
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Welcome to the ccNSO Council meeting 197 on the 20th of July 2023. A quick reminder to all ccNSO councilors to please add to your Zoom ID the word ccNSO or councilor so it's easier to look for you when we are doing any voting. Also, I am going to put now in the chat the link to the wiki with the documents that will be useful for today's agenda. And with that, I would like to ask Kim if we are quorate.

KIM CARLSON: Hi, Alejandra. The call is quorate at this time. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Kim. By the way, I want to tell you that we did a little bit of redesign of the agenda. So we have four sections. One is the administrative matters. The other is the updates, usually the written updates. And then we have administrative decisions that are the ones that are effective upon publication. And then we have the section of discussion and decision, if needed, that are the decisions that will be effective after seven days after publication. This way I think it's a little bit more organized. And also we added to this agenda the discussion on the letter from Kim Davies to the council. So it is in item 18. And one thing that we need to address in this call is the planning for ICANN 78. Since if we do that at our September council call, it will be too close to the meeting itself. So it's better to have a look at it now. And because of these new items and of these needed discussions, we will see how we're doing on time to see if we might need to defer the items 20 and 21. Any comments regarding the structure of the agenda? I see none.

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.

And thumbs up from Javier. By any chance does anyone have any other business at this time? So I can take it into account. If not, when we get there, I will also ask again. But I see none.

So with that, let's get started with the administrative matters. We are in item 2, relevant correspondence. We have the letter from Kim Davies regarding the establishment of a caretaker designation for top-level domains in the root zone database. As I told you, we will discuss in item 18. And then we have item 3, minutes and action items. The minutes from the last council call are taken from the record. And all action items have been completed except one that is ongoing, that it's the ccNSO triage committee to review and update the portfolio of activities quarterly, and they will be included in the September agenda. Anyone has any comments regarding the action items? I see no hands up. So let's move on.

So we have item 4 is the intermittent decisions that we had. We have the approval of the NomCom balancing submission, the approval of the submission to the PTI by-law change. And we also appointed some members to IGLC and the DASC. In item 5, the intermittent decisions from the triage committee, there have been none since last meeting.

And with that, we arrive to the updates section. So the document with the written updates was circulated on Monday, the 17th of July. Are there any questions regarding the written updates? This applies for items 6, 7, 8, and 9. Okay, I see no hands up. With that, I'll move to item 10, that is the update on the ccNSO website redesign. And for this, may I ask Kim to give us a brief update?

KIM CARLSON:

Sure. Hi, all. Just a few updates from the team. The site audit continues. Again, there are several policy folks and contractors who are providing this service. Bart and I and Alejandra continue to handle the escalations in the consultations. As of today, the last time I looked, there are just 118 items left to audit. The auditing has slowed down in the last few weeks based on some of the complexity of the content and the availability of the auditors with ICANN 77 just happening recently.

The next steps will be to begin authoring the front-end requirements. And this is going to happen in early August. Early estimates will be two months or so for that. And during this time, the expectations will be weekly meetings with staff and either a community liaison or the planning team or a combination of all of that. The Org team has looked at the future site and requirements and determined from a development standpoint, there are features and functionalities that have already been designed and developed from the ICANN Org site. So, a lot of that will be repurposed for the ccNSO site. And they'll use as many of these as possible for the new site. And I'll put some examples in the chat here of things that they'll repurpose for the ccNSO site.

And once the requirements are completed, we move on to the design the wireframe and mockups phase. Again, everything is moving forward, but taking the necessary time to make sure it's done the correct way. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Kim. So excited to see that we are moving forward with this. I see Stephen, you have your hand up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Kimberly, as you know from my rant yesterday or the other day or today, I don't remember when, regarding the delegation, redelegation working group notes, the bulk of it's gone down the rabbit hole. And I'd like to see it come back out of the rabbit hole and back on the website at the end of the day.

With regards to the correspondence, historical correspondence between the ccNSO and ICANN Org, I am happy to continue that [inaudible] chase, shall we say, to try to get that all documented. But the delegation, redelegation stuff really has me concerned. And it's yet another example of how we need to like really dig and dig and dig deeper and get the stuff back. Thank you.

KIM CARLSON: And Stephen, I do have a weekly call with the ITP team. And if you could send me an email with some of your concerns, then I'll bring it up with the team next time we meet. Thanks.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, happy to do so, Kim.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Excellent. So with that, let's move to the next item. So moving to item 11, we have update from the Chair, Vice Chairs, Councilors, Regional Organizations and Secretariat. I do have some updates. As you are aware, we cancelled the podcast that was requested from us because it was around individual ccTLDs. Also, there was a planning call with the SOs and ACs regarding the ICANN 78. It will include the celebration of ICANN's 25th anniversary and also a session with ccNSO, GNSO and ALAC joint 20th anniversary. The block schedule has also been shared. I'm just going to give you a pre-warning that it has impacted the planning of the schedule, but we will take a further look and more details when we reach item 22, that is the ICANN 78. With this, are there any updates from Vice Chairs, Councilors, Regional Organizations or the Secretariat? I don't see any hands up. And Jordan noted in the chat, nothing from you. Thank you.

So with this, now we move to the next section of the agenda. It's the administrative decisions. These are the ones that are effective upon publication of the resolutions. And we are in item 12. So this is the application for ccNSO membership by the ccTLD manager of the QA, that's Qatar, the Communications Regulatory Authority. Are there any comments or questions regarding this topic? Okay. I don't see any comments or questions, but I am going to ask now for a mover and a seconder. And I have Stephen in the chat to move. May I have a seconder? And Pablo seconds, the same way as Stephen did. I see. So with that, let me read the decision that we have in front of us. The Communications Regulatory Authority ccTLD manager for .QA applied for membership of the ccNSO, the ccNSO Council approves the application and welcomes the Communications Regulatory Authority of

Qatar as member 176 of the ccNSO. The Secretariat is requested to publish this decision as soon as possible. This decision becomes effective upon publication. Any comments or questions regarding the resolution? Okay. I see no hands up. So let's move to the vote. So please, this is only for councilors. So use your green ticks if you're in favor or your red crosses if you object or abstain. Okay, I'm going through the list. I see only green ticks. Thank you all. Thank you very much. You may lower them down. And just for good measure, is anyone objecting or abstaining? I see none. So this has been approved and congratulations. We have yet another member.

Let's move forward with item 13. We have appointments to working groups and committees and we have a decision here to appoint to the TLD Ops. We have Angela Matlapeng, [Nicholas Bousset and Josh Simpson] as members for this standing committee. Are there any questions regarding topic itself? And it's noted in the chat that the names will be fully added to the minutes. No comments? Okay. So may I have a mover? Very well, Pablo. And I see Tatiana has her hand up. I'm guessing seconding?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, absolutely.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Tatiana. So with this, we have a decision and it says at the nomination of the TLD Ops Standing Committee, the following persons are appointed as members of TLD Ops Committee. Angela Matlapeng, [Nicholas Bousset and Josh Simpson.] The secretariat is requested to

inform the candidates and TLD Ops Committee and publish the decision as soon as possible. This decision becomes effective upon publication. Any comments or questions on the resolution? And we have a typo that we will fix. Okay. I see no comments. If so, then please use your green ticks if you're in favor and your red crosses if you object or abstain. So I see all green ticks. Thank you very much. And just for good measure, I will ask if anyone is objecting or abstaining. I see no hands. So this has been approved and thank you very much to Angela, Nicholas and Josh for stepping forward to the TLD Ops.

With this, we have item 14. It's update, if any, regarding Council, board and CSC calls for expression of interest. For the CSC calls for expression of interest, may I ask Kim if there is any update?

KIM CARLSON:

No real updates. The council has until Monday to send me their selections or their preferences. I've only received five. So I'll send out another reminder, but if you could send those, that would be great. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Kim. So please do send your preference as soon as possible. Jordan, you have your hand up.

JORDAN CARTER:

Yeah. Hi, everyone. It's just a bit of a comment on the decision process, which I think might be one we need to take a look at. We get the papers, we get the CVs, and we're all meant to make an individual

decision without any collective discussion. Of course, all our discussions are recorded and published. So it's a little bit awkward to talk about any individual candidate. But it's also awkward for me if I don't know any of the candidates and don't have the chance to discuss it with council members. So I don't know how we can fix that tension. But I think maybe it's something we should talk about at a meeting in the future. So I just wanted to say that now, so we can make the best possible appointment decisions. I think that comes from nice individual scrutiny of the information provided and a bit of sharing of perspectives between us as the appointing body. Something for next time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, Jordan. Noted. And we shall discuss on how to improve this. And I see that Chris is also in agreement that we will definitely seek for a way to make this a better process. And Pablo as well. And I see Chris suggested that maybe a discussion in camera will be a way forward. Yes, definitely. Thank you. Any other comments regarding this? If not, then may I ask Joke to give us an update regarding the board and council processes?

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Hi, happy to do so. So let's start with the board nominations. You might have seen that the board nominations kicked off earlier this week. That was slightly later than originally foreseen due to an oversight from my end. So apologies for that. The timeline was adjusted. So the later start time also means that the timeline for the closing date of the nominations has been moved up slightly as well. Further, there is no

impact on the overall timeline. The updated one has been circulated to both the ccNSO members and council mailing lists. And the call for nominations has been published.

To date, we have received several nominations as accompaniments for one candidate. Katrina had—her first term will end soon. And that is the position where the call for nominations is currently being launched for. All the details and etc. have been published on the website. And deadline for council to appoint the candidate is the 26th of April to 2024. The timeline foresees time for the due diligence verifications to be conducted. And also for a question and answer session at ICANN 78 plus potential elections, not potential elections, for sure, there will be a vote after ICANN 78 starting in November. Details regarding the election itself will be made available then closer to the election time. That in terms of the ICANN board seat 12 nomination. If there are any questions, I'm happy to answer them now before I go to the council procedure.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Any questions for Joke? I don't see any hands Joke, so you may continue.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Okay, thank you. So regarding the council, there will also be a term end of five councilors at ICANN 79. That is in March 2024 at the end of that meeting. In order to fill the vacancies, there will be a call for nominations, which starts in September. There will also be a webinar in September. Time and date still needs to be confirmed. But the idea is to

promote the call for nominations and also to give information to potential candidates that might be interested in joining the ccNSO council. The elections will only happen if there's more than one candidate per region. And those elections will also start after ICANN 78 when the ccNSO members have an opportunity to participate in a question and answer session with those candidates. That's it regarding the council procedure. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much. Any comments or questions for Joke? I don't see any hands up. So thank you very much. We've these now we are moving to the next section of the agenda that is the discussion and decision if needed on the ccNSO. These resolutions are effective after seven days of their publication.

So on item 15, we have the adoption guideline of the ccNSO statement of interest and conflict of interest procedures. And for these may I ask Sean to introduce this topic?

SEAN COPELAND:

So as you know, when I started to become a councilor, this was one of the items that was on my list on the GRC side. Went through a process a little over a year ago, it kind of really all came together in the Hague. And before you now, after going through the whole entire process, which I learned is very long, longer than I had anticipated, before you is the final, the final guideline, both the statement of interest as introduced to the community, which will be light, lightweight, but easily usable. And of course, the conflict of interest for my fellow councilors

myself, which will be a little bit more in depth. And the hope is that this is a guideline that will alleviate any concerns going forward in the future and improve our transparency. I'm not sure if I need to read the draft resolution itself, if Alejandra would like me to do that. But I would appreciate, of course, your support for this. And as is my way with anything from the GRC, I will abstain from the vote.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay, thank you very much, Sean. But before we go to the resolution, we need comments and questions regarding the topic. Are there any questions or comments regarding this topic? I don't see any hands. And now we need a mover and a seconder. So I see Pablo moves. And who can second? I see Jordan seconds. Thank you. I see your hand, Irina. I think it was for secondment, right? But I saw Jordan in camera. So with this, yes, now we have a draft resolution. So if you would like to read it, Sean?

SEAN COPELAND:

Sure. I don't have my glasses on because I'm actually really hot with the AC. So my glasses are steaming up. So don't mind me. At the request of the ccNSO Council and the ccNSO Guideline Review Committee, GRC looked into the value for the ccNSO to introduce a conflict of interest and/or statement of interest procedure for the ccNSO. After an extensive discussion and consultation of the ccNSO membership, starting at the Hague meeting, ICANN 74, the GRC proposed to introduce a statement of interest procedure for participants in ccNSO working groups, committees and council. The GRC also proposes to

introduce a lightweight conflict of interest procedure specifically and only for council members, given that the decisions they have at times have to take, sorry if I screwed that up, guys. This conflict of interest procedure builds and is added to the general statement of interest procedure. In preparing this guideline, the GRC has consulted the council and members extensively as meetings and online, and the GRC noted that there's general support for the introduction of the statement of interest and conflict of interest procedures. So with that, can I ask for somebody to move, second, vote?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: That's already done. Thank you. So we now go to the decision. And are you going to continue, Sean, or shall I?

SEAN COPELAND: You go ahead. I cannot see my screen anymore.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, let me do it. So the decision is that the ccNSO council adopts the guideline of the ccNSO statement of interest and conflict of interest procedure as circulated to council on the 28th of June 2023. The secretariat is requested to publish this decision as soon as possible and inform the ccNSO community of publication of the decision. This decision becomes effective seven days after publication. After the decision becomes effective, the secretariat is requested to implement the procedure as soon as possible and report to council on progress of the implementation at the council's regular meetings. After the

procedure is properly implemented, the procedure shall apply only to new working groups, committees, and other groups, and to newly appointed members of already existing groups. Existing groups are invited to apply the procedure voluntarily to all members. Finally, the council wishes to express its gratitude to the GRC for its hard work and perseverance on bringing this topic to a close.

Any comments or questions on the resolution? I see no hands up. So with that, we go to the vote. So use your green ticks if you're in favor, your red crosses if you object or abstain, and I've heard that Sean said he would abstain, so that's noted. And I see only green ticks. Thank you very much. For good measure, I will ask if anybody else besides Sean is abstaining or objecting. I don't see any hands up, so thank you very much. This has been approved, and it has been a long journey, but now it is a reality. Thank you.

With that, we move to item 16, and it is the adoption of the terms of reference for the ccNSO universal acceptance group and for a call for volunteers. So we review the proposed terms of reference for this new committee. The suggestions are included in the version that was submitted for adoption by council. And assuming that we adopt these terms of reference, the council will be asked to launch a call for expression of interest. Any comments, questions regarding the topic? I don't see any hands up, so may I have a mover? I see Biyi's hand up for moving. And Pablo seconds, I guess. Irina, your hand comes late. Next time. Thank you.

So with this, we have a decision in front of us, so I will just go to the part of the decision. It's the ccNSO council adopts the terms of reference as

submitted to the council on the 13th of July, 2023. Further, the ccNSO requests the secretary to launch a call for volunteers after this decision has become effective. Once this resolution is effective, the ccNSO council UA ad-hoc group is closed, and the ccNSO council wants to thank the members of this ad-hoc group for their hard work. And the secretary is requested to publish this resolution as soon as possible, and this resolution becomes effective seven days after publication.

Any comments or questions regarding the resolution? I don't see any hands up, so let's go to the vote. So please use your green ticks if you're in favor, or your red crosses if you object or abstain. Going through the list, I see only green ticks. Thank you very much. For good measure, is anyone objecting or abstaining? Okay, I don't see any hands, so these have been approved. Thank you all.

And now we go to item 17, and this is the kickoff of the OISC review. And I know that this has come up in several council calls, and you may be wondering why are we talking about this again, but the thing is that we adopted the review template and the team that was going to do this in November of 2022, so it's been a while, and I suggest that we reconfirm if we are still on board with this. So for this, we have Ai-Chin, Ali, Olga and Nick as the team to do the review. So are there any questions or comments regarding this particular topic?

Okay, I don't see any, so may I have a mover? I see Pablo's hand, thank you. And may I have a seconder? I see Irina. Yay! Thank you, Irina. You may use your camera as well since I'm seeing you. Okay, so with that, we have a resolution. The decision is that the decision of council reconfirms the appointment of Ai-Chin, Ali, Olga and Nick as the team to

review the terms of reference and effectiveness of the OISC and reconfirms the adoption of the template for the review of the OISC. The team is requested to commence its work as soon as possible and inform the council regularly of its progress. The secretariat is requested to publish this resolution as soon as possible and this decision becomes effective seven days after publication. Any comments or questions on the resolution?

I don't see any hands up, so let's go for the vote. So please use your green ticks if you're in favor or your red crosses if you object or abstain. Okay, I see only green ticks. Thank you. Thank you all. For good measure, is anyone objecting or abstaining? I don't see any hands, so we have approved this. So please, let's have this team start its work really as soon as possible. We know it can be done after seven days, but still, let's get it done.

Okay, with that, we arrive to item 18. This is the new topic. It is the discussion on the letter from Kim Davies. So with this, let me give you all a little bit of background. In Washington, Biyi, Jordan and myself were approached by Kim Davies. He informed us about this situation with .LB. We discussed various ways if and how to involve the ccNSO and we concluded that this letter was the optimal way forward. We felt that the ccNSO should not be involved in individual cases, but at the same time, we noted the lack of clarity in the process for these particular circumstances.

So this time, we reached out to Kim to see if he would be available for this meeting, but unfortunately, at such short notice, he was not. So going forward, we have a range of options on how to react from the

minimum of acknowledgement of the receipt of the letter, to inform the community and have a discussion with the community, to launch a second framework of interpretation, even to launch a policy development process to fill in the gaps. But before taking any further steps, I would like to hear your views, and I see that Stephen has already his hand up. So please Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Alejandra, for the floor. I do have some remarks on the .LB ccTLD topic. As I suspect is the case with all of you on council, I did not become aware of the situation regarding .LB until I saw the correspondence from IANA to Alejandra, which was published on the ICANN website a mere week ago. I might want to point out that the core of almost all ccNSO policy development to date has been focused on the issues of revocation and transfer and management of a ccTLD, which is what we're seeing here.

I've been extensively involved with the issues of the revocation and transfer of ccTLDs for over 10 years now. With the review mechanism policy now under consideration by the ICANN board, we were, I thought, close to the finish line on this topic. But based only on the letter dated 13 July from IANA to Alejandra with regards to actions that Kim Davies took with regards to .LB, it is my opinion, after a lot of consideration and trying to come up with a lot of rationales, that he acted appropriately. He took an action that goes to the core of IANA's responsibility, which at the end of the day is to ensure the stability of the internet, full stop. So good for him on that.

I was initially curious, however, how Kim was not able to work with Lebanon's GAC member, sort of a successor to AUB as a day-to-day registry operator. But based on further information received from ICANN Org sources, I'm convinced that he did and continues to really try to do his best to sort this matter out. And I think he's really respectful of what we've been trying to do with policy development over the last 10 years.

Unfortunately, I think it is likely that we may well have to initiate another PDP process to develop policy regarding how IANA should actually transfer a ccTLD under their, what I would describe as "temporary" management to a competent in-country or in-territory entity.

Based on my discussions with my sources within ICANN Org, I think there are also a couple of other policy gaps that we should consider and perhaps incorporate them under a new PDP initiative, as much I really hate to suggest that.

Given that, I also want to briefly touch on the topic of transparency on the part of our chair, whom I hold in the highest personal respect. It's clear from the published correspondence that there was a meeting between IANA and our council chair, and it appears also our vice chairs, at ICANN 77 regarding the .LB situation.

To my knowledge, I am not aware that the ccNSO council was advised of nor consulted regarding this extremely sensitive matter. And frankly, I just find this development extremely disappointing. I do not see where in any documented roles and responsibilities that the chair's

authorization to make any agreements with IANA, whether formal, informal, without consultation with the council.

And thus, I feel that we as council should have been advised of this situation whilst it was unfolding. And with that, I thank you and I yield. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Stephen. And just to address that part in particular, we were informed of what was going to happen. So we didn't take part in any specific decision on how to handle the situation, but only on how it would be nice to, or well, not nice, but how the ccNSO should be informed about this. And that's when we suggested that this letter was going to make that particular step in bringing this to the council. So that was what happened. And we were hoping to receive this letter sooner rather than later. But again, we don't know people's agendas and why they take the time that they take. So I just want to clarify that. And with that, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

Thank you, Alejandra. I absolutely agree with Stephen. However, my comment is more on the importance of developing policy to take care of situations similar as the one of LB, situations similar as those when the CEO dies, as it happened with [VI and .PR.] And also, what if for whatever reasons, an operator becomes impaired for whatever reasons, physical or mental diseases or whatever.

So I think this is very important to not only handle it from the perspective of that LB, but also from the perspective of what happens when somebody dies suddenly and we don't have, there isn't any paperwork to follow, any guidance, or what happens if something happens to the operator immediately. And again, we don't have any guidance. The operator hasn't any testament or guidance or anything of how to proceed. I think this is important to include as well. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks Alejandra. I'll just also offer a comment on the point that Stephen made about the process. I think as a leadership group, we will always meet with someone if they have concerns to raise with us and that that's the right thing to do. There were no decisions engaged and all that Kim told us was that he was going to be doing what he was going to be doing and that he would write to tell us so. So there was no decision, there was no discretion, there was no doing things along the sidelines. And as Alejandra had said, the indication was that this letter would come quite quickly. And it's just taken a bit longer. So I'm sorry about that. I guess we could have given the list an informal heads up and that would have been probably fine as well. But we just kept thinking the letter would arrive. So that's that.

On the broader point, though, I think this does show a gap in the global policy framework. And if the ccNSO has a responsibility, it is to be the stewards of the global policy framework that applies to IANA's dealing

with ccTLD matters. And something that I haven't seen done for a while, or ever, I don't know if it's been done, is a kind of gap analysis of the global policy framework. In other words, are there certain sorts of scenarios where if they happened, we would find that there were other policy gaps besides this one? I think this one is obviously a gap. There might be other ones that we should probably make ourselves aware of and decide with how to deal, whether it's through an FOI type approach or a PDP type approach.

So I think one of the things that we should follow up from this is not just dealing with a specific case through a specific narrowly scoped PDP, but some kind of a piece of work that sought feedback from our communities, that sought feedback from the IANA functions operator, from ICANN, from the Secretariat, to see what other, if any, gaps people think there are, and in what order might we choose to solve those gaps, and through what means might we solve those gaps? Because there isn't anyone else in the world responsible for answering those questions except the ccNSO. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Jordan. Chris? Chris, I cannot hear you. Thank you, Chris. I see in the chat that we should move on while you try to fix it. But here, okay, before I continue, are there any other—I see Stephen has his hand up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

I would like to appreciate both Pablo's and Jordan's comments. And again, I don't mean anything disparagingly personal to you as chair. I

have a little better background now on that. Thank you, Jordan, for explaining that. My sources tell me that we have a cooperative partner in IANA. Kim needs some help, not only on this issue, but on several other issues. And as much as I said earlier in my remarks that, oh my gosh, not another PDP, I think we're going to have to go down that path and kind of figure out, in cooperation with IANA, what holes do they see that they need some policy guidance on, as well as this obvious one that's thrown itself in our face. And I think we're going to have to proceed from there. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Stephen. And no worries, no hard feelings here. I'm glad that this was clarified. Chris, if you find it that your mic is on, just let me know. So with this, what I hear is that we actually need to do something. And what I would suggest, since of what we discussed, we see that there's some gap analysis needed that might require either a framework of interpretation or a policy development process. So maybe for—oh, Chris, let's see if you have your microphone.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you. I just wanted to say a couple of things very briefly. So first of all, I agree that Kim did the right thing. Secondly, I think it's entirely appropriate for Kim to reach out to the leadership of the council. These matters are delicate political matters. And if it was my ccTLD, I would probably be quite comfortable and happy for a very small number of people to be contacted to make sure that the next step was the right step. And thirdly, I agree that a gap analysis is probably a very sensible

thing to do. And fourthly, yes, it may be that a policy development process or some form of work to figure out what to do next is necessary. And I think we just all need to be very careful and remember that each of these, when it comes to this particular level of stuff, the different political environments and the different jurisdictions are very complicated and very difficult to deal with. And it may be that an overarching policy is the right thing. But it also may be that some form of flexibility is necessary in order to ensure that the policy itself isn't self-defeating. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you. Thank you, Chris. So with this, I think that the next steps might be to send a letter in reply to Kim's letter, just to close that loop and maybe mention in the letter that we will discuss this matter further and hopefully during our September meeting. And for this, may I ask for a small group to prepare a discussion on this topic for the September meeting? May I have any volunteers now? I see Sean. Jordan, Pablo, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I volunteer. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Molehe, Nick. And Jordan? Or are those hands up? Okay. And Stephen. Okay. So thank you all. So please take your time and take this on and we will continue to further discuss it in September. In the meantime, we'll

reply to Kim to his letter. So thank you all. Kimberly is checking in the chat if she has all the names. Please help her to gather them.

With that, I will continue to item 19. And it is introducing the GRC proposal on implementation outline. And for this, may I ask Sean to introduce it for us?

SEAN COPELAND:

Howdy. So background for you guys. As you know, we've had a couple PDPs on the retirement side go through. And there was sort of a what next event, what happens next. So this led to a document that we started working on, I'm going to say in the fall, I could be off. And through a consultation with the GNSO, people within staff, and a lot of discussion within the GRC, which I know a number of you guys are on. We arrived at what would be a lightweight framework, if you will, for PDPs to be monitored during the implementation, and how council can perhaps look at and evaluate and make adjustments without having to be too structured in stone.

There's two parts to this. There is the actual policy itself, and I hope that you guys have read it. And then there is the background, which is a little bit meatier, a little bit more complex, and perhaps not as easy to read. But I think it's important for the two documents to be together, just so that the thought process of the GRC membership went throughout the time is available in the future.

I do think it will run fairly well on the PDP3 stuff. As PDP4 comes along, I think that's where we'll get a real test of if we have done this correctly. Because of the nature of PDP4 being mostly non English speaking

members of the community. So that will be the real test. And of course, in light of Kim's letter earlier in item 18, and the gap analysis that could lead to further PDPs, do consider what we put here before you as being hopefully a very workable model for implementing and monitoring the work that is done. Back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you very much, Sean. So please, if you have any comments on this, let the GRC know. And I wonder if there's any other comments on this topic. I see Jordan, the proposal is not in the wiki yet. It will get there. Or if not, it will be circulated. Thank you, Jordan.

With that, okay, I see that we still have some time. So we will continue with items 20 and 21. So with item 20, it's the update on the councilors 360 review and next review process. This still is pending on review. As we spoke the other day, we need to review the questions themselves and the quantity of them. But also, we need to review the frequency of the feedback. As it is stated, the review should happen one year after a councilor take their seat and at and six months before the end of their term. So this will be done. And we will discuss it either online or at the latest at September council meeting. So this is just for update.

And then we have item 21. It's the update and review of the ccNSO appointees to other groups. The small group that has been reviewing the roles and responsibilities for councilors is also reviewing these appointments. We met this week to have a look at this. Progress has been made. But we still need to add a little bit of information regarding skill set requirements and to understand some roles that might be

needed in the future that it would be nice to have them listed already just not to start this process again when we need them. So these will be coming as well.

And with that, I will move to item 22. It's the ICANN 78. Sorry, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah, just as an FYI for the small group and the councilors. Today the DNS abuse standing committee met and one of the future roles which is not included yet they discussed was a potential liaison with the Registry Stakeholder Group. So don't be surprised if you see this forthcoming, because if you think about it, there is a lot of cooperation already going on between the ccNSO and the Registry Stakeholder Group. So it might be also formalized something like a liaison with the registry stakeholder group as well. So that will be raised when the little group meets and for the council. Don't be surprised. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you. So with that, now we are moving to item 22. That is the ICANN 78. So for this, may I ask Kim to display the current draft that we have for the ccNSO schedule for ICANN 78?

So again, this is the first initial draft. This is still moving pieces. It's very fresh. So don't take it as set in stone yet. But this was made with the shared block schedule that we got on the SO/AC planning call. And the things that I want to draw your attention to is that we will have different time slots in different days. So this was to accommodate certain activities. As I told you, like the anniversary 25th anniversary

session, the joint ALAC, ccNSO, GNSO anniversary plenary and other things. So one day on Tuesday, we will start a little earlier at 8:30. And again, this is the first schedule. It might change. So don't take it as the last view of it. But we think it might stay like this. We just don't know.

But for this, there are several things that we need to discuss. And one of them is the joint sessions that we may have. So a meeting with the board, it's already scheduled. ICANN board and ccNSO, remember that we agreed that we would have these joint meetings on the AGM. So for this, and for any other joint sessions that we think we need, I would ask you if you have any topics that you see that we should discuss.

So we have the meeting with the full board. There's a question whether we should have a meeting with the GNSO council as well, or with the ALAC or with the GAC. So any thoughts already? Okay, I don't see any hands up yet. So we can of course have these thoughts on the mailing list as well. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Probably should have a chat with the GNSO. It's been a while.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And what topics do you think we should address?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: They're about to engage in yet another round of new gTLD round as best I can tell from what I've been observing. And that might be of consequence to us. Certainly consequence to them. And of course, I'm

always open to a discussion with the board. I really think we should be discussing having a meeting with the board every meeting that we can. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: One of the things I think would be useful to exchange with the other SOs and ACs is the ICANN's positioning going into the Global Digital Compact and the WSIS+20 review, which are big external things that could shape the internet governance environment that we're part of. I see with great joy that there are two sessions proposed in this block schedule about that topic with the IGLC. And I think that it's something that will probably come up at the SO/AC chairs roundtable as well on the Saturday. So I think that would be something that we could talk about both with the board and with the GNSO and with the ALAC. And with anyone else who wants to talk about it. And also, if we do by October have a view that we have got a gap analysis to do or to be doing about the CC policy framework, it might be good to tell them that. Because presumably, they'll have—at least the ALAC level some kind of interest in engaging with such process. And the GNSO might have some tips about how to do it. So that's just a few thoughts from me about those joint meetings. It feels like a long time since we've done them in person. So good to do even if it's just a general discussion.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. Yes, the last time we were with the GNSO was in Cancun. And we had a very short brief session, but noted the topics, Jordan. Some other topics that we may consider are all these pilot changes that have been up for public comment, how to improve the processes. And the reviews, for example, that the IFRT, the CSC review, the holistic review, all these things can be discussed with Board and with the other, with the GNSO as well. So we have some topics there. And I don't see any more hands up now, but I'll maybe send an email to the mailing list to discuss these topics. And if we find many, then we can set up the joint sessions. We have a tentative joint session with the GNSO on Monday, and the ICANN Board and ccNSO on Tuesday. And for the ALAC and the GAC, we shall see in the mailing list if we have any topics to discuss.

Also, here in the block schedule, there are two things to be noted. Both of them happen on Sunday. First, we will have the SOPC workshop, where the SOPC will discuss to identify ccNSO priorities in ICANN's planning. So we should participate on that. And we will have also the council workshop, where we, oh, before I go to that, I see Irina has her hand up. So, Irina?

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you very much, Alejandra, for mentioning the SOPC and council meeting. It is actually on Saturday. It's marked as SOPC and council chairs. And the Sunday meeting is intended for SOPC to discuss the outcomes of these Saturday meetings and plans forward. But definitely, everyone is very welcome to attend. But yes, on Saturday, we as SOPC are looking forward to guidance on the priorities which we should take

into account during their next budget public comment cycle, which will start December and will include both ICANN and PTI plans and budgets coming together. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Irina. So that's, again, on Saturday. And the ccNSO council workshop, it is on Sunday. And in the council workshop, we will do a tabletop exercise together with the GRC on the rejection action and approval action procedures, because we need to be reminded of such procedures and aware of how to deal with those, which might be happening soon. So be prepared for that. That's something that we will do.

And also for this, as you can see, it's a very packed agenda already. Again, nothing is still set in stone. But considering that this could be the agenda, may I suggest that we do a virtual council prep call before the ICANN meeting? Maybe do it already, set it already for the 12th of October at 12:00 UTC. That's, if I'm not mistaken, two weeks prior to the meeting, to the council meeting. So with this, we don't have to pack everything in person. Because we are all scattered in several working groups. And also we have two workshops already. So I see Jordan's hand up. Yes, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

Just 12th of October is the last day of the Internet Governance Forum in Kyoto. So I think that might affect a few of us. I think 12:00 UTC, honestly, I can't work it out in my head. I suspect it's probably in the evening. So that just might be an issue. I know that we'll obviously try

and make it if we can. I don't know what time it'll be in Japan. If someone does, let me know. 12:00, you're talking midday UTC, weren't you Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, exactly. I don't know also the time that it would be right now.

JORDAN CARTER: I suspect it's about 9:00 PM the same day.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So do you think it's doable?

JORDAN CARTER: It just means that people won't be able to go to a closing cocktail for too long. I think that's fine. Yeah. Unless people are flying out on the evening that it finishes. I don't know how many of us that affects. I might be the only one.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Why don't we just then take this to the mailing list to see how many can actually, how many are affected by this. And if not, again, this meeting will be recorded. And if not, we will find a more suitable day and time. But thank you for letting us know, Jordan.

Okay. So with that, another thing to see here in the schedule is that we will try to have our usual council meeting on Thursday. And I believe

that's it. Ah, well, and we have our last anniversary celebration session on Tuesday at the end of the day, right before going to the networking event. So those are the main things to be taken into consideration for now. So are there any other comments or questions regarding the block schedule? I don't see any hands up. So with that, I think we're done with this item. So thank you, Kim, for sharing the draft schedule. And now we go back to the agenda. Yes. Thank you.

So with that, do we have any other business? I don't see any hands up. I don't have any. With this, just for the record, let's note that the August meeting has been canceled. So we will see each other again on the 21st of September at 18:00 UTC. And with this, the council meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much for attending and see you soon. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]