ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Hello everyone and welcome to our Council meeting 204 on the 18th of April 2024 at noon UTC. It has been a while since we've been together. With that, again if you have not done so, please do add to your Zoom ID the word Council or Councilor so it's easy to find you. And I will, as usual, put the wiki in the chat so it's accessible to everyone where we have all the documents for today's meeting. I would like to say that there will be an AOB for my part where we will discuss a little bit on Katrina's update on the review mechanism. And I would like to ask now if there's anyone else who has an AOB. Nope. If not, when we get there I will ask again, but just to know beforehand. With that, Kim, are we quorate?
KIM CARLSON:	Today's Council meeting is quorate, thank you.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Thank you very much.
BART BOSWINKEL:	Just one point of order, you did receive formal apologies from Jordan, Wafa and Tatiana.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:	Sean did add his apology as well.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, so you have received four of them.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you. And noted. With that, does anyone have any updates in the statements of interest by Councilors? Yes, Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, hello everyone. This is not technically an update, but I do now have a statement of interest. I didn't have that before. If that counts, nothing more to say.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, that counts. Thank you. And for anyone else who has not submitted theirs, please follow Peter's lead and do submit yours. If you don't know if you have done that, because we know we are busy, feel free to reach out to the secretary, they will let you know.

With that, let's continue. Now we are in administrative matters and we have relevant correspondence. We have a letter from Tripti. We did receive this letter at the beginning of March, but we decided to defer it to this call and it is under item 16, so we will be addressing that then. I will move on now to the item three, minutes and action items. So the minutes from last Council call are taken from the transcript since it was during the ICANN meeting in Puerto Rico.

And now on item 3B, it's the action items. As you can see, we do have a long list of action items. Most of them are done, but I would like to run through some that are either ongoing or pending or still open to see

where we are at with those and if we can close them. So many of them come from meetings, like several meetings behind us. For example, the first one is from the Council meeting 198. That's to seek liaison from the GAC. So this is regarding the liaisons with the GAC to set up the agenda. We are in contact with the GAC leadership and this is a priority for them, but they're still working on that. So we'll discuss this a little further when we talk about our meeting in Kigali at the end. That's the last item on the agenda.

We have the action item on the Council Ad-Hoc to Report on Succession Planning regarding external roles and responsibilities. It's almost done, as in it was completed, the roles and responsibilities for either our roles and responsibilities and external ones. But what it's pending is the succession planning on the external roles, which by now I think it's a little bit complicated to achieve in an environment that it's only with volunteers. However, we do need to update the current appointments and the Chair and the Vice-Chairs will review the current appointments and make suggestions to complete the roster by the May meeting. So more on this in our next Council meeting when we have some updates on this.

And then we have the action item 203. It's the IGLC was requested to gather information on what ccs are doing with respect to the WSIS+20 and to provide simpler and more targeted messaging to the ccTLDs. They have taken up this role and they're working on it. We had deferred this, waiting on what ICANN would present, but now we can consider it completed, so this can be closed.

Also the next one is the staff, we told them to monitor how the discussion regarding the exclusion of IRPs through contractual arrangements or by-law changes evolves. We will discuss this in item 17 on the agenda and therefore it can be closed afterwards. Also the next two items are regarding the GRC to review certain processes. In the first one, it's the recommendation on board nomination process manager that was included in the board seat 12 election report. They have been informed, they are aware, and the suggestion is to remove this from the agenda and once they completed their work, we can add them as an agenda item.

Also the next one regarding to the voting and voting process, to add anonymity as an item to harmonize the guidelines. They are also aware and the suggestion would be to remove this from the future agendas and include it as items when they report back on this.

One, maybe two more, it's jumping to action item 203-05, it's for future election, the ccNSO council to consider two separate resolutions for vice chair appointments. As you see, this is to be revisited by February 2025, so it would be a good idea to remove this from the action item list and ask the secretary to add this to their to-dos for the next chair and vice chair election.

We have the next action item that is pending is the ccNSO council to implement suggestions from the World Café sessions. This we will discuss under item 19 today, so after that, we can close this one. We had one regarding publishing the draft notes from the [inaudible] sessions on the ccNSO wiki and if I'm correct, and Kim, please confirm, this has been done, right?

KIM CARLSON: Yes, they are done.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. So, that was a quick run through all these open or ongoing action items. Does anyone have any questions or comments regarding those? Yes, Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI: Good morning from Argentina. About the WSIS+20 and all this process itself, are we having a report from members of the ccNSO or what's the idea of this? Because all this is happening, part of it in May also, and maybe some of us are participating. I will do virtually, but maybe some of us are on site.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, the IGLC, that is the Internet Governance Liaison Committee, is the one that is taking upon anything that is regarding Internet governance. We are not expecting from them any particular report, but they are the ones gathering information on what CCs are doing regarding this matter and then maybe use this to either have a session at an ICANN meeting or maybe a webinar to tell the rest of the community what's going on, but we do not expect a report from this. Okay. All right.

With that, I don't see any more hands, so I'll go now to the intermeeting decisions, and I want to bring your attention to a new numbering that

we will be using from now on. These intermeeting decisions are the ones that we do in between council meetings, and usually they didn't have any number. They were just listed as the decisions that were made, but now with the website redesign, we found out that this is something that is needed, so now what we will do is we will number them with the previous meeting and then letters. So this will distinguish them between the decisions that were made in between meetings and the decisions that were made at council meetings. So that's why you see now 203A and 203B, and those were the two decisions we made on the letters that we drafted and have been already sent. Any questions or comments regarding this? I see none. With that, there were no intermeeting decisions from the triage committee either, so that's item five.

So we will now move to item six, that is the beginning of the updates. So we have the updates from ECA, IFRT and CSC, and all of these are written updates, but I just wanted to give you a heads up regarding the CSC. We will be asked shortly to start the election process of a new member and an alternate, something that is also related to the external roles that will be reviewed. But for now, just to let you know that Brett Carr is on his third term and it's final, so we will actually need a new person here. His term ends in October and the alternate is elected every year. So that's something that's coming.

And another thing that is coming is something that we need to discuss with the registry stakeholder group on how we want to handle the third CSC review. And if it sounds familiar, yes, we almost ended the second one and now the third is coming, which is supposed to start in October. So shall we put this in the agenda for our main meeting to have enough

time to discuss it and to prepare it? Can I see green ticks if you agree or red crosses if you don't? Okay, I see only green ticks. So thank you. So now you know, this will come on our next council meeting. Thank you very much

The rest of the updates, the working group updates and the updates of the liaisons are written updates. Just one more note, it's that now we have the continuous improvement program added to the working groups updates. But other than that, does anyone have any additional comments or questions? I see none.

So with that, we move to item nine, which is the update of the ccNSO website redesign. Just a quick update, we nearly completed the requirements for the new website. We have been having a high frequency of meetings, three meetings at two weeks. Within two weeks, we have three meetings every two weeks. So it's been intense. But the final requirement session, it's scheduled on the 8th of May. The next steps is that ICANN will, well, the team at ICANN will develop the wireframes on the basis of our requirements. And we are closer to the light. So with that, does any other member of these small team would like to say anything?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think we're making really good progress, actually. We're getting close.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:	I agree. It's been very slow for months, if not years, I dare say. But there's definitely been a sort of an acceleration of pace. And I'm sort of optimistic about the trajectory now.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Thank you. Chris, I see decades. Yes. But we're getting there. So soon we will have good news, I hope. Okay, with that, let's move on to item 10. It's update from the triage committee. So first, we have a reconfirmation and the ccNSO purpose and goal statement. So it has been determined that they should remain the same. And we have a resolution in front of us. So are there any questions or comments regarding this topic? I don't see any hands. So with that, may I have a mover and a seconder by a raise of hands? I see Chris, and I see Olga seconds. Thank you.

So the decision is the ccNSO Council adopts and reconfirms the 2023 ccNSO purpose and goal statement and requests the Secretary to adjust the approval date to April 2024. This decision becomes effective seven days after publication. Do we have any questions regarding the resolution? I don't see any hands. So with that, please use your green ticks if you approve or your red crosses if you object or abstain. I'll give you a minute. Okay. I see only green ticks. Thank you very much. This has been approved.

With that, now we pass on to the updates on portfolio of activities 2025-2026 and what to expect. And for this, may I ask either Nick or Bart to provide an update?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I suppose, coming on from the review of the mission statement purpose, thanks for that in Jordan's absence. I think we were a little bit, you know, hadn't looked at it for a bit of time but when we looked at it we were very pleased that the prioritization and activities seem to be up to date and stand the test of time so that's why there's no amendments to it. And so when we look at the portfolio of activities and the things coming down the track, the prioritization, I don't have it actually on my screen, but it's basically as before with no surprise, I guess. So the same sort of priorities that the PDPs, the reviews, the normal machinery of the ccNSO, the committee structures and those activities largely fell into the three areas of the ccNSO mission and priorities. So I don't know if there's anything more particularly to say.

BART BOSWINKEL: The portfolio needs to be adopted on a yearly basis and so this was the first year we worked with a project management tool to monitor them and taking a deep dive is probably not something you want to do every meeting but at the same time it was felt it would be useful for the council to understand what is really driving the activities, etc., and have a bit of an overview of some of the underlying sessions. You don't want to do this at your regular council meetings, so probably around May or the suggestion is to include this in a working session of the council prior to ICANN 79, then present the high-level summary again to the members in Kigali and then adopt the full plan in Kigali at the council meeting. This way, yeah, it sets the, I would say, the baseline to monitor the progress over time of the next one or two years again as we did last year. So that's the forward-looking part of the portfolio itself, so the activities.

And in time, and that's the something, this is more as an alert, it might be, say, the triage committee started to have a discussion about the resourcing in a very broad sense and that definitely needs some more preparation time and that would be a real deep dive into resourcing and to be, I would say, to be facilitated by the triage committee. But that would be a working session as well, but definitely not for Kigali and it definitely needs to be in person at its earliest in Istanbul. So that was the heads up. I think, Nick, anything I missed?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: No, not really. I think that the one-page statements of purpose with the high-level activities, I think, when we, on the triage committee, didn't feel we were particularly familiar with it and maybe not as familiar as we should have been. I think it'd be really valuable to socialize that more widely and to, because basically everything that we do flows out of that high-level flow. So I think that there's just a bit more of a look at it. And I think particularly, there's a really interesting discussion to be had around capacity and resources versus the future work that we want to see done as part of that statement of purpose. Some things are basically constitutional and not able to be moved or varied. Others are sort of more, as it were, discretionary. So that's where the real subject is around. What's the appetite and what's the prioritization, which I think is something that we're happy to lead on. But I think we would all, on the triage committee, feel much more reassured if we felt that people were understanding our thinking and that we needed to take them along with it on that journey if that helps.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Well, with that, since we are talking about the whole set of activities done in this ccNSO, maybe in this working session that it's been planned, should the chairs of the working groups and committees be invited? Are you considering that?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: That's a good point. I mean, obviously that would increase the participation number of it quite significantly. So yeah, let me think about that. But potentially it's a good idea, as you say, perhaps if we're not as close to some of the activities as the actual chairs and vice chairs of the various different constituents, working groups and committees. But yeah, you're right, we should make sure [inaudible].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Just to make sure, since many people work in several committees and all of that, so all these overlap and all the resources and you're measuring that. So just a suggestion, but let us know, since this seems to be something that will be done at Istanbul, so there's enough time to plan for it. So thank you. Any comments or questions for Nick or Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe just to make sure to understand, say, there is the resource and capacity, but it's also, yeah, the council needs to approve the portfolio of activities. And in order to familiarize the council and maybe the working group chairs with it, have a first run through of what is happening over the next two or three years. And just to check with the working group chairs, if their activities are captured there as well, and

to raise awareness with them what is happening. That's something else than the discussion about the resourcing and capacity. That's for a later stage. This is the first step is first, let's get everybody on the same page that they know what the ccNO is doing to spread the word. And then as a follow up, and that was the suggestion around Istanbul or even later, have a discussion on these very important issues around future resourcing and capacity. That's a different type of discussion, I would suggest. So have a workshop first, say, prior to Kigali and run through, say, what is happening, what the triage committee is expecting next year and what the various chairs, etc., next year. So it's more a sanity check than anything else. But it's good that everybody knows what is happening. And then the next step would be the real in-depth discussion about resources and capacity.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you. With that, then we are moving to item 11. That is the update of chair, vice chairs, councilors, regional organizations, and secretariat. And I have one point there. We had a one-on-one call with Sally and Biyi and Jordan and myself. There we discussed some topics regarding the WSIS+20 plenary and the plans for it. We talked a little bit on IDNs and the IDN ccPDP that was going to be voted upon, the Universal Acceptance Day, the grants program, or they are all related somehow with this. Also a little bit on the policy gap session, on its content and logistics, to share some of the new methodologies that the ccNSO uses. So maybe they could be [pollinized] somewhere else at ICANN, because we think they are useful. And that's basically it. I don't know, Biyi, if you would like to say anything else.

Another update that I have is that I gave a webinar on the IDN ccPDP with Bart to the LAC TLD community, and it was very nice to do that and to put at least the LAC region up to speed with this policy. It felt great to have that opportunity to discuss this topic. With that, any other updates from councilors, regional organizations, or the Secretariat? Yes, Kim.

KIM CARLSON: Thanks, everyone. Just wanted to provide an update, let everybody on this call know, and the wider council and those listening to the recording, that I will, after almost nine years, I will be leaving the ccNSO and policy starting July 1st. It's a slow transition between now and then. I will still be with ICANN moving into the meetings team as part of the design and production team. So I'm working with Bart and others from the policy team on the backfill position, just making sure there's a continuity of service and to ensure zero service disruptions. Just wanted to announce that first here to the council first. I appreciate everything with this council, and I've enjoyed working with all of you. Like I said, I'm not leaving ICANN. I will be with the meetings team. Not sure what my involvement will be at ICANN 80, but hopefully I'll still see everybody around at the meetings. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Kim, for this and for all these years with us. I think I can speak for the council saying that we really appreciate all the things that you do. We will miss you deeply. And we wish you the best in your future activities within ICANN. We know we will continue to see

you, but still, I just wanted to say our appreciation. And if anyone else would like to say something else right now, please do so.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: This is Chris. Only that I just want to say to Kim, I think it shows a complete lack of commitment to the ccNSO, that after all these years, you should dare to move on and do something else. But as you know, Kim, we will miss you madly.

KIM CARLSON: Thanks, Chris.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think, Kim, I can say on behalf of the council that you're always welcome at any ccNSO social function going forward.

KIM CARLSON: And you are recorded on that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It does depend on how many tickets are available, though, to be fair.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, with that, a round of applause. And thank you, Kim. With that, now we need to move on the next item of the agenda. We have the progress on the gap analysis, preparing for Kigali. And for this, may I ask Chris to give us an update?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure. Thanks, Ale. Thanks, everybody. This is Chris. I'll be very brief. We had a very interesting meeting the other day in which we went through two things, really. Kim Davies has started to prepare a topic areas list for ccTLD policy review. It's extensive. He's got a bit more work to do on it, but we spend a lot of time discussing that. It's throwing up some really interesting questions that ccNSO will need to consider when the time comes. And we also briefly looked at a sort of experimental start of a redraft of 1591 that Jordan has begun because he has nothing else to do with himself other than work on that. And again, that's something that we will be working on over the next few weeks.

When it comes to Kigali, I'm not absolutely certain where we are with organizing a session in Kigali. Bart, can you help with that?

BART BOSWINKEL: It's probably really, I'd say, two major or three major points. First of all is probably more in depth, and that's why the work on Kim Davies's document and follow up from San Juan on what are the gaps and what is policy, what is interpretation, what is guidance and what is incidental. And then related, what are the methods to address it? So that's two of the three topics that we continue, maybe introduce the general overview so people really appreciate the overview of where you can find all the relevant documents because they, and implementation areas because that's what the small group already has produced. Needs a little bit more refinement and that's something else than this general

restatement, I would say, of RFC 1591 because that comes with its own ups and downs.

And then the third item is, yeah, next steps. I think by after Kigali, yeah, the council, the community and the council need to decide how to take this forward with a fully mandated group or, but at least not as an ad hoc group of the council anymore. I think they run into the limits of what you can explore with no mandate. It has advantages and disadvantages. Now it's got to go on its own, yeah, four more feet, I would say. Chris, I think those were the three main topics.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. So we are going to have a session in Kigali based on those topics, right?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's it, Ale, for now. Unless there are any questions, of course.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris and Bart. Any questions for them? I see none. So thank you. With that, we are moving to item 13 and it's the update and closure of the second councilor 360 feedback process. So to introduce this topic, let me first thank you, all fellow councilors and the secretariat who have completed the survey. From my end, as one of the councilors

who was reviewed, I find it really helpful and a good source to have a sense on how you see me. So thank you for that.

I do want to note that out of the 21 potential participants, that is the 18 councilors minus myself because I do not evaluate myself and the four members of the secretariat, only 12 responses were recorded. So I want to raise this to encourage you to do this because, again, it shouldn't take much time and it's a very useful tool for councilors. Do any other councilors want to comment on this? Yes, I see Olga and Chris.

OLGA CAVALLI: Alejandra, I think this is very important, especially in my role of NomCom appointee. I've been appointed by NomCom in other roles. And as far as I got to know, there was never a feedback in between what the NomCom appointee was doing in a council or board or whatever to the NomCom. And I think this completes a cycle that is very useful for both, for the council, for the appointee, for the other members of the council and for the NomCom. So I think it's very useful. Thank you. And thank you for having time and talking to me and giving my feedback. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: You're welcome. Thank you, Olga. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Ale. Yeah, I just wanted to kind of endorse what you said. It is incredibly valuable. And it might look like a daunting task because you get an email from Bart that says you've got 27 people that you need to

review. I'm exaggerating. Clearly, there aren't 27. And you know, you've got to do it all by the 15th of the month or whatever it might be. It actually doesn't take that long. You can take as long as you like over it if you want to write an essay in each box about the person. But really, it's incredibly valuable just to go through the yes/no questions and say, you know, fully agree, partially agree. And even I don't know is a valuable answer because then it begs the question, well, why don't you know? The answer is, well, because the particular person that I'm reviewing, I don't know particularly well. So that in itself raises a point. So it is incredibly important. And I really do encourage everybody to do it so that the feedback to the individuals is as wide as possible, rather than just from a few people who can, you know, find the time to do it. So please, let's have everyone do it if at all possible.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you, Chris. With that, if there are no more comments on this, I would like to alert you that we will have shortly another round of evaluations that will start in July. And the following counsellors will be reviewed. That's Biyi, Jordan, Nick, Demi and Pablo. So, again, this doesn't take too much. When you receive the survey, go with what your heart tells you right then and there. So if you feel, yes, I completely agree, just check it and just put it and then it could take maybe five minutes per person. Or as Chris mentioned, as long as you want, if you want to write something else.

With that, let me move on to the next item. It's item 14. It's the results of the members vote for the ccPDP. And for this, may I ask Joke to tell us about it, please.

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Hello, everyone. Yeah, I'm happy to let you know that the ccPDP4 vote is now closed. Voting closed a few hours from now on the 17th of April, one minute prior to midnight UTC. Quorum was met and the vote is valid. And 65% of the emissaries voted. And out of all the votes received, 97% of the votes cast were in support of the ccNSO Council recommendation to adopt the proposed ccPDP4 IDN policy. There are no major issues to report, but there will be a vote report with all observations that is currently being drafted. And you may expect that in your inboxes by the end of next week. Thanks, Alejandra. Happy to answer questions.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Joke. And thank you, everybody, for voting. It's good to see that these long processes get to an end and they end well. Does anyone have any questions for Joke? I see none. And just to let you know, the next steps, once we receive the election report from Joke, we will review and adopt. Wait a second, my ideas just crossed in my head. So we will add this to the members report, the election report. And with that, we will build the board report that we will send to the board for their consideration and vote. So as you know, this board consideration will include a public comment period and a request for the GAC to provide any advice. So these are the next steps ahead of us.

With that, I'll move on now to the next item. I don't see any hands, so let's move on. We have the appointment of members to committees and working groups. In this case, we have the appointment of [Federica

Tortorella] from the LACTLD staff as an observer to the IGLC and an observer to the DASC. Are there any questions or comments regarding the topic? I see none. So we do have a resolution. So may I have a mover and a seconder? By raise of hands in Zoom. I see Olga. And I see Stephen. Thank you. So, Olga and Stephen.

So the resolution says the ccNSO Council appoints [Federica Tortorella] from LACTLD as observer to the IGLC and observer to the DASC. The secretariat is requested to inform the leadership of both groups and [Federica.] This decision becomes effective upon its publication. Any questions regarding the resolution? I see no hands. So please use your green ticks if you are in favor or your red process if you object or abstain. Okay. I see only green ticks. So with that, this has been approved. And thank you, [Federica,] for joining us as an observer.

Now we have item 16. That's the ccNSO membership application of the Internet Society Lebanon, ISOC.LB. So we received the application. The application was reviewed, including the usual IANA review, and no issues were identified. And so we have a resolution to approve this membership. Are there any questions or comments regarding this? Demi, did you put your hand up?

DEMI GETSCHKO: No, no, no. Just as a mover, not as a question, sorry.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So with that, then now we do need a mover and a seconder. So I take Demi as a mover. And a seconder, please. Olga.

Thank you. So the decision is the ccNSO Council approves the ccNSO membership application of the Internet Society Lebanon to become member of the ccNSO and welcomes ISOC.LB as member 177 of the ccNSO. The chair is requested to inform ISOC.LB and the ccNSO membership. This decision becomes effective upon publication. Any questions regarding the resolution? I see none. So with that, we go to the vote. So please use your green ticks if you approve or your red crosses if you object or abstain. All right. So we have a vote. I see only green ticks. Thank you very much. This has been approved. And welcome .LB to the membership.

Now let's move on to item 17. This is the response letter to the letter from Tripti regarding the amendment of recommendation 7 of the CCWG auction proceeds. So as I mentioned at the beginning of the call, we received this letter early in March, but we deferred it until today since we have until mid-May to respond. So we propose to discuss the letter today to set the direction of travel of our response and to use the results of our discussions to draft a letter next week. The final letter, of course, will be signed off by the Council as we usually do.

So let me start to share my understanding of the request. We have two parts on this letter. The first part is regarding the removal of the sentence on the recommendation number 7. This particular sentence limits the overall -- let's say what is intended here is that they don't want to use the funds within the grant program to any litigation or administrative or legal fees. But the recommendation says that existing ICANN accountability mechanisms such as the IRP or other appeal mechanisms cannot be used to challenge a decision from the

independent project applications evaluation panel to approve or not approve an application.

So what they want to remove is this from the independent project applications evaluation panel so that it's a broader scope and as in anything in the process of approving or not the application cannot use those mechanisms. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Whenever you're finished explaining, Ale, I'll make a comment once you're finished.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. So, well, this is on the first part, as in just to see our view on if we agree on this particular edit, since we were participating on this grass community working group. The second part relates to proposed bylaw change that comes from this part. But just to not make any confusions, let's start with the first part, and then we can move on to the bylaw proposal that has been made and was in public comment. So, Chris, would you like to say something regarding the first part?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, I think the two things are actually related, Alejandra. So, basically, the situation is that what the auction proceeds working group intended was that no one should be able to use ICANN's accountability mechanisms to question a decision in respect to a grant. So, if you apply for a grant and you were refused, you shouldn't be able to use reconsideration request or IRP to question that. And equally, if you

were given a grant, no one else in the community should be able to object to you being given a grant by using the reconsideration request or the IRP. The issue on the current drafting of the recommendation, and the reason why they want to change it, is because the board itself will actually be involved, not in deciding whether or not you get a grant, but in checking to make sure that the process that was followed under which you were given a grant or you were refused a grant has actually been correctly followed. And so, therefore, if you only say you can't use the accountability mechanisms to question the decision of a panel, you would be able to use them to question the board's checking of the process. So, that's the reason for changing it, so that there is clarity around that. So, that encapsulates the first part, and I'll comment on the second part when we get there.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. Anyone else? So, is it okay for us to say that we agree on removing this particular sentence and that we don't have any issues with that happening?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Ale, it's Chris again. I think our response needs to be in the whole, rather than splitting it down into the two pieces, because the two things are interrelated. The second part is much more, to me anyway, is more troubling, because what the board has chosen to suggest as a way forward is not something that I'm particularly comfortable with. But the principle of changing the first part, I think, yes, that's fine. That does make sense.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I agree with you that these two things are interrelated, but there are two different questions to me. So, one is if we're okay or not with removing this part. I feel that there is no harm in doing so. But then, now to the second part, what is proposed here is to do a fundamental bylaw amendment to make sure that these sort of requests from cross-community working groups don't have to be dealt with every single time. There was also a request to have a bylaw amendment regarding this.

But now the proposal is to have a general amendment in the bylaws where if there is a community recommendation that it's requesting to not have these accountability mechanisms used, then if they're already in the bylaws and they fulfill certain conditions, then they should move forward. I do have my concerns, but I would like to hear you first before I give any thoughts on this. So, Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks. So, it's clear that the recommendation from the working group, the auction proceeds working group, involves a bylaw change. Well, we believe it involves a bylaw change. It's been suggested that it could be dealt with in terms and conditions, but the problem with dealing with it in terms and conditions is that that would only mean that you as an applicant, because you would have signed the agree to the terms and conditions, would be blocked from using the accountability mechanisms. But it wouldn't stop me as a community member not liking you and saying you shouldn't get a grant and using the accountability

mechanisms to object. So, in order to clearly do what the policy, the working group recommended, it's necessary to change the bylaw.

I can understand the temptation to look at the bylaw, to look at the process one needs to go through in order to change a bylaw and say, well, while we're there, you know, why don't we do this? It's a bit like when you get to a certain age and you bend down on the floor to pick something up, you think, well, having got down here, what else can I do? Because it's so challenging to bend down and stand up straight again. And I appreciate that there is a difficult process for changing the bylaws.

But the reality of the situation is that what this change would mean is that you would be able to in future change the bylaws if a cross community working group or whatever recommended it, recommended something that led to a change without needing to go through what we put together in the restructuring of ICANN with the empowered community.

Now, that may very well be a very good idea. But what is not a good idea is to agree to make that change under a process of having the board make a suggestion and then having the community comment on it. The only way that change should be possible is if the community forms the necessary committee, cross community working group, ICANN bylaw review, policy development process or whatever you want to call it, and reaches a consensus that that change is a valid and valuable change.

To try and make that change by the board having an idea and then putting it forward as a suggested change to the bylaws in a process that has nothing to do with that, but is actually about auction proceeds, and then just having that agreed to by the community in some form of public comment process, rather than going through all of the checks and balances that these things should normally go through, and a vote of the empowered community and so on and so forth, strikes me as being fundamentally flawed as a process.

So whilst I might think that it makes perfect sense to make such a change to the bylaw for the future, the only way I think it should be done is by following the existing process for making that change. And this is definitely not that. So I think we should go back to them and say, we were happy to agree with the auction proceeds recommendation, and that bylaw should be changed so that no one can, whatever wording is necessary, so that no one can use the accountability mechanisms, but introducing a new process for making changes, as is suggested, is not something we should be agreeing to at this stage and we should say no. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. I'm not sure if I understand it the same way. I think that this public comment on the proposed bylaw change is just a test on whether the community would be willing to have this done, instead of just going to the process because once it's gone to the process, we have 21 days to react as an empowered community member to say if we agree or not. The way I understand it, this was like, we want to do this

and we want to know whether you would like us to do this. I don't think they're overstepping the process.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: You're correct. My point is, and if I put it badly I apologize, my point is that coming to that conclusion, it can't be right that it's possible for one part of the community. What I'm trying to say is there needs to be a more enrolled and enveloped process to put forward something like this, before it goes to a vote of the empowered community. The community needs to get together and discuss whether this bylaw change is itself sensible. Instead of having a discussion in its silos, which is what's happening right now, ccNSO is having a look at it, do you think this is a good idea, and the registry stakeholder group is having a look at it, do you think this is a good idea, and so on and so forth. This is a change to a fundamental bylaw and that discussion should be taking place in a process that involves the whole of the community. It shouldn't be being put forward as a suggestion that then straight away, because we all go okay that sounds like a really good idea, ends up going to an empowered community process. That's my problem.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Not that I disagree with you, Chris, but I think that yes, having the discussion together would happen when the bylaw process starts, and then there can be a community forum to discuss it together, but that's within the process of the approval action, but I see Bart has his hand up. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. Just to check, Chris, for when we go into drafting mode, are you suggesting that the initial steps followed by, through this letter, by the board, lacks process? And so, effectively, I know this has been on the agenda in the discussions between the ccNSO Council, the ccNSO and the board in how do you effectively change fundamental bylaws? What are the trigger mechanisms for changing fundamental bylaws? And this clearly doesn't follow any of say what is coming from the community, broad support from the community, and then you initiate that process. Is that what you're saying? Because then you hit the point of public comment, etc. And that's not done.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think I'm saying both things, Bart. So to be very clear, I think the change for the auction proceeds is a no brainer. It should be done. That was the recommendation. I think whilst we're here, I think the board looking at that saying, well, whilst we're here, why don't we do this as well, is not the right way of doing it. But I also think that the actual concept itself is flawed, because I don't think it should be possible for a PDP or a cross community working group to come up with a recommendation that involves a bylaw change, and simply because that has been a consensus based recommendation across the community, you then get to bypass the empowered community mechanisms. I know it's a pain. I know it's ridiculous. The community working group has decided it thinks that this bylaw change should happen. And then we have to go into a whole other process of using the empowered community processes to get it done. But I actually think that's a worthwhile check and balance. And removing that is a recipe for fights

over whether or not the criteria for not using that process have in fact been met by this cross community making a decision.

So I'm actually saying both things, but I'm saying I think the change to the bylaw at the meta level, as opposed to just dealing with the auction proceeds is wrong. I don't think it's the right thing to do. But I also don't think that the process by which it's being put forward is the right process either. So it's on both sides. If you want to keep it simple, the simple answer is, from my point of view, is yes to the auction proceeds change. No to the bylaw change in respect to the future. Simple as that. Don't worry about the process. Just say no.

BART BOSWINKEL: And do you have an alternative? Just go for the fundamental bylaw change as suggested by the auction proceeds? Go back to that change?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, the removal of the thing that the board has asked us to remove on the auction bylaw change is right. We should agree to that. Because that is a correct point.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, okay.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: This is obviously a complicated discussion. Maybe the answer is we need to get a document up and start drafting a possible response so

that things will become clear, especially for those for whom either English is not their first language or their second language, and who are not legally bylaw minded, it would be a lot easier for people to understand if we had a piece of paper in front of us that we could scribble on, perhaps.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: We will do it. We will set up the Google Doc for a reply for the letter. I think we're discussing two different things here. One is the process to which led the board to suggest the bylaw change. We've discussed this with the board before, as in there is no process on how to do that, as in how does a fundamental bylaw change start. So, this goes to that part, as in related strictly to the process. The other part is the proposed bylaw change is just, to summarize it, is there a way of, if any other cross-community working group wants to restrict these accountability mechanisms, then it's already predefined that it should happen, not with every single cross-community working group that suggests, oh no, this should not happen, there should be a bylaw amendment. That's what they are proposing to do, like these generic things.

I'm not saying it is fine. My concerns are more that this suggestion includes terminology that is not defined in the bylaws or anywhere in ICANN, like what is a cross-community working group and how to be considered. There are some guidelines that have been adopted between ccNSO and GNSO, but that's it. Those are not the only SOs and ACs that could go to a cross-community working group. Again, these are guidelines that could be changed easily between either us or the GNSO, so it's not written anywhere. This is on the substance matter on what

it's been proposed as an easy way of dealing with similar requests that they think that in the future might come again, as in to restrict these independent review processes and reconsideration requests. There's a little bit more to this.

Now there are three parts, I would say. The things that are addressed in the letter, it's like if we should remove the text from the recommendation. So far I understand that yes, no problem with that. Second part is what they proposed as a bylaw amendment that has its own issues in content and everything else. And the third one is the process on how these bylaw amendments are being done. Did I capture that right, Chris? Yes? Okay.

Okay, I was just reading the chat. Okay, with that, yes, we will set up a Google Doc and it will be shared with all of us so we can draft the letter. And also all related material to this is in Tripti's letter, so please if you haven't had the chance or opportunity to read it for today, do read it for the drafting of the letter next week. Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: May I suggest that we, not the full council, but initially the small group of council draft the letter and that it will be circulated afterwards to the full council. It's easier to manage that way. So if there are some volunteers, that would be great. So Alejandra is a volunteer. Chris. Anybody else? So put your hand up if you're wanting to. Okay, Olga, anybody else? And Jennifer? Okay, I think that that captures it. So we'll set up a Google Doc, share it with this small group initially and then get

back to you early next week with drafting and then circulate the end result to the council. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you, Bart. And with that, we need to move on to our next item, that is the results on the OISC review. So the OISC review team has finally concluded its review and has suggested based on its findings to change and limit the mandate of the OISC and that it should focus more on organizing, mentoring and onboarding. I take this opportunity as well to note that the mentoring and the onboarding were also topics which emerged as priorities from the World Cafes. So it's something that the community is requesting to make the ccNSO more future proof.

So with this, I don't know, Nick, if you would, or anybody else from the review team would like to say anything regarding this. I don't see any hands. So do we have any questions or comments regarding this topic? I don't see any hands. So we do have a resolution in front of us. May I have a mover? I see Jennifer hands up and [inaudible] seconds it. And Chris has [inaudible] so I don't know why. But it was fun.

Okay. So Jennifer moves, [inaudible] seconds, and now I will read the decision. The ccNSO Council adopts the final report of the review team and thanks the team wholeheartedly for its work. The ccNSO Council supports the recommendation to limit the remit and scope of activities of the OISC and requests the Secretariat to suggest new terms of reference by our next meeting in May. This decision becomes effective seven days after publication. Any questions regarding the resolution? If

not, then please do use your green ticks if you are in favor or your red crosses if you object. All right. I see only green ticks. So thank you very much. This has been approved and thank you for the team for reviewing this committee.

With that, we move forward with item 19, that is the discussion and decision on the next steps outcome of the World Cafes on keeping the ccNSO relevant for 2030. So in March, we adopted the following process to review and act upon the outcomes. We first need to see whether it's on the remit of the ccNSO, and if it is on the remit of the ccNSO, then we need to see whether one of our groups is already dealing with it. And if it is, then we need to, and if it isn't, then we need to find where it could fit or who could deal with it.

So afterwards, we need to report back to the community on how all the suggestions have been dealt with. So in preparation for this, staff have compiled an overview of all actions and suggestions for assessment. And for this, may I ask Bart to explain this, please?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. Kim, can you put up the document I circulated to the Council? So this is, say, the summary of the World Cafes reports. You most likely have not read it, but the main topics are there. Can you scroll down, please, to the next page? We'll start with this one, community involvement, cross-community involvement. As an example, I will not go through the full document.

So you see the suggestions from the World Cafes, from both listed. The question is whether they're in scope of the ccNSO. In some cases, so I

haven't suggested any answer that's really to, say, for the Council to do. Say, current status is, I know, I've completed some of them as suggestions, where and how they, say, the suggestions have already become, say, actions. And then who is doing it, so is there a working group or committee currently handling this suggestion, dealing with this suggestion, acting upon it, or is it part of it, of the actions? And then, if not, then assign it to another one, yes or no. And if not applicable, meaning it's already done.

And then finally, a kind of priority, especially if it's not done, should it be a high priority, middle priority, or even an end, meaning don't do it, because there is hardly any, yeah, it's a lot of effort, but hardly any benefit from doing it. So there will be a little bit of effort impact analysis on each and every of these suggestions, looking at the goal of the World Cafes, does it make an, have an impact on the relevancy of the ccNSO over the next seven years.

So it lists all the suggestions. So I assume it's one or two hours work to complete with the, say, with volunteers. So that's about it. Don't know if there are any questions. Back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you, Bart. So you can see we have a very nice proposal on how to deal with all the suggestions. So to complete the assessment. Well, first, do you like it? Do you agree with this proposal? If so, please use your green ticks to say that you do, or your red crosses that you don't. Okay. I see green ticks. So with that, now we need to complete it. So what I would like to propose, it's a small group to

complete this assessment and present the results in the next council meeting. If you like this idea, again, use your green ticks. Or your red crosses if you don't think that's a good idea.

Okay, I see some green ticks. So let's have a small group to finish doing this assessment. And now may I ask for some volunteers? Anyone? No. All right, then I will ask you personally later if you would like to join. But we do need some people here.

BART BOSWINKEL: Can we do it after the call, say online? And yeah, that's easier. I'll circulate an email tomorrow to the council asking for volunteers.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, please. Thank you. So that will give you also some time to think about it. There are not many suggestions. So it's I believe that it won't require too much time to complete. So with that, let's go to item 20. That's the ccNSO relevant meetings at ICANN 80. With that, may I ask Kim to present the schedule for us? Okay. So, Kim, just a quick question. Would you like to run through it or shall I?

KIM CARLSON: Would you mind doing it?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No problem. So thank you. Just confirming. With this, well, this is the current draft. As you know, it's a draft. It still could have some changes,

but hopefully not too greatly. We have the tech day and DNSSEC on Monday. And on Monday, we have penciled a joint meeting with the GAC. And I say pencil because I believe that there is a suggestion to defer this joint session. We don't have confirmation about this yet. This is a small meeting, as you see, it's four days only. And we know the GAC will have the high-level meeting as well on Sunday. I believe that the time it's very tight. So there could be still need to be confirmed whether we will defer this session or not.

In the event that we do not defer the session, there is a suggestion on having, let's say, a rundown from the working groups and committees of the ccNSO. So just like an introduction to all the activities that we do. Let's remember that it's been a while since we had a joint meeting with the GAC and that they do have a high turnover. So there's a lot of new people. So it would be a good idea to bring them up to speed, not only with—they already know what the ccNSO does and what's its scope, but it would be a good idea to let them know exactly where we invest our efforts and our activities. So we'll see how this evolves.

There is also the WSIS+20 plenary. Now we know that they did a call for volunteers for organizing it. And I know Jordan and Annaliese will be participating there. So they will tell us more next time, at least Jordan. And then for the members meetings, we have, well, the welcome. Then we have ccTLD news. The DASC will have a session. And we have on a hold there on Tuesday, because as we spoke, we are seeking whether we can have a different activity for the ccNSO cocktail or gathering. And we will use this space for that. Then we have the Universal Acceptance Committee on Wednesday, the Policy Gap Analysis, the IGLC and the SOPC.

And on Thursday, there's the Registrar Capacity Building follow up from Hamburg. And then there will be a World Café from the GRC, where they will be looking at the membership voting process and seek ways on how to improve it. And we end with the ccNSO Council meeting. And there is a hold from the board and the org on the last block on Thursday, in case they find a topic they want to present. We don't know more on this at the moment.

So with that, I want also to let you know that we need to have a call before Kigali regarding a preparation for the meeting. And maybe to discuss what was presented regarding the portfolio of activities. So maybe we can combine those two. And there are two possible dates for this, either the 23rd or the 30th of May. And maybe later, we'll send an email. So you can state your preference. We will have our next meeting on the 16th of May. So that's something to take into consideration. So we'll see on that.

The next thing is that we have already scheduled a virtual meeting with the GNSO Council on the 11th of July. Because again, having bilaterals in this short meeting is very difficult. And that's it. I don't know, Bart, Joke, or Kim, if I'm missing anything regarding the block schedule?

BART BOSWINKEL: No, you captured it very well.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, thank you. With that, we can come back to the agenda. Thank you very much. And now we are in AOB. And we have like two seconds. So

I'll try to be as quick as possible. And excuse me for overrunning one minute. So we received the email from Katrina giving a heads up on the analysis of the ccPDP review mechanism. And as we heard from her in her email, and at the Q&A in San Juan, we will receive two sets of questions. One for clarification, as in this is what was mentioned, maybe a yes or no. And a request to confirm the interpretation of recommendations, whether there needs to be a little bit more work.

So it is my understanding that we can expect these questions next week. And we need to plan these a little bit carefully on how we want to handle it. Because this is a new procedure for all of us. I think for the ccNSO, for ICANN, and for the board, we are talking about ccNSO recommendations that were approved initially by the working group that dealt with the ccPDP, then approved by us and then by the membership. And currently, the Council is looking at related matters through the Policy Gap Ad-Hoc group. So it is not something to take lightly.

So what I want to ask you is if you would like to handle these questions at our next meeting in May, in the 16th of May, or if we should have an extraordinary call before, say in two weeks, like the 2nd of May.

Since we are over time, I will send this question as well in the mailing list, just to gather your thoughts and to see where you want to go, if we should have an extraordinary call or at the next meeting. And with that, I apologize for the overtime. Our next Council meeting is on the 16th of May at 21:00 UTC. And I thank you all for joining and for participating. And see you soon. Have a great day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]