there is some, so like the financial contribution, there is a date assigned to it. It's a fairly soft date, but this way you can capture future work as well.

And then there is potential work, which is, I would say, in the grapevines. PDP 5 on the removal of IDN strings. It's one of the work items that may or may not emerge from the IDN ccTLD work. But this is a five to ten, even longer, maybe five to ten years out after adoption of the policy. But I think it is wise to capture and this is still up for discussion with the triage committee first, whether you want to have these. These are really work items which are way out.

And the second one is whether or not the ccNSO has a role to play with respect to capacity building, however defined. So this is, yeah, I think by now, the only thing that really needs to be done is solidify the dates, etc., and if feasible, add some assigned working groups, etc., to them. But I haven't figured out yet how that works, but we'll get there. So I'll stop there and see if there are any other questions. And back to you.



JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Bart. Are there any questions? It's a bit difficult to see the thing when it's really shrunk down like that. But it's proved to be a pretty useful planning tool. If you do have any thoughts about it later, feel free to buzz Bart in particular. He might even take you on a little tour of the app if you're particularly interested. I think that's all for this item. Back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Jordan and Bart. It is quite impressive what you have compiled in there, and it's good to see that we are keeping track of everything in this collaborative tool. So thank you. With that, we will move along to the item nine, that is the discussion and recommendation 10, NomCom review, composition of the NomCom.

So as I told you, we got a letter seeking feedback. And just to clarify, this is a separate thing from the current public comment on bylaws amendments and documents to implement the NomCom 2 review. Both are NomCom related, but one is the one that we are currently drafting. And this is a new thing that we need to discuss.

So in the discussion of the drafting for the public comment, we went back to the original idea of the NomCom, that is to select and nominate independent board members and councilors. So to keep that in mind when we're seeing this feedback that we are required. So may I please have the letter displayed? I'm not sure if we have it available so we can all see the questions and from there. Thank you very much.

---

So as you see, we are being asked what does it mean to have a balanced NomCom at a point in time? What would be the criteria? How to measure it? If it's balanced or not? If we support the view that the current composition needs to be balanced, and why or why not? How frequently should this balance be measured or assessed? How do we suggest that the NomCom composition be rebalanced? Who should conduct this work and how? And how would our community, as in ccNSO, prioritize consideration of this issue within our planning efforts? So any initial observations regarding this? And please raise your hand. Yes, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

Thank you, Ale, and greetings all. The one thing that I found disturbing was the fact that ALAC has five representatives in NomCom, whereas the ccNSO has one person. So each time that we have—and we are an association that financially supports ICANN, yet we have only one person there. So each time that we have to go and participate at ICANN, we need either to be a savvy diplomat and make sure that you can work your way around. Or other than that, you're in a tremendous disadvantage.

So this is the one question that I have had with leadership. And so the question comes down to do we increase five members of the ccNSO, which we are making the NomCom gigantic, or do we decrease ALAC's representation there? So that is one discussion that we need to have, because if we are going to talk about balance, there certainly is no balance between the ccNSO and some of the NomCom members. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Oh, my. Thank you, Pablo. You echoed what I was thinking completely. And I know since you served your term with NomCom, I believe we do need to increase the representation of ccNSO on this committee. And I agree with Pablo that a decrease in ALAC membership would also be appropriate. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Alejandra. Hello, everyone again. Okay. So just perhaps as a reminder for some and new information for others, the structure of the Nominating Committee has effectively been this way since the beginning of the Nominating Committee. And one of the reasons why the ccNSO has only one person is that the ccNSO didn't actually exist when the Nominating Committee was first established. And in fact, the first representative of the ccTLD community on the Nominating Committee was actually the chair of [inaudible] at the time. That seat was there and it was converted into a seat for the ccNSO. I'm not suggesting the ccNSO shouldn't have more. I'm just saying that's the historical reasons.

---

It's also slightly weird if you look at it. The GNSO has two Business Constituency seats, a small business and a large business, because that's what they wanted at the time. And this is 2002, 2003, and negotiating abilities and stuff was different then to the way that it is now. It's abundantly clear, it seems to me, that the Nominating Committee does need to be restructured.

But it's equally abundantly clear that one of the most important things to get is to get clear about what the Nominating Committee is about. So acknowledging what you said before, Alejandra, that this is separate from the discussion about the change to the bylaws, it is interconnected in this way.

So if the bylaw changes go through and the Nominating Committee is charged with an overarching responsibility to find at least, I think it's three or whatever, let's just call them independent directors for the sake of discussion, i.e. people specifically not from the community, and if you go back to the basic reason for having the Nominating Committee in the first place, which is to be a skilled body that finds people suitable to be directors, it frankly doesn't matter whether each constituency of the GNSO is represented or five regions from At-Large are represented. It makes no difference. You could very easily say that there are two seats for At-Large and that every two years that rotates around the regions. You could do the same with the ccNSO. You could come up with a much smaller, dynamic, useful, skilled Nominating Committee. So those are all just sort of thoughts and suggestions, but categorically it's clear that this needs to be rebalanced and restructured. Thanks.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI: Hello, good morning, colleagues. I hope you can hear me. You might know that I have been advocating for a reform of the NomCom for many years. I think it's unbalanced and I think it has a relevant role in specially selecting half of the board that should be really representing the whole community.

So the selection committee should be representing the whole community. I always found it weird that the ccNSO has only one seat and the ALAC has so many, one per region and all that.

I agree with Chris that it should be a smaller group, high-qualified and rotating around regions and more balanced. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Olga. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Alejandra. I think I'm in the current of the other speakers so far. It is a strange group and it works in strange ways, is what I've discovered from not being on it but talking to people who have been. And like an absurd situation where it doesn't let the recruiters who it pays a lot of money do any shortlisting. It reviews all of the applications manually anyway, but spends a vast quantity of money paying other people to do the same thing.

---

Personally, I think it must have been some kind of argument that the representation on it should connect somehow to the board seats that it appoints. And I just think that I'd much rather have something that was cleaner along the lines of the way that the empowered community is structured because in the end, the job of the NomCom is to help select and to select good governors for ICANN as a whole within the subdivisions that it's got within the board and how it's composed, which is a different discussion that we should have sometime but not right now.

So I think that having a balanced group would be equal participation for the Cs, the SGs, the ALAC, SOs and ACs and the GAC. And this group is not that. So I think it does need a look.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thanks, Ale. I strongly believe that the number of votes that some of the ACs, that other ACs may have, it is completely insane to have that many in there. And just as insane for the CCs to have one. I hear what Chris has to say, that at the beginning, there wasn't a ccNSO and it took time, but it has been long enough for us to really address this issue in having either more presence or ask for lesser presence of other ACs.

Regarding the recruitment of prospects that could aspire to become members in the board of directors, I must say that as a co-chair of the outreach within the NomCom, we took it very seriously to go after very

---

strong prospects. We seek at different universities, we seek for people that were CEOs and that they either were members of respectable boards and that had taken seriously enough to invest in education. So we went after Harvard and Kellogg universities looking for those individuals who took those courses and went after those alumni and all that.

And I must say that if the NomCom continues to do that, it's very helpful. That is in addition to what the other headhunters are doing. So that is one way of balancing. And I don't want to knock down NomCom at all because NomCom did—at least in the two years I was there, the tremendous amount of work and the depth of the investigations that were done by us and by me and others, it was titanic, but it was a lot of work. NomCom is very intense. There's a lot of work and this is something that needs to be done.

So I don't have quarrels with how NomCom does things in terms of the processes of identifying individuals. My problem is with the balancing issue. That's my problem right there. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Alejandra. I just wanted to pick up on a couple of points just in response to Jordan. I think, Jordan, you're right that there have been some odd things, odd practices, if you will, over the years. What used to happen in the old days was that the Nominating Committee would start

---

afresh every year and everything would be thrown away and the new chair would come in and start all over again and there was no history, no history of applications, no nothing.

That's all changed now. And so I think it's much, much better. And I assume the concept, again, to go back to the other side of this fence, which is the proposed changes to the bylaws, I'm assuming that the concept of having a supervisory committee to deal with the structuring of the NomCom and all of the processes in place, whatever—the world's most confusing name of the NomCom Standing Committee, which makes no sense at all, is there to ensure that there is consistency and historical stuff in place. So I just wanted to address that point.

And the second thing I wanted to say is I do think that, and I sort of agree with Pablo, to a degree, there's nothing to be gained by spending time dealing with how the NomCom does its work. There is a lot to be gained by looking at the structure of it.

Pablo, I acknowledge that people who work on the NomCom do an extraordinary job under difficult circumstances. All I would say is that there is a distinct lack of criteria to appointments of the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee has a vast list of criteria to find people to sit on the ccNSO Council, the GNSO Council, the Board. There are very few criteria to being on the Nominating Committee. You don't even have to be able to demonstrate that you've ever interviewed anybody before. It seems to me to be bizarre that we would set up a group of people to go out and interview people for high power roles in this organization, including on the Board, without checking to see whether any of these people actually have the ability to interview. So



---

there are a whole raft of things that sit with that rebalancing. And I would suggest that that's what we concentrate on, the rebalancing and the criteria for those people. Thank you.

Thank you, Chris. Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI:

Yes. Hello. Just a clarification on the comment. It's not the first time that the NomComm wants to be reviewed. There was a proposal I think in 2014. I think one of the things that I think that ICANN is missing is having history and reminding what was done before. It didn't succeed, but I think it was quite good balancing the NomComm. It didn't succeed.

And the fact that the GAC does not participate, they have one seat, but some countries refuse to do that. So as a consensus outcome, the GAC does not want to use that seat, but they have one seat. And in my modest opinion, should be balanced with other SOs and ACs. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Olga. Biyi.

BIYI OLADIPO:

My view to all of this is it looks like we are all aligned on the need to rebalance the NomCom and also revisit the structure of the NomCom. So what I think, in my opinion, is that we should just make our representation. And if it's going to be a bylaw change, why not just propose one and then have that done? It's something that looks like it has to be done. So I think we should just set up a process.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Biyi. Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thanks, Ale. Addressing what Chris was mentioning, I do agree that criteria needs to be looked at and structure needs to be looked at. It is important. I mean, there have been many internal arguments in NomCom of what is the right amount of people, the right amount of outsiders versus insiders in terms of what we should be looking for and aspiring to recruit. And there are many spaces to work on. So to that effect, I do not disagree that criteria and other areas need to be looked at and sooner rather than later. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. Thank you all for all your feedback. It is pretty evident that we need to address this. And we have a deadline on the 30th of June to give a response back. So the proposal is to have a council statement. And for this, I would like to ask the secretary to propose a timeline so that we can actually meet the 30th of June deadline and to launch a call for volunteers from the council to do a drafting of such a statement.

It is evident that we feel that this needs to be addressed and now we need to deliver our views and how this should be done. So thank you all for your feedback and we will continue this work afterwards. And looking at the chat, do we need to be careful with the way we explain this? Yes, of course. So delicate matter.

---

Moving along, I will go to item 10 that is updates on ccPDP. In particular, we'll go to update on the ccPDP 3 review mechanism and membership voting. Please, Joke, can you tell us what's going on?

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Thanks, Alejandra. What's going on? Well, earlier this week, I submitted a vote report to council and a small comment regarding the date included in the vote report. It looks like I'm living in the future. That needs to be adjusted. But apart from that, there are various chapters in the vote report. A short introduction. What are the council developments that led up to the vote? What was done in order to promote the vote? When was the vote launched? What happened after closure of the vote and what were the vote results?

So you will see that the quorum was met. 60% of the emissaries casted their votes and an overwhelming majority of those votes cast was in favor of the council's recommendation to adopt the proposed policy. The vote therefore passed, it met all requirements, etc.

So you will see in the vote report some observations and also some details regarding the votes that were submitted. There is a regional distribution of the votes received. There is also an overview of the number of votes coming in over time, starting on the 18th of April until the 9th of May when the vote closed. And on this overview, we'll also see some marks regarding when reminders were sent directly to the inboxes of the emissaries.

So the tool that we used for the voting is called Tally. Tally has a functionality which allows us to send reminders to all voters that have

---

not yet cast their votes. This brings the ballot directly back into the inbox of the emissary and it makes it easier for voters to click on the link and to cast their votes.

There are some observations included regarding guidance that I seek from council in my capacity as vote process manager regarding the outreach in terms of this voting to those that have not voted yet. You can see a short table at the very end of the vote report with a comparison between the results of the retirement vote and the review mechanism vote. So the number of people eligible to vote was about the same. 172 for the retirement vote, 173 for the review mechanism vote with 58% of the members voting for the retirement and 60% now for the review mechanism.

There were differences regarding the approaches. There was specific outreach, both by the secretariat and by others to those that did not vote yet. I would like to seek guidance from council regarding the desirability of this approach and if it matches with the confidentiality approach. So as you may know, voting is indeed confidential. The results are not identified by the ccTLDs or by the email addresses of those that received the ballot. That concludes my update. Thank you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Joke. Stephen, do you have your hand up?

JORDAN CARTER: I do indeed. First, I want to thank Joke for a really comprehensive election report and for her service as election manager on the review

---

mechanism vote. Really well done. I agree with you, Joke, with regards to how we approach future votes. I think what we did was okay, but I think we also need to get council buy-in on that approach going forward with respect to outreach, particularly with the regional organizations. It was effective. I think it's a useful thing to do. I'm supportive of the approach we took, but I think council should have a discussion about it just so that everybody's on board with it one way or the other.

And second, I just want to thank the community wholeheartedly as the chair of the review mechanism PDP3 working group for their endorsement of the policy. Thank you. That's it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Stephen, for giving the intro to this particular discussion, because yes, as we see, there were various outreach efforts. And yes, we have this scope of confidentiality and I would like to know your views on this. Is it okay if we know whether a member has already voted or not? Should we have it like, should we be able to know this and then reach out? Should we not do that? Should we just rely on this system of reminders? What are your views? And Irina, please.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you, Alejandra. I believe I have raised this issue earlier, and I think it would be extremely helpful if we know which ccTLD manager has already voted and which not. We don't need to know how he voted, but the fact that it was done, I think it would be extremely helpful in the outreach. But I fully support.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Irina. And yes, the vote itself as in if they are in favor or not or blank. That's not in question, definitely, but whether we could know if they have voted or not. Yes. So thank you. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think we handled it pretty well overall. We pushed it back onto the regional organizations, APTLD, CENTR, ec., and said, okay, these members of your organization have not yet voted, so go with the vote with them and get them to vote one way or the other. We would like them to vote, yes, but it's up to them, but just get them to vote because we were looking for the voting threshold percentage for starters.

And I also thought it was really useful for Joke to produce the by region, who's voted, who's not voted, not who is voted, but just numbers. I thought we handled it pretty well. With respect to confidentiality of the actual vote, obviously, but also just whipping the vote, basically. So I was pretty pleased with the approach we took. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Biyi.

BIYI OLADIPO: Okay, I think we already do this in some ways. So, as to response to those things that request council action, which secretariat produces what is meant to be voted for, who has voted, who hasn't voted, without necessarily saying what's necessarily the person voted for.

---

So if we extend that to the community, I think it would work and work better. Yes, our regional to the regional organizations worked very well. However, in my own outreach to our own regional organization, the first question I was asked is, do you know who has voted and who hasn't? So I think it would help if we have that kind of detail, but not necessarily what the person voted, whether yes or no or abstain. I think since we already do it for the council, it should work. It should work for the community. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay, thank you, Biyi. Thank you all. I do hear that having this information, it's helpful. I'm not sure if we would like to get into solution mode, but who should be involved in this outreach and to what extent? As in, should it be only councilors who ask, as we have done now, as the vote manager for this information? Should it be maybe published in the ccNSO website and updated as soon as votes are there? I don't know. Any suggestions to that, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Alejandra. I think it should be an all-on effort. As you know, I went to the APTLD meeting in Laos just to whip the vote there because a lot of the attendees who are ccNSO members don't actually pitch up at ICANN meetings. So I thought that was an opportunity to make them aware of the importance of it and solicit votes, frankly, one way or the other.

I think this is a topic for another discussion so that we don't go into extra time on this meeting. But how we approach these going forward, I

---

mean, we got PDP4 coming up, etc. I think it's for another venue to discuss, but I think the approach we took with the review mechanism, vote whipping, I think it's appropriate. I'll stop. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. And Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. May I support Stephen's suggestion to revisit this discussion? But also, and I was a backup for Joke when necessary, what we did see, and I think it's even in Joke's report, if you map the times we send out the reminders, so from Tally to the people to vote, that was the moment when people started voting again.

[There was a lot of outside,] but one of the issues is we don't know which and when we reach emissaries, even the regional organizations are not able to reach the emissaries. So the only way we definitely know that we reach out and reach the emissaries, so the people who can vote, is through a reminder of Tally. So there is a bit of a balance. That's one comment. So yes, please revisit this before we start a next vote at one point. And it could be, for example, with a board election, which is, say, the board nomination process is forthcoming. So that's one opportunity, and the one-on-one is the IDN PDP.

So that's one. Secondly, it's probably also in the context of looking at all these different measures, balancing this against the effort. And the third element is—and that's why I push a little bit back on the general sense, people sometimes do not vote for a particular reason, not because they



---

are not aware, but for example, because they're not in a position to vote. I think this was one of the comments from Leonid, from the general manager from APTLD, is it takes quite some time to go up the bureaucracy's food chain to get sign-off on a vote, if you are a government-related organization. And then the two- or three-week window is too short. And then publishing this probably could have a negative side effect. So these are all factors to take into account before reaching out and starting publication of all the voters and non-voters. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Bart. So definitely, we are not supposed to resolve this now, and we should keep the discussion going at the next meeting. And maybe we should also consider broadening it a little bit more into how to involve the membership in the ccNSO, not only in the voting, but also to attending sessions and not necessarily joining a volunteer effort, but to make them more involved. And so they can be aware of what we are doing, not just when a vote is coming. And this is one of the reasons the OISC was created, the outreach part. So the review that it's spending, it's absolutely necessary. So it's important that it gets done so we can compile this there. So thank you all for your time.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thanks for the reminder.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No problem. Next, items from 10.2 to 13 are written updates. If there are any questions, it would be a good time. If not, we move forward to item 14. And yes, it is the ccNSO website redesign. And for this, I would like to ask Kim to give a brief update.

KIM CARLSON: Hi, everybody. Being cognizant of the time, I'll make this quick. The website audit work continues. The auditors have a standing weekly meeting to go over issues, ask questions, provide updates. And it's proven to be really useful.

During the last update, we were told that of the nearly 7,000 pieces of content that need to be audited, in two weeks of auditing, 1,000 items have been audited well ahead of schedule.

In addition to the weekly calls, we have a very, very active Slack channel. Again, it's used to ask questions, get advice, updates, that kind of work. Bart and I continue to work as SMEs and taking on any kind of escalations. And this includes, if necessary, to add any additional taxonomy. And as noted before, the taxonomy is not static. We're adding to it daily. The more taxonomy and accurate taxonomy we can apply to content, the better the search function and ability to find specific content will be. We're adding better topics, subtopics, and that to be attributed to each item as well.

In total, there are 12 auditors altogether, two from the information, the ITI, Information Transparency Program initiative, two contractors, six policy colleagues, and Bart and myself. In addition, Alejandra continues to provide support and consultation.

---

The hope is to reconvene the planning group between 77 and 78 and start the next phase, which is the fun one, the requirements phase. But there is good forward progress. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Kim. Any questions or comments for Kim? If not, then let's hope for the good work and to keep getting ahead of the planned schedule. That's always good news.

So moving to item 15, it's the update from chair, vice chair, councilors, regional organizations, and secretariat. Does anyone have any update to make?

I just have a short one to let you know that we attended the listening session on the CEO selection or search for the new CEO of ICANN. We gathered all the input that we got from everyone, from councilors, from the community, and we gave them, and then we had some questions asked. And in my particular point of view, the format was a bit strange to me because I'm not used to not being allowed my fellow councilors or the council to speak. And just having Biyi, Jordan and myself there makes it difficult, I would say, to gather the many views that the full council may have. So that's my observation. I don't know if Biyi or Jordan have any other comments to add to that. Jordan, no. And Biyi.

BIYI OLADIPO: Okay, I share your views too. I felt it was a bit awkward in that, yes, you have been asked to gather all the comments and all of that, but there were other people who were present I think who should have actually

---

been given the opportunity to also say something rather than have just three of us speaking and taking questions and making the inputs to the things that they wanted to hear.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Yes, thank you. With this, that's all the updates I got, and I don't see any other hands, so let's move on. Item 16, it's update charter and terms of reference. We don't have any this time, so we'll move along to item 17.

And as I said at the start of the meeting, we have resolutions on the appointment of various people. This time we have a combined resolution. Until yesterday, the selection process closed in some of these positions, so now we can have the names added to the resolution. And we are appointing members for IFRT, NomCom, vice chair of IGLC, and liaison to the GNSO Council.

Do we have any questions on the process for the positions? Okay, I don't see any hands, so we do have a resolution. May I have a mover? Okay, I see Pablo moves, and I see Irina's hands up, and I'm guessing for secondment or question.

IRINA DANIELIA:

It's for secondment, but I also have a comment. I want to suggest to thank all the volunteers, not only those who are appointed, but all the people who stepped forward to fill the positions.

---

BART BOSWINKEL: It's included in the resolution. Gratitude to the other strong candidates. That was tried to capture this note for those who stepped forward

IRINA DANELIA: Sorry. I see it now.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, no problem. Thank you. Okay, so we have a mover and a seconder, and we have the decision, and it says, following the various calls of volunteers, the ccNSO Council selects and appoints the following persons.

Sophie Mitchell from AUDA to the ccNSO appointee to the NomCom, Anil Kumar from NYXI as vice chair of the IGLC, Everton Rodrigues from .br, it doesn't say, but maybe we should add it, a ccNSO appointed liaison to the GNSO Council, and Peter Koch from .de, Olga Cavalli, and Sami Ali from .bh. We should add those details as ccNSO appointed members to the IFRT.

The Council congratulates the aforementioned persons with their appointment and expresses its gratitude to the other strong candidates. The Council requests the secretary to inform the appointees, the other candidates, and groups to which the appointees have been appointed as soon as possible. The secretariat is also requested to publish this resolution as soon as possible. This resolution becomes effective upon publication. So any questions or comments regarding the resolution? No? Okay, thank you. So we need to vote. Please use your green ticks if you are in favor, or your red marks if you abstain or object.

---

I see only green ticks. Thank you very much. For good measure, I'm going to ask if there are any abstentions or objections. I don't see any. So thank you very much. These have been approved. And again, thank you to everyone for stepping forward and contributing to the work of the ccNSO. Thank you so much.

With this, we move to item 18. Kim, if you would be so kind to share quickly the block schedule so we can all have a look on how it looks for ICANN 77. Thank you all.

So as you know, we have the ccNSO 20th anniversary. So there will be a session on Tuesday regarding that. There won't be any joint meetings. We see there all the ccNSO related meetings. We have welcome and working group updates. We have ccTLD Registration Trends. Updates from SOPC triage. There will be a session with IANA, some ccTLD news, legislative initiatives affecting ccTLDs, and the ccNSO Council. So I don't want to go into details through all of those, just reading them quite quickly.

For this, I have a couple of questions. We are supposed to have a virtual Council prep call. And we are expected to have also a virtual Council workshop before ICANN 77. So the question is, should we have two separate things or shall we just combine them in one? Because since we don't have joint meetings, I think it would be easier to have one joint virtual session on the 1st of June at 20:00 UTC. So we combine the workshop and the prep call there. Or do you think it would be too much? Maybe we should split them and have two separate meetings?

---

To make this easier, if you have a preference for separate sessions pre-ICANN, please use your green ticks. And if you would like to combine them, please use your red crosses. So I see some red and a couple of greens. Pablo, you want two separate sessions?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Apologies, I misunderstood. I prefer to combine them.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, I was doing that a little bit tricky. Olga, would you like separate or combined? I'm not sure if Olga can speak right now, but combined.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Combine is red?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. So thank you all. You may remove your ticks and crosses. And yes, we are not meeting with ALAC or GAC. This is a very short meeting, the policy forum. So it's four days and that's it. So that's why we are not having, not even meeting with the board or anything like that. So yes, we are combining this. Kim?

KIM CARLSON: Yeah, hi. Thanks, everyone. Currently, we have an hour blocked off on the first. Do you want to extend it to 90 minutes?

---

BART BOSWINKEL: Would be wise if you do the roles and responsibilities, the introduction into the work plan and the prep call, and schedule it for 90 minutes.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes.

KIM CARLSON: Okay, thanks. I'll revise the invite. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Kim and Bart. So, one more question regarding the ICANN 77 item is on the ccNSO council meeting. Last time, we had an on site council meeting. We had a super long table and it was super hard for me to see everyone on the table, even though we are all going to be on Zoom, always. And I was inquiring whether we could have a U shaped room instead of our regular room. And the response is yes, we can have a U shaped room, but we wouldn't have translation services, or we remain in our room, and then we arrange ourselves better. Maybe some seating in front in the front row and some seating at the large table so we can see everyone and have translation services.

So, I would like to know if it's such a strong feeling that we should have a U shaped room and we give up on translation services, or not that strong and we can manage on our own to see in the room and have translation services. And I see Stephen in the chat says let's go for translation services. I agree. I see some nodding in the cameras. Okay. In the chat Pablo as well. So we stay in our room, if this is correct. Now please do use your green ticks to stay in our room and have translation



---

services. Okay, I see only green ticks. Thank you. Thank you all. So yes, we stay in our room. Thank you.

We will still use Zoom, as we are doing right now, but I think it would be better experience if we have people in the front row and in the front table. Okay. Can we go back please to the agenda? And Pablo, I see your hand up.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

Yeah, it's just a quick comment regarding the translation services. We have asked for this for a long time and now that we have it, it would be a mistake not to use it. Not to mention that it facilitates the participation of so many others who are remotely or [inaudible]. So translation services all the way. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Yes, thank you, Pablo, and even if we don't see them right there in person or in the Zoom room, the recordings remain. So that's, I think, very valuable as well.

So moving to item 19 any other business. Does anyone have any other business? I don't see any but I can tell you I have a quick one. We got an offer to provide to an update on various review related work by ICANN, including the holistic review. And we responded that maybe we should schedule jointly with the GRC post ICANN 77. They wanted that to be maybe done in ICANN 77, but it would be too difficult to do, so that's why we say maybe let's do a webinar afterwards and coordinate better on this update.

---

Any other business? If not, then we will see each other online for the prep and workshop session. And I wish you a very good rest of your day. Thank you very much for joining.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**