ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much and welcome to the ccNSO Council meeting 200. What a milestone. So today is the 16th of November and it's noon UTC. So, before I continue and just some checks, please to all Councilors, please add ccNSO Council to your ID in Zoom so it's easier for us to keep track on voting. As usual, I'm going to paste now in the chat the wiki for today's call where the documents are compiled. I do note that Stephen has requested some time for AOB. So, does anybody else would like to have an AOB so I know now? If not, I will ask at the end anyway. Okay, I don't see any hands. With this, may I ask Kim if we are quorate?

KIM CARLSON: Hi Alejandra, yes, this call is quorate. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. And moving along. Does any Councilor have any material change that we need to be aware of or conflict of interest? I know this is a new question but I just wanted to test it out. Since we agreed to have now the Statement of Interest, we approved the guideline, and we know that we have the template now available for us to fill our Statement of Interest. You have it in the agenda. So, please, if possible, I would like you to fill it in, so we can start using the procedures that we set forward for this. It is a good idea that the Council is the one that sets the example for the rest of the community. I know that in other working groups, it's been already being shared and distributed. But in any case, it is something that it would be important for us to do. So please, as soon as possible, to fill it in. And now, every

time we have a Council meeting, I will ask the question that I did before, so we are compliant with the guideline. Are there any questions on this topic? I see none.

Okay, so let's move forward. Let's start with the administrative matters. We have the relevant correspondence that we will discuss during the meeting. We have minutes and action items. Unfortunately, the transcript from last meeting is not available yet. As you know, when we have Council meetings and ICANN meetings, we use the transcript for the minutes and for the action items. But we have a list of action items, and several are completed and some are ongoing. The ones that are ongoing, I would like to bring your attention to the item 199, number 8. That's the ccNSO leadership conversation with registry stakeholder group leadership on exchange of liaisons. So, we are still pending on having a conversation with the registry stakeholder leadership on this regard. But maybe it would be a good idea to have this conversation jointly with some of the community members that we know are already active in that particular area. For example, Chris or Nick, or even David McCauley. If that's a good idea, please let me know. Do you agree this is a good thing to do? If so, you can put a green tick, or if you don't, then a red cross in Zoom. Okay. I see several green ticks. They're in reactions below, where it says share screen, then reactions, there's like an emoji face. There you are. Okay, good. So this was a good exercise as well for the following of the agenda. Well, you may lower them down now. Thank you all for the support.

With this, also we have ongoing the liaison to GAC to follow up regarding virtual joint meeting. As you may know, the GAC had the change of leadership during ICANN 78. With this, my suggestion would

be to reach again to the chair of the GAC and to establish again a person that he considers to be the one that would be best to liaise with us regarding agenda, to continue the conversation, because before it was Par Brumark, and he is no longer a vice chair, so maybe his role has changed. We just don't know. We need to confirm this. So I will reach out to the chair and see what are the best steps forward. With this, any questions or comments regarding the action item? Okay, I don't see any hands up.

Now we move forward to item four, it's intermitting decision. Since our last meeting, we had the decision to support the fundamental bylaw change. The letter was sent yesterday to the ECA, and today it's the last day for submitting the votes of the decisional participants. And then the other decision we made was the decision on the participants of the leadership program. As you saw in the mailing list, they were selected, they were already appointed, and everything is moving forward with that. So congratulations to the members that are going to participate this time. I hope you enjoy it and take advantage of it.

Next item is intermitting decision on the triage committee, and I wonder whether Jordan would like to say anything about this?

JORDAN CARTER: Just very briefly, Alejandra, that most of the recommendations record decisions that council has already made, or that are on the agenda for this meeting. We continue to document them in one place so that there's a comprehensive record of the various things that come through so you can find that spreadsheet at any time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you, Jordan. Any questions or comments so far? I don't see any hands up, so let's move to the update. Oh, yes, Joke?

JOKE BRAEKEN: I just wanted to write in the chat that the online tracker on the ccNSO website, where you can keep track of the triage recommendations, will be updated in the next 24 hours. And I will also add a link to the quarterly update of the activity tracker for the ccNSO. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Joke. So, moving along, we have the updates. And unless there is any special point to be made, or are there any questions, I would like not to spend too much time here, because these are all written updates, and they've been shared. So, we have update ID and ccPDP, update on ECA and CSC, and updates on the working groups and on the liaison. Any questions, comments? Okay, I don't see any hands up. Then let's move on.

                        We have item 10, it's the update on the OISC review. Nick or Kim, is there any updates to be provided now?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Not since the meeting in Hamburg.

KIM CARLSON:	Nick, did you want to do a quick overview of the meeting in Hamburg since the Council hasn't met since then?
NICK WENBAN-SMITH:	Okay. So, yeah, we did meet with the OISC members, because we wanted to obviously have a... we had our own, I guess, impressions from the documents, but we wanted to hear verbally from the members of the committee what went well, what wasn't going so well. Yeah, frankly, at the review point, like I said, in Hamburg, there's sort of three options in terms of the review. You know, we can review the committee and decide that it's going fantastically as it's currently set up and for it to continue with its charter and activities as they are. We could decide that there's some elements of the thing, particularly outreach and mentoring, I think we've decided, I think were very valuable. Perhaps the charter for OIC could be refined or made more focused on a couple of specific activities which were found to be very high value, and that other activities which are within the charter actually are also overlapping with other activities and other different groups over the course of time. So essentially continue but with a refined focus, or we could decide that essentially the OISC should be kind of terminated, its work was finished and the activities were continuing elsewhere and the other working groups or activities of the council. I think everyone knows my opinions around the real pinch points, I guess the bottleneck on activities, being the capacity of volunteers, and we must be kind to our volunteers and if activities are continuing or there are committees ongoing, where we don't see the value that it's our obligation almost to make sure that we do our best for our volunteers to focus them on the areas which are best for the community and bearing in mind the

resource constraint of the of the volunteer capacity at all times. So those are the three options, and I talked about it quite frankly, we had a really nice exchange. We will be continuing with that review and coming to, I think, some written conclusions for council. I think that's it, like I said, in Hamburg, that's why we had the meeting with the Standing Committee members because we want to do it in partnership and with full understanding of all of their perspectives as we bring our recommendations forward. I mean, I think that's it, that's enough probably for now I think that's more or less what I said in Hamburg, it's all a bit of a blur. But if there's any questions, then please don't hesitate to ask.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Pablo has his hand up.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Hi, thank you all and greetings, good time of the day to all. More than a question I just want to publicly thank Nick and the rest of the team for an excellent meeting in Hamburg. Thank you for taking the time and listening with care to each one of us and taking all that into consideration. So that's basically what I wanted to say is just thank you and job well done.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: You thanked me too soon. But appreciate the sentiment. Thank you. Can you tell us where the next ICANN meeting is? I kind of can't remember.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: In the event that you don't know, and just for the newcomers to find out, the next ICANN meeting is going to be in Puerto Rico, and we can have more of these meetings with mojitos and piña coladas.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you for that and thank you Nick. Looking forward for the progress on this review, and hopefully we will hear back from you soon. With this, let's move forward with item 11, update on the ccNSO website redesign. Stephen, would you mind giving us an update, please?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Alejandra. With regards to the website, I would say we're making progress, but we're frankly not making the progress I'd hoped for. And really to that extent, it's pretty much my fault. We really got sidetracked by the Hamburg ICANN meeting. We were not able to pull off a face-to-face meeting there, which was unfortunate. But the AGM is just a marathon of overscheduling on all fronts, to say the least.

On positive notes, the Small Website Working Group has been meeting regularly. We've gone down this development path of personas. Basically, what we're trying to do is come up with theoretical people who might want to access the ccNSO website, and sort out what they might want to look for and why and how. This is all an attempting to formalize actual website requirements with ICANN IT, which we hope to do shortly. And I can hear everybody going, "What is this?" I too was a skeptic. I have to say, this is kind of fuzzy for me. It is actually proving to

be really interesting and useful. I knew nothing about this website development approach until a couple of months ago. But I think at the end of the day, we are going to get to a really useful website out of the effort with good requirements for the IT folks. And they seem to have a very good toolbox to build this thing once we get there. We're trying to schedule a meeting of the full Working Group early next week, but it's problematic here in the U.S., given it's also U.S. Thanksgiving week. So basically, we have two working days, Monday and Tuesday. And that's about it. I also would like to note that we're getting some ICANN staff persona input into the mix. So hopefully we can make things easier for our staff, for them going forward as well. Alejandra, I defer to you if you have any comments regarding the persona development approach, because I'm a newbie to it and you're not. But that's my focus. Alejandra, I yield the floor back to you. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Stephen. I think you made a very good summary. Are there any questions regarding this topic? Okay, I don't see any hands up. So let's move forward. Now we have the Item 12, the update of Chair, Vice Chairs, Councilors, Regional Organizations and Secretariat. And there are already two updates that I would like to bring to you. One is an invitation to meet with the Ombudsman Search Committee. This is a committee from the ICANN Board. This is a listening session. I believe it's very similar to what they did in the search for the CEO. We've been shared a draft of what they're looking for on the Ombudsman and they would like us to tell them a summary of what the community would like to see in this role. So I will most certainly be following up on email on this. But if you have any immediate thoughts on things that you would

like Biyi, Jordan and I to deliver to this committee regarding the Ombudsman role, we're all ears right now. Or I will send an email later to let you guys have a thought about it and then share your views. Yes, Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I mean, sorry, I'm just a sort of a perspective of somebody who looks in at ICANN sometimes with slightly rolled eyes and a bit of kind of curiosity or amazement that this thing exists. But has anyone actually used the Ombudsman service? Because whenever I've kind of gone past it, it always seems to be like an empty office. And I'm not really sure, like, how I don't know if there's any statistics about how much you get used and anything useful that comes out of it. Because I don't really have any insight at all to contribute at the moment.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. I don't have the information as enough statistics available, but I do know that it is being used. And I do see some hands up. So maybe they will either provide a little more information or that's something we should seek. Like, where are the statistics? Stephen first and Tatiana second.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Nick. Actually, it has been used and not just for maple cookies. But it does serve a very useful purpose within the org for mediating and defusing issues before they really blow up publicly. And

from that standpoint, I say it's a worthwhile effort. And I guess I'll leave it at that because I'm going to miss the maple cookies. Thank you. Bye.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, I just wanted to elaborate a bit into the direction of what Stephen said. First of all, yes, it has been used extensively as far as I know. And many issues that you're not aware about, Nick, because they never go publicly because they are being resolved via ombudsman. And perhaps in the ccNSO space, there is much less going on in terms of offensive communication and so on and so forth. But believe me, it's not the case in some other spaces. Not all spaces are so safe and friendly as this one. This is the first one about usability. But I would say that even if it has never been used, during the transition, there was accountability processes, you might remember. And the ombuds office and ombudsperson was a part of this. So it is just a part of ICANN structure. So I would say even if it's never been used, it's a necessary measure for accountability of the ICANN community and ICANN itself. So I think it's a very important office, even though I doubt many people in this space are ever going to turn there. I hope not. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Tatiana. Biyi?

BIYI OLADIPO: Yeah, just to add my voice to what everyone has said is that the reason a lot of people don't know that the ombudsman's office is used is because they get to deal with things before they actually blow up. It helps to resolve a lot of issues before it becomes open. We've had to use that service once. There was an issue that involved someone from Nigeria and also a gentleman from India who made a public statement on something that he shouldn't have. And the ombudsman called us outside and had a discussion with us and settled the issues before it got really messy. So it's been used and I think it's something that is needed in our community. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Biyi. And just to add to that, from the time I've been chair that it's not that long, I've been approached once by the ombudsman on a potential issue that in the end didn't develop. But still, it's something to put here in the statistics of the ccNSO. And I see that Jordan has put some statistics in the chat and also Bart has shared the ombudsman report. So please give it a thought. I will follow up on the mailing list to gather your input. And then we will let you know how it goes in this listening session. With that, Nick, I hope you're...

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, I was just going to type that's really useful background because it's something I have literally no interactional visibility of. So, but it sounds to me, yeah, we should get the list input, but it sounds like we should obviously support the continuation. And I don't suppose if it's working very well, that we want to particularly suggest any changes to

the current terms of reference from the sound of it, unless there's... Yeah, so a large number of complaints. I mean, it's interesting to know how many of them are upheld or, you know, but I agree that a mediated lower key resolution process, if there's that volume of complaints to stop them escalating is extremely valuable. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. So beware of the email and do please reply in the thread and let us know your thoughts. With that, I'm going to move to the other item that's already in the agenda is the SOAC leadership roundtable in Washington. As I told you in ICANN 78, we had an in-person roundtable and there was a proposal to have a more strategic workshop at the beginning of January in Washington, DC with the SOAC chairs. And this would be a two and a half day in-person meeting. So far, the topics proposed are around the roles and responsibilities of this group as a collective governance body, exchanging the views about strategic goals and priorities for the next five year strategic plan, presentation and initial feedback on uniform program management tools for each SOAC, collaborative discussion on shared priorities, for example, DNS abuse among others, and also how to coordinate and manage plan anticipated additional non-policy work like holistic review, continuous improvement, non-com rebalancing, etc. So those are the proposed topics that I shared also with you when I forwarded the minutes on the last roundtable meeting. With this, one more thing that the SOAC chairs meet monthly, and we had a brief discussion on other potential topics that we would like to bring to this strategic workshop. And one of them is the WSIS+20 coordination, since this is a topic that we heard a lot during ICANN78 and there is a coordination to be made.

So this is one of them. And after this particular item, if there is no objection, I would like to use it as a jump to that topic in the agenda that we have, that it's our last topic, since we have here Annaliese and Anil from the IGLC to talk about it. It's item 19. So if there are no objection on changing that item after this one, we will do that. Is that okay with everyone? Okay, I see thumbs up and nodding in the cameras. So before doing that, are there any comments to the updates I've given or are there any other updates from any other councilor or secretariat or regional organization? Okay, I see none.

So with that, let's jump to item 19. It is the role, if any, of the IGLC ccNSO Council and/or ccNSO with respect to the WSIS+20. So we had a very successful session organized by the IGLC on this topic. We had a discussion also with the ICANN board on the CEO goal number six, that it's related to this. And ICANN would play a coordinated role and ccTLDs could amplify the campaign style message that it's going to be developed somehow. This is what we still don't know how. So there, these are just two recent examples of activities gearing towards the WSIS+20, which affects us, the ccNSO and ccTLD community. And it will get more traction as we move forward to this event. So I would say that if we're not careful, it will end in a discussion on multilateral versus multi-stakeholder model. And it's something that we would not like it to get up to that point. So as the ccNSO is seen and perceived as the voice of the ccTLD community at a global level, I wonder what our role as council should be with respect to this topic. So do we have a role? Should we leave it up to the IGLC? What should we do? So I would like to start with that. If anyone has any comments. Okay. If not, maybe I

can ask Annaliese, Anil or Jordan to share your views regarding this topic and what the role should be for ccTLD or the ccNSO. Yes, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: I'm going to get the ball rolling and get through the awkward silence moment. Just a few thoughts. I mean, I don't know that institutionally -- let me start somewhere else, actually. One thing we can encourage members of the ccNSO to do is to talk about this topic with their governments, either with the regulator or the digital economy ministry that most people are connected with, or the foreign ministry. And if CCs don't have those relationships, it might be a good reason to start to build them. Because then you'll start to learn what your government thinks about the topic. And that provides something additional for us to talk about. The second one might be some -- I hesitate to call it a meeting, but some kind of a dedicated coordination point or conversation where we can swap information about what's going on on this thread of work on the WSIS and GDC. It might be convened by the IGLC, it might be a particular kind of IGLC meeting that's about WSIS or GDC coordination. Might be something else, I don't know. But I think those CCs that are interested in the topic and engaged in the ccNSO have a reason to be talking about this, sharing insights, sharing information. I think one of the pieces of feedback that we heard a bit after the sessions in Hamburg was still quite a big -- when people are involved in working in this area, it seems obvious to them why it's important. But if they aren't, it doesn't. So we need to tell a better story about the linkage between ICANN and the ccNSO and how that could be shaped or affected by changes in this bigger picture. So I think finding the right language and explanation there is something that we could be

doing, and perhaps the IGLC process [inaudible] the Q&A work that we need to do within our own organizations. And I know that at AUDA, we're starting to think about how to do that, getting our comms and marketing people involved in some of those conversations and how to talk about this in a way that's meaningful for people. So those are just a few thoughts from me.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Jordan. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Alejandra. To Echo what Jordan has said, we need to start engaging with our governments. Traditionally, [inaudible] not, but that era is over. I'm wondering, Jordan, if IGLC or something similar could act as a clearinghouse so that there's a central repository of what CCs are doing with their governments, just so we could have a global overview. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Seems like a good question to ask the IGLC vice chairs. Chairs, co-chairs, sorry.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you. I'll follow the queue now. We have Tatiana, then Annaliese, then Nick.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, I don't know if Annaliese wanted to go first to answer the question, but actually maybe she also can comment on what I say as well. So I think there is absolutely, certainly 100% a role, and it might be a big role as long as Annaliese and the group are ready, have capacity to take it. I mean, willingness and capacity. Because I do think that many of us are engaged in this process and in the broader community and engaged with the governments and whatever. And in the broader community, there are growing concerns about WSIS+20. And we all sort of work in silos. We communicate with each other, but sometimes randomly, sometimes sporadically, sometimes via established channels. And I like this idea of clearing house plus plus also kind of mobilizing point and point of collection and sharing of all the information, ideas, and sort of setting the scene and developing a strategy. Because to me, IGLC, in addition to ccNSO itself, I think it connects ccNSO to broader community in terms of inter-governance and also to ICANN. Because communication with Veni, for example, with Elena Plexida and with others can be also useful in sort of, I wouldn't say aligning strategy. I know how much ccNSO is worried about sovereignty, but at least knowing what's going on and exchange information and issue warnings and whatever. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Tatiana. Annaliese.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Alejandra. And just to echo what others have said, I think there is a role that the ccTLDs can play here in engaging with their

governments. And many on the IGLC are already doing that or thinking about doing that. We held in Hamburg, we held another sort of mapping exercise to consider the hot topic issues across the various regions. And WSIS was certainly something that came across as an issue across all of the regions. But we haven't sort of turned our minds to what we might do with the mapping exercise in terms of prioritizing. So with this in mind, we can certainly think about how we might usefully, if the council thinks it's useful, the committee can turn its attention to how we might sort of go about forming some sort of clearinghouse or trying to understand and document exactly what people are doing, how they're engaging with their governments. It's something I think that people are keen to know more about. And I'm certainly personally keen to keep being involved and having the committee involved in these WSIS discussions. So I'm very open to exploring ideas about how we can usefully contribute. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Annaliese. Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH.   Yeah, I think thanks very much to Annaliese and Jordan and the AUDA team for taking quite a strong lead on this topic. I think it's a very important one. I suppose I think the message has landed that we need to be thinking about it and engaging and certainly in the UK, we have a meeting in London with the CEO of ICANN, Sally, to talk about, because she's British and based in the UK, so to talk with our government and national stakeholders about WSIS. But I suppose what I'm thinking is

that we've all got the same path to travel on in parallel, and it'd be really helpful if we had a clearer consensus as a community as to what we are advocating for. I mean, is it a continuation? Is it a continuation with variation? If so, what variations? We need to be clear on this if we're going to be successful. And the other thing is that I think it's very helpful to share information because we're all doing the same thinking. One, we're doing a lot of duplication of effort with the regional organizations at the national level and actually some sort of coordination to reduce duplication, to make it all easier so that we all pull in the same direction. I think my final point is that if we have a clear objective as a community, then if we can all push towards that, then we're more likely to be successful than we all each individually follow our own engagement and government relations exercises, because otherwise it's going to be a bit left hand and right hand. And I think where we want the same thing, we need to know what that thing is and then advocate for it clearly and forcefully and consistently across all different territories. So something which would help get that with the least effort and most impact, I think, is what I would like to see from this ideally. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. Anil?

ANIL JAIN: Thank you, Alejandra. I fully agree with all the speakers who have spoken on the subject that there is a big role that ccTLD has to play in WSIS+20. I personally feel that there should be a communication

channel which should be set up between ccTLD managers, the government and ccNSO council, where the ccTLD managers should be encouraged to engage with their governments and give the feedback to ccNSO council on a regular basis. Similarly, whatever ccNSO council decides should also be communicated back to those governments and the ccTLD managers to do that. This is one aspect. The second aspect is that we already have a group called GAC, where government representatives are there. We propose that IGLC, which is actually working on all Internet governance issues, should start interacting with a selected group from GAC. And then GAC, based on the discussion between these two groups, may advise their members how we have to collect this information and advocate the stand taken by ICANN and ccNSO to their governments through their representatives. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Anil. I just wanted to say that those are very nice ideas, as in motivating ccTLDs to reach out to their governments and their government representatives in ICANN and to all have a relationship, as Jordan mentioned at the beginning. But it's not something that we can force. So we can encourage it, but in the end, ccTLDs would do what they think is best. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: I just wanted to say something sort of inspired by something Nick said, which is that I think we just need to be conscious in dealing with this, that countries have quite diverse and sometimes quite opposed views about the future of the broader Internet governance system in the

EN

world, whether it should be multilateral or multistakeholder based, the future of the IGF and so on. And I think we just have to be conscious of that to say that those disagreements will become more visible if we're talking as a group about those questions. And we need to make sure we put that discussion in a container where we can have it, but where it doesn't spill over into the broader ICANN work of the ccNSO, where I think everyone is committed to making the ccNSO a success and doing the work together that we have to do here. In other words, to be a bit more direct about it, if there are people around our council table and in the ccNSO community from countries who don't support the multistakeholder approach at an institutional and a national level, and that's okay. And part of the problem that we have in dealing with these things is it's very difficult to have real discussions and conversations between these points of view. So I think it's probably more important for us to be really conscious and respectful of those differences in any work we do in this area and uphold that diversity as a strength of the ccNSO as a platform to allow those discussions and to be cool with the fact we might end up disagreeing with each other on the substance. And that comes back to Nick's point, because I think it's unlikely that we would all agree across that diversity on what we want to see come out of the WSIS process or the GDC, but there will be some ICANN institutional interests in what the outcomes there might be that maybe quite a lot of CCs will share. And those, understanding what those are, which could come from the information sharing and clearinghouse elements that have been discussed. So I just want to say that because I think we should be open and acknowledging that it might be a sort of tense discussion and it's our job together to hold open that discussion and make sure it doesn't sort of flow into all the other work that we do.

And then I'll shut up after just sort of talking about Annaliese's question. The CEO goal six is a goal that is applicable from 1 July '23 to 30 June '24. And we're almost halfway through that period now. So, and we will have a, probably have a CEO transition at ICANN before 30 June next year, I think. Well, you know, it seems to be possible anyway. And so we should, I think, expect to be hearing more about ICANN's WSIS messaging sooner rather than later. And certainly if it hasn't emerged by the time of the SOAC Leaders Workshop in Washington in January, I'm confident we can be sort of asking where that is and where it's up to and why it isn't out there and available yet.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. And before giving the floor to Jiankang, I would like to let you all know that I've been approached regarding this matter as in the ccNSO, it's a key player here because of the diversity of, well, the worldwide reach that we have. And one thing that was brought to my attention is that it is important to have the voices heard from all the possible places because currently the louder voices are mostly Anglo-Saxon voices. So it would be of interest of the community to actually hear from everyone. And with this, I would like to give the floor to Jiankang.

JIANKANG YAO: Okay, thank you. So from my point of view, I think because ccNSO is a bigger family of every ccTLD, most of the ccTLDs have a good relationship with the local government. So I think ccNSO or ccTLD should play a role with WSIS. So maybe we can promote the Internet for

everyone, for inclusiveness. So one topic maybe WSIS is also interested in is universal acceptance. I also discussed this topic in WSIS meeting. So Anil is the UASG chair. So maybe this is one topic WSIS would like to, maybe ccNSO can also play a role in this regard. So for multilingual Internet. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you, Jiankang. So with this, I believe that we see some key aspects. One is it would be nice to know what all what CCs are doing. And the IGLC seems to be the place to be gathering that information because you're already working on it. If this is correct, do we all agree that they should do this type of, let's say, greenhouse seeking of input? If so, please use your green ticks. I see lots of green ticks. So, yes, the IGLC will be tasked to do that. So thank you, Anil and Anil for joining us here and for taking this on board. You may clear your green ticks. Another thing that I've heard so far from what we discussed is that we need a simpler message and a way to tell ccTLDs what is it take for them in this whole big picture. But in a simpler message, because, again, also during ICANN 78, I had conversations with many people and some were still not understanding why this should be important to them or why should they do anything about it. So the message has not come across as far as we think. So maybe do a more simple message would be something else that I would like to ask the IGLC if they can make that happen since we already have the FAQ. So maybe something a little more targeted. Oh, I lost my other thought. And of course, well, we need to bring this topic to the roundtable that we will have in January. And there I think we will consolidate the overall ICANN strategy regarding this topic, because, again, time is passing. And

if there is something that we need to do, we need to do it faster. So let me check the chat. So what I'm going to read out loud, it says, what are our expectations for this issue or what direction does ccNSO intend to take? This will allow us to offer concrete thoughts for our members. And yes, well, this is what it is all about. It's a platform for sharing information. So what we can do is actually propagate the message of what is happening and what ccTLDs can do or how they might be affected by these processes that are around the ccTLD ecosystem. So I would believe that that's still our role. And maybe since we don't have too much time to keep discussing this, maybe we can defer this discussion also to the mailing list if there is anything else that we think that the role of the ccNSO should be. Do we agree on this? I see some nodding. Okay. Any other comments or questions on this topic so far? Okay. Yes, Anil, thank you so much for coming. Thank you, Annaliese, as well, for coming. I know it's late for you, so that's why I wanted to bring also this topic first on the agenda. Thank you so much for joining us. And this is not the last you'll hear from us. And thank you for your work as well.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. And thanks for readjusting the agenda. Thanks, all.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So with that, let's go back to where we were in the agenda. Now we go to the item 13 and it's an update on the 360 feedback on councilors. So as you recall, last time we talked about this, we talked about the

frequency of these feedback sessions. And we agreed on reviewing like the terms of reference or the guidelines that we will follow and also the questions that were going to be in the questionnaire for this. May I ask Kim to pull the new proposal up so people can see it. And I will make my screen a little bit bigger, too. So here we are.

So with this, the major changes are that the paragraph with the background was deleted. There's also now a clear point that councilors are not expected to complete every single question, if you don't know the person well enough. And then the questions themselves were reduced in number, reordered and are more, let's say, objective. And they're focused on what you can observe on your fellow council colleagues to see how they perform or how they behave.

Also, other changes that were made in this document were to move some information from one place to the other, where it made more sense than having it separately. But in short, if we can move a little bit further in the document, please, Kim, to see the questions.

When you will see the questions now, there were 15 questions before. Now there are 10. So there were some that were very similar and others that when we heard your feedback, they seemed difficult to respond or written in a form that was not easy to respond or maybe out of scope. So that's what happened here. So you will have, of course, some time to read it and carefully and slowly. If so, if you don't mind to provide any comments by the end of next week, then with all the comments received, if any, we will circulate a final draft for adoption in December. Are there any immediate comments or questions on this matter? Okay, I see none. Thank you very much, Kim. We may go back to the agenda

EN

with this again, please. Well, you already have it. So please review it. And if you have any comments, please send them to the mailing list so we can adjust accordingly.

With that, let's move to item 14, and that's appointments to working groups and committees. And we have been. Well, the first one is the appointment of panelists on the Excellence Award Selection Committee. So we've been asked to appoint two panelists again. We've been told that there is a preference that the panelists serve no longer than two consecutive terms. To date, Olga and Pablo are both appointed or were both appointed last year, so they are eligible to serve again. The suggestion is to reappoint them. So first, I would like to ask them, are you okay with this? I see a thumbs up from Pablo and I see a thumbs up from Olga. Okay. Any comments on the topic? I don't see any hands up. So for this, may I have a mover? I see Irina and I heard Stephen. So Stephen seconds. Okay, thank you. So we have a decision. It says ccNSO council appoints Olga Cavalli and Pablo Rodriguez for their second term to serve on the Excellence Award Selection Committee. The chair of the council is requested to inform ICANN or accordingly. This resolution becomes effective upon publication. Any comments on the resolution? I see no hands up. So let's go to vote. So green ticks. If you're in favor, red crosses in case you object or abstain. So I see mostly green ticks and if I recall correctly from our COI SOI guideline, if you are part of the resolution, it would be best to abstain. So if you don't mind, Olga and Pablo, may I put you as abstentions? Yes, I see thumbs up. Okay, so with that, this decision has passed. Thank you very much. And thank you, Olga and Pablo, for doing this job.

With this, let's move to the appointment of ccNSO NomCom appointed councilor to travel funding committee. So what happened here is that Javier Rua was a member of the ccNSO travel funding committee and his term in the council ended with the ICANN 78 meeting. So now we need to appoint another NomCom councilor to replace him in this committee. This is what the guidelines of this committee say about it. I see Biyi has his hand up. Would you like to say something, Biyi?

BIYI OLADIPO: Maybe I'm jumping the gun. I was going to nominate Wafa.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: A little bit ahead, but we'll see. Thank you, Biyi. May I ask Joke to do a very brief summary on what is expected from councilors on this committee?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thanks, Alejandra. So this committee consists of three members. They evaluate the proposed timeline for the travel fund application rounds, and they also evaluate the applications that come in from the community members regarding travel funding for ICANN public meetings. So based on the guideline, staff prepares a draft assessment with a score for each of the applications by the community members. This subcommittee then evaluates those assessments and makes a decision on the distribution of the funding based on the available slots, etc. that we have available. I hope this was a good summary. Currently,

Biyi and Jennifer are members of the committee. So please Biyi and Jennifer, chime in if I forgot something.

BIYI OLADIPO: The only other addition I could have is that based on the charter, the member of this subcommittee would automatically be a member of OISC by the time that gets reconstituted.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you very much, Joke. Thank you very much, Biyi. With this, I wanted to ask either Tatiana, Olga or Wafa if they would like to volunteer to serve on this committee, if they would like to do so. So who would like to join this committee?

WAFA DAHMANI: Okay, since Biyi nominated me, I would accept. I would accept.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Wafa. And so are there any comments on the topic? Any other comments? If not, then may I have a mover? Okay, Tatiana moves and I saw Pablo and Olga having their hands up, so I will go with Olga. So Tatiana moves, Olga seconds. Thank you very much. With this, we have a decision. So the ccNSO Council appoints now Wafa Dahmani, a NomCom appointed councilor to serve on the ccNSO Travel Funding Committee, replacing Javier Rua, fulfilling Javier's term until March 2024. Any comments on the resolution? I don't see any hands up. So now please use your green ticks to, if you agree, or your

red crosses in case you abstain or object. Okay, I see all green ticks and I will add Wafa as an abstention, since you're part of this decision. So thank you very much. This has been approved. And thank you, Wafa, for stepping forward for this committee.

With this, now we move to item 15. It's contacting members of the Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group recommendations and other issues pertaining to the grants program. So this is a lot of information to take in, but let me see if I can summarize. In your background material, you have some letters, some exchange of letters between Xavier Calvez and Sebastien Ducos on these matters. So let me take a step back. So the ccNSO was one of the participating entities in this Cross-Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds, and was asked if ICANN Org could contact former members to assist with the interpretation of the recommendations that this group had. So at the time, Pablo, Stephen, Peter Vergote and Ching Chiao were appointed to this Cross-Community Working Group by the Council. So more recently, we had this exchange of letters. And the thing is, there is a recommendation that aimed to have a fundamental bylaw change to implement it. That's recommendation number seven. So this recommendation was something that ICANN, in the end, thought would not need to have a bylaw change. So that's the exchange of letters here. So it's not about the recommendation itself, because whatever was recommended was going to be implemented, but how the recommendation would be implemented. So this is a very brief summary, and I wanted to bring this to your attention, just to make sure you were aware, and to see if you have any views or thoughts regarding this topic in particular. Yes, Irina?

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you, Alejandra. This is Irina for the record. I actually am fine with how ICANN is dealing with the issue, and I think the approach is reasonable.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Irina. One thing I forgot to mention in the background is that a decision was made already by the Board during ICANN 78 on how to proceed, and a resolution has been already published. So I see something in the chat. Let me just check. Okay, so Joke sent a summary in the chat. Maybe Bart, am I missing anything else here?

BART BOSWINKEL: Not really. Thanks, hello everybody. The way I understand it, effectively, this point has become a little bit moot because of the Board decision in Hamburg, where they decided to follow the advice of staff and not go for a fundamental bylaw change. One of the reasons is to ensure that the grant program will really start somewhere at the end of Q1 of 2024, with a fundamental bylaw change that would take quite some time. And there are some real concerns, at least from an ICANN Org and probably Board perspective, with changes and making the fundamental bylaw change as pointed and as focused as was recommended. So they came up with an alternative approach. It's also my understanding, at least, that the GNSO is more concerned about diverting from the mechanism to implement the recommendation. So not using the fundamental bylaw change, but using probably a contractual solution to ensure that the applicants can't use the independent review panels process or the

reconsideration. And that's where the discussion landed before the Board resolution. So in a way, this topic has become moot. And also the point about the approach of the members of the CCWG, because that email or that letter was dated somewhere in August. And the exchange between Sebastien Ducos in his capacity as chair of the GNSO started the 3rd of October, at least the final one. And there was a response from Xavier Calvez, I believe, on the 17th or 18th of October. And then you saw the Board resolution in Hamburg. So, yeah, that's far as I can tell. Thanks. Back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you, Bart. And an additional comment is that during the discussion of this resolution from the Board, if I understood it correctly, they will still pursue the bylaw change in parallel. So I'm not sure that was written in the resolution, but it's something that they are planning on doing.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe that's an interesting observation. It is about a broader discussion, I think, that is part of the resolution. That is probably something to monitor and put in the CCWG or ICANN bylaw repository. If you look at this resolution, I would say commitment is probably too strong a word, but this intention to consult the community on broader implication of fundamental bylaw changes, etc. So that's something to capture and to monitor as well, I would say, especially in light of your exchanges in Hamburg on the process of fundamental bylaw changes. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Bart. So I see that there are no major concerns regarding this topic, but it would be a good idea just to keep an eye on it. So yes, please, Bart, let's add it to our bylaw change monitoring, just to be on the safe side. So I don't see any hands up for this, so let's move on. We have item 16, it's update on council election and board nomination process for this. May I ask Joke to provide both updates, please?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thanks, Alexandra. I will start with the board seat 12. So following a call for nominations and due diligence verifications by independent provider by ICANN, the ccNSO membership was now asked to participate in an election to select its preferred appointee to board seat number 12. The voting started on 7th of November. That was according to the timeline originally foreseen by the ccNSO council and voting will close on the 28th of November. Currently, there are 177 members corresponding to 175 emissaries. Those emissaries received ballots according to the timeline foreseen by council and voting is currently ongoing. So Tuesday, the 14th of November, that was one week after start of the voting, a reminder was sent via the voting tool directly to the emissaries. To date, today on the 16th of November, at 10:00 UTC, we counted 59 ballots, that is excluding any duplicates, and there are 116 voters that have not voted yet. There is no quorum requirement for this voting, but the candidate that receives the plurality of the votes cast by the ccNSO members shall indeed be the candidate that will in turn be elected to be nominated by the ccNSO council. So still some time left regarding this voting process. Also wanted to let you know that six

ballots could not be delivered to the emissaries. There was an email error that the tool generated. We had a look at those email errors and checked whether there were any alternative email addresses contained in the IANA database. So the IANA administrative contact or technical contact received an alternative ballot instead of the one that could not be delivered. That in terms of Board Seat 12. I'm happy to answer any questions if there are any.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Are there any questions regarding Board Seat 12 nomination process? No, no hands up.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Okay, thank you very much. Then I will continue with the council elections. So in September, there was a call for nominations for one vacancy per region on the ccNSO council. So five vacancies. For the Asia Pacific region and for the European region, there were more than one candidate nominated. Candidates also accepted their nominations. There was also the Q&A session at ICANN 78. That meant that for the Asia Pacific region and for the European region, elections needed to be held. Those elections started as per the timeline foreseen by council. Voting started on Thursday, the 9th of November for both the Asia Pacific region and the EU region. And voting will close on the 30th of November. For the Asia Pacific region, there are 55 members corresponding to 54 emissaries. There was a typo in the email that was shared on the mailing list. The email mentioned 53. This was corrected in the online announcement. For the EU region, there are 47 members

EN

corresponding to 47 emissaries. For the council elections, in contrast to Board Seat 12, there is a quorum requirement. The majority of all the emissaries in the geographic region entitled to vote shall constitute a quorum. That means for the Asia Pacific region, that 50% is 28 votes are needed for the quorum to be met. Currently for the Asia Pacific region, we still have quite some way to go. Because to date, we only received 12 votes. In total, 54 emissaries, 12 votes received for the AP region. We still need quite a few votes in order to make sure that the quorum requirement is met. In terms of the EU region, the quorum requirement is the same, 50%. So that means we need 24 votes. And here we have almost met the quorum requirement. I counted 22 votes earlier today, around 10:00 UTC. For the Asia Pacific region, we received one error message. The ballot was then resent to the administrative contact or the technical contact. And then for the European region, no error messages were received. There was however one representative which was updated in the meanwhile. So the ballot was resent to the new emissary for the European region. That concludes my update and I'm happy to answer any questions.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Joke. Are there any questions regarding the elections for Joke? I don't see any hands up. So thank you very much, Joke, for this very nice summary. With this, we move now to item 17 and it's to confirm no role of the Council or ccNSO to discuss individual cases, if invited to comment on specific ccTLD cases in press or otherwise. So this is following up our conversation in our workshop that we had in Hamburg. And I wanted to reinforce that we agreed not to discuss individual cases nor as a Council or as a Councilor in public.

EN

Some of us have been approached by different entities to discuss such cases. For example, as I told you, I was approached to discuss the .su and others have been approached to discuss other cases. And we see that there are other cases that come up at various points. For example, in the public forum in Hamburg, there were some issues regarding the Ghana ccTLD and others. So this reminder comes to here because soon we will be discussing gaps in IANA policies. And what wouldn't be a good idea is to bias those policies or those discussions with this. So I want to use this opportunity to remind everyone that we agreed not to discuss this as Councilors or as the Council. Of course, as individual persons, we can have our own opinions and we can do as we see fit, as long as it's clear that it's on personal capacity. And I don't know if there are any comments or questions regarding this topic in particular. Yes, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: More a comment than a question is that I completely agree that we should not engage in discussing any particular ccTLDs or ccTLD related issues in public. We should discuss it in the appropriate spaces and with the appropriate people. So once again, I support what you are sharing with us. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. And just to add another comment to that, it's that commenting on a specific ccTLD situation, it's always complicated because there will always be sovereignty issues involved and other things that we actually don't know because we don't have the whole

context on what's happening in each particular case. So it's best to not do so. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Does that extend to ICANN or if they reach out to us for our view on a topic?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, if they would like the Council's opinions, that will come through the Council and then we can see what we can do. But so far, ICANN is very aware that we do not discuss individual cases like the latest example on .LB. We were informed on what was going to happen with that ccTLD. We were not asked on ways to deal with it. But if that comes at a point here, then we can discuss whether we would like to say something or not. But in principle, I would advise not to. Thank you, Stephen. And also, again, in your individual capacity, that's another story. So if you agree with this principle that we should not discuss individual cases, not as Council or as a councilor in public, please do check your green ticks. And if you don't agree, then your red marks. Okay, I see only green ticks. Thank you. Thank you very much.

With this, we move forward to the almost last topic, the Portfolio of Activities Monitor from the Triage Committee. For this, may I ask Jordan to tell us about it?

JORDAN CARTER: You may, and I'll be as very quick as I can. We circulated the monitor updated. We'd said we would do it quarterly, but we found that a lot of

stuff had happened at the ICANN meeting. So we did another update after the meeting and circulated it. Our next focus, as there are some new things coming onto it and some new activities coming up next year that we're going to need to worry about. So Triage is going to do a bit of work on the resourcing impact of the activities we see coming and making sure that we're not trying to overload ourselves. So just a brief update on that as well. So if there are any questions about what is in the monitor, probably easiest given the time if you ping us on the email list.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. And so far, I don't see any hands up. And yes, regarding time, I would advise to do so in the mailing list if any questions. Thank you. With this, we move to item 20 and it's the transition ABR process in regular budget process. We have extensively discussed this on the mailing list, and it is my understanding that with this topic, we need to distinguish between process and substance. And the proposal is about the process, how to submit a budget request. So currently, there is a separate process and ICANN proposes for efficiency and transparency to include the ABR procedure in the annual budget process. And based on what we discussed, my suggestion is to inform ICANN that we support the simplification of the process. However, we do want them to be clear about the process and provide a template like they do now to distinguish between the budget request and comments on the budget operating plan. So if this is the way to move forward, may I ask you to please use your green ticks and if not, or you have other proposal, use your red cross in Zoom. Okay, I see only green ticks. Thank you very much. So this is how we will move forward.

And with this, we reach the any other business. And Stephen, the floor is yours.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, but we've hit, I believe, our hard stop at 90 minutes. Kimberly, correct me if I'm wrong on that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: We did, but we can have two more minutes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That being the case, I will yield the floor back to you and I will submit my comments that I wanted to make to the list. Move on to 22 because otherwise we don't have time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, thank you. Thank you for that, Stephen. And sorry that we took longer than expected, but the WSIS+20 topic was a very fruitful one and discussion needed to happen. So looking forward to your email. With this, I would also like to mention that there is the DNS abuse mailing list up and running. So something that please do distribute this news to everyone you know. And also the next council meetings for January, February and the prep in February for ICANN 79 were added to the agenda. So please mark your calendars with that. And with this, we've reached the end of our meeting. Thank you very much for joining. It was lovely to see and discuss with you. Have a nice rest of your day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]