
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Welcome everybody to our ccNSO Council meeting 2007 on the 18th of July 2024. Please, if you haven't done so, to all councilors, please add to your Zoom ID the word ccNSO Council or Councilor. I'm going to take the opportunity now, as usual, to paste in the chat the wiki where we have all the documents related to this call. And I would like to ask if anyone has any other business already so I can keep track on it. Okay, I don't see any hands right now, but in any case, when we get there, I'll ask again. So, for now, do we have any apologies?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, we received apologies from Molehe.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. And are we quorate?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We don't have anybody from the African region yet. I'll let you know so that somebody joins. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Claudia. So, with that, moving to update on statement of interest. Does anyone have any updates to the statements of interest? I don't see any hands, so we will continue. So, let's go to the administrative matters. We have the relevant correspondence. Here we have the letter that we sent regarding ICANN's role in the WSIS+20

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

process, and it is here because we will address it briefly to let you know how our conversation with Sally went. This will be on item 10.3.

With that, moving along with minutes and action items. The minutes from our last in-person meeting were circulated and no further comments received, so they are adopted. With that, the action items listed have been completed. We will discuss the result of the action item 206-04, which is the set of calls for volunteers. This is under item 11 of the agenda, but besides that, are there any questions regarding the action items themselves? No? Okay, I see no hands, so moving along.

We are now in item 4, intermeeting decisions. So, with these decisions, I'd like to add that we have approved the timeline for the 360 evaluation. This means that you will receive the links to the various surveys from Bart. Please use this opportunity to give feedback to the councilors. I know from my own experience that it's very helpful, it's greatly appreciated, and as we have discussed this in the past, it shouldn't take that much time. So, just as soon as you get them, find, I don't know, 30 minutes of your time, and if you can fill them all at once, that would be awesome. Thank you.

With this, moving along to item 5, the intermeeting decisions of the triage committee. There have been no decisions since the last meeting, and that brings us to the update session. So, with respect to items 6, 7, and 8 on the agenda, we have written updates from most of the working groups and committees and the liaisons. Are there any questions or comments regarding these updates? I would like, yes, Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, this is Peter for the record. Last meeting [inaudible] heads up regarding the RSS GWG. Is that under this item, or should I defer to a later one?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, we don't have it in these written updates, but yes, we should include an update here, if you have one. Do you, or would you prefer to send it later over email?

PETER KOCH: Well, I would just maybe say two or three sentences, a bit for the background, and then have questions and can send a more detailed explanation afterwards, if that is okay with the chair, Madam Chair.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, let's do it like that, Peter. So, it gives us time as well.

PETER KOCH: Okay, thank you so much. And I apologize for the sound, but I can't do much against it. The RSS GWG, which is the Root Server System Governance Working Group, is a cross-community working group that has three, I believe, appoint, two appointees, I'm sorry, two appointees from the ccNSO, is tasked to propose a future structure for the governance of the root service system, and that includes deciding about questions like how to add or remove root name servers, how to

determine the number of root name servers, and a discussion about the accountability.

The current state is that we're working on a, on a proposal for a structure, and that structure should have representatives from various stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups have a different strength, so to speak. There is the group of root server operators, which already today has the, yeah, that governs itself in a way, which is very recent to come up with this additional structure. There is the group of the gTLDs and the group of the ccTLDs that would have this stronger position as in, I'm inclined to say voting rights, but that's not completely the correct term. There might be other stakeholders that can be involved in the discussion, but these three groups are currently it.

For various reasons, that group, that steering committee in a way, is currently designed to have 24 members, 12 of which will be appointees from the 12 root server operators, and the other 12 will be six from the ccNSO and six from the GNSO. Now, the large number is basically to balance the, quote unquote, voting power so that no one group could outvote the others, and especially the TLDs balance the root several operators, and the second aspect is that there is little hope that the root server operators could agree on representation, which is the precondition for having less than 12 seats for the root server operators, unless [inaudible] for that committee.

This is not baked yet. It is something that we had worked on and ended up at the moment during the negotiations. There might be a discussion that we should have at a later stage, how to deal with this challenge of

finding six qualified volunteers that would also be able to regularly participate in the sessions of this particular steering group.

Other questions are maybe about the, the balance of power, so to speak. I wanted to raise this in a meeting verbally so all the councilors understand the opportunities, but also the challenges that are there. I'm happy to answer questions immediately, which, I don't know whether we have time for that, or maybe we can have a discussion about that. Or maybe in a specialized session for this topic of interest.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Peter, for the update and the introduction. I think that since we didn't have, well, the background information for this particular call, it would be best if you can send us the summary over the mailing list and we keep the conversation there and then we can, well, if you need answers, let us know for which date do you need this information. And if it can wait until our next council call, then we can discuss it further. Does that sound good to you?

PETER KOCH:

Yes, absolutely. Thank you. Okay. Yes. I was just to add for clarification, there is currently no call for volunteers that we would have to immediately react to. For that to happen, the whole structure would have to be formally accepted, which would again involve a ccNSO statement. So just to make this distinction clear, we are discussing the structure and the challenges about that, not actual calls for volunteers. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, perfect. Thank you, Peter. I see some questions from Chris in the chat. Maybe, Peter, you can address them in the chat. So, with that, any other comments regarding working group updates? I just want to mention, while I see if any hands are raised, that we have included the new policy gap analysis working group. It should be PGA. It will be correct. So it will be included in the usual updates. And we will include now, Peter, the root server governance one also in our updates.

So, with that, moving to item nine.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Alejandra, sorry for the interruption. Biyi has joined. We are quorate.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, thank you. Thank you, Claudia. So, with that, we are now on item nine. It's an update of the ccNSO website redesign. The small group has met again after ICANN 80 and we are getting up to speed again with the pace of the meetings. We are now looking into the wireframing of the new website and more to come. Things are moving forward. We are seeing progress and we are happy. I don't know if any of the members of the small group would like to say anything else regarding the website. Okay. I see no hands.

With that, we move to the item 10 and we have the update of chair, vice chairs, councilors, regional organizations and the secretariat and we already have some updates listed. The first one is regarding the ICANN 81 planning call. We had one planning call. The main block schedule was

shared. And based on this main block schedule, there are some sessions for ICANN 81 that have been already penciled in.

There is one question pending that we need to answer soonish, is whether we want to propose a plenary and of course, if we want to get involved in any other plenary that is suggested. So far, there has not been a topic shared in the mailing list, but we are able to propose one until tomorrow. So if you have some thoughts on that, we will discuss it further in item 17, unless you already have something you would like to share.

Okay. Seeing no hands, I'll go to the second item and these are the takeaways with the meeting with the GNSO council. For those of you who were not able to attend, the main topics that we discussed were whether or not to defer the third CSC effectiveness review. These will be discussed in our item 13 on the agenda. Just to give you a preview, we had an agreement to write to the board that the ccNSO and GNSO felt like deferring the review for a year or until the bylaws have changed, whichever comes first. We exchanged our top priorities. We informed them about the policy gap analysis working group, the management of activities and also some of our continuous improvement efforts.

It was mentioned briefly, the note on how we meet that we will discuss later in our agenda. We didn't have much discussion on that topic because they haven't had the opportunity to discuss it themselves as neither did we. So we were just tasting the waters to see if they have any thoughts on it. And the only comments came from the process and

they share a little concern about the role of the SOAC leadership as a conduit.

Finally, Nick was kind enough to give the GNSO a small summary on the technical coalition, which is related to the discussion on the WSIS+20. The GNSO council as such is not focused on it. However, many of the individual councilors are involved. And finally, we did agree to tentatively meet in Istanbul or online if necessary. Some of the topics that we discuss could have potential follow-ups like the CSC review, how we meet and the WSIS+ 20. Does anyone else would like to add anything to this summary? Or the others? Okay. I see no hands up.

So with that, I'll move along with the WSIS+20 conversation. This meeting happened on Tuesday at 10:00 UTC. From the council were present Biyi, Jordan, Peter, Chris and myself. And from ICANN, there was Sally, Benny, Elena and Theresa, even though briefly. We introduced the letter. Sally noted that the letter was timely and concerns are shared across the community, not just the ccNSO council. And she mentioned that the GAC and the ccNSO are the ones who are most active in this area.

And then we discussed ways to address the concerns that we raised. And the suggestions are mainly to develop a more active strategy to work on implementation through the network that's already been built. This builds on the recognitions that ICANN should play a more active leadership role in a role as facilitator through a series of gatherings with the whole community. We also talked about having better and earlier communications by ICANN to the community, including the ccTLDs, so there are no surprises and there's better coordination. And finally, it

was discussed of having or consolidated and more targeted and updated ICANN's messaging. We will receive the notes of this conversation as soon as possible, and when those are delivered, I will share them with you. Do others who were present in this call would like to add anything? All right, I don't see any hands up. Oh, Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER:

It was good that the call happened. It was unfortunate that it happened because someone sent the letter draft to Sally or someone in the ICANN staff. And it does feel like they know they need to change course. The upsetting thing, I guess, if there's anything to be upset about is that they're now re-agreeing to do things they agreed to do in January. And unless I missed it, it's July. So we've wasted six months by them not doing things they'd already committed to. So I think we need to be careful to keep some pressure on for that. And I sort of wonder whether one way to that might be to propose a plenary session at the meeting in Istanbul in November to give them the chance and give us all the chance to show that we're more successfully engaged than we have been so far. So that's the observation I would offer.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Jordan. And yes, I completely agree. In the round table we had in Washington, this was the agreement that we had reached and then things changed along the way, but now maybe we're getting them back to course. And I agree that proposing this topic as a plenary would be timely, maybe not necessarily on what ICANN is doing, but what we should do as a community. So have a discussion together on the

messaging and since it's a plenary, well, everyone will be in the room, everyone will be involved and everyone will know next steps. So just to check whether that would be a good idea, may I ask if you would put your green ticks up if you agree that we suggest this as a plenary for ICANN 81.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Significant amount of water will have flowed under the bridge between now and Istanbul. I'm concerned that there's a possibility that if we put it up there as a plenary, there'll be a temptation to wait until we have the plenary before we see any real action. I'm wondering if that, I'm not sure if that's just, I may be being overcautious. The only other point I would make is that there is always the geopolitical session, which we could suggest is run more as, rather than taking up a separate plenary, we could perhaps suggest that that geopolitical session is extended slightly and run more as a plenary rather than having a separate plenary. Just a logistical thought. I can see Jordan's got something to say.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Chris. And yes, that could be a risk. And this, of course, we are very clear that that's not what we are aiming for. What we were, let's say, discussing with Sally is that there will be a series of calls with the whole community who wanted to participate, to engage and move things forward from now on, not until Istanbul. But I hear you, Chris, that it could be misinterpreted. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, I think it's a risk we should be conscious of and probably best managed by suggesting a plenary that says ICANN is going to be working with the community to establish a strategic approach dealing with WSIS-20 review. There'll be progress on that in the third quarter of the year. The chance of this plenary will be to both present the achievements of that strategy to date and talk with the community about what we can all do to mobilize around this. So I think as long as we frame it with that risk in mind, we can probably make sure it isn't about, here's the opportunity for ICANN to present its new idea that it talked about in July. So I think it just needs to be taken into account in how we frame any proposal. It'll be interesting to see how the GNSO council responds to that as well.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. I see Chris gave a thumbs up in Zoom. So, okay. Jordan, if I could ask you to write a little draft and send it to the mailing list, if it's possible, since you already have the inspiration.

JORDAN CARTER: You can ask and I can say yes. So I'll do that tomorrow my time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Or maybe I will just, to give us a little bit more time, maybe I'll write to the planning team saying, we do have a proposal of a plenary. We just need to phrase it properly, just to let them know it's coming. So, because again, they have this deadline tomorrow. So that would buy us some time, I think. And regarding Chris and the proposal on the

geopolitical session, we, yes, can suggest that to be done differently, but unfortunately that's as much I think we can do, provide suggestions because it's on them to actually build it. Thank you, Chris. So I did see some green ticks on that, but after we had this conversation, do we still have like the green ticks or anyone changed their minds? I just want to make sure. If you could please put them up again, if you agree. Okay. I see many green ticks. So we've moved forward with it. Thank you. Thank you very much. So does anybody else have any other options or any other updates that they would like to share now? Okay. Let me see. No hands up. So with that, we move along.

So we have item 11. It's the appointment of members to committees and working groups. And in item 11A, it's the progress on the selection of the CSC member and alternate. The call for volunteers is open until today at midnight UTC. As far as I understand, there are at least two candidates. That means that we will need to select the members and the alternate. And on this topic also, Sam Demetriou, the chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group has already reached out to coordinate the selection of the members. This is just a formal step. So from our side, the CSC selection committee will be involved. So soon you will get a calendar invite for this formal step. Moving along.

On 11B, we have the approval appointment of members for the policy gap analysis working group. And here you will see that we have a table of people who applied. This is the result of the call for volunteers and also the webinar that was organized by the Secretary to solicit the interest in this policy gap analysis working group. We have quite some interest in total. We have 19 people who put their name forward and we have a little bit of a mixed bag of applicants. So, in addition to the

regular applications, we received one from a person who didn't list an affiliation with the ccTLD or other entity. We have Laura who volunteered as a liaison from ALAC, which is great. Thank you, Laura. And we have Rocio, Federica and Peter van Roste from regional organizations who will be liaisons as well.

So, looking at the charter, those who are associated with a ccTLD organization can be appointed as members. Regional organizations can be confirmed as liaisons. Those related to other SOACs are as invited, for example, a liaison from X organization can be a participant and others can be observers.

So, we also need to appoint an initial chair to get the ball rolling. The chair and vice chair eventually will need to be nominated by the working group and appointed by council. But for now, may I ask Jordan to be the initial chair for this working group?

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, I'm happy to do that. It feels reasonably well connected with the small group I've been leading already. So, happy to.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you, Jordan. So, with that, are there any questions or comments on the topic? Yes, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Ale. So, I didn't put my name forward because I'm not associated, technically speaking, with a ccTLD. I could probably get a

ccTLD to say that I'm associated with them, but it didn't seem to me to be a sensible thing for me to do. And the form required that. And I'm fine with that. I don't have any issue with that at all. But I would like to, given my involvement in the original PDP, I think it would be useful if I was at least observing it. So, I just wanted to say that now because I didn't fill in the form. So, we could deal with that offline if it's possible. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, I believe it is possible and also you can join us as a council member, unless I'm mistaken. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, of course. And look, in this sense, it's more important that we have the right people on it. And this is kick-starting the PGA. I do think in time, others might be interested to participate in the later stage as well. So, this is not a one-off call for volunteers and then closing everything. So, it's definitely open, but this is to ensure the continuity of the work of the small ad hoc group and get it up and running as soon as possible. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'll leave it in your hands, Bart, to figure out what I need to do. Thanks very much.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yes, I just said I didn't mean to volunteer for this. I didn't. But the deadline isn't apparently passed yet. So, I do like a deadline as a challenge and an opportunity to leave things to the last minute. But I'd like to volunteer as well. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think we'll take this offline and take the next... Do you want to volunteer as a member, Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think so, I guess. Can you not join as a non-member or is this...

BART BOSWINKEL: You could be invited, of course, by the chair.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I'm not very excited by these technical distinctions. I think I'll just stick to the vanilla membership, if that's okay.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It's okay and well noted. So, with that, any other questions or comments? I see none. So, we have a resolution in front of us and I need a mover. I see Pablo's hand and Jordan's hand as seconder. Thank you. So, are there any questions regarding the resolution? If not, then I will ask you to please use your green ticks if you're in favor or your red

crosses if you object or abstain. I only see green ticks. So, thank you very much. This has passed. And thank you all for volunteering to this new working group. I see there is a lot of interest and motivation, so I wish this will be a very productive working group. With that, fingers crossed, Jordan.

With that, we will move now to the schedule of other calls for volunteers and expressions of interest. So, if you recall, we did ask the secretary to put together a draft schedule for the various calls of volunteers that need to happen and the calls for expression of interest. This schedule was circulated on Tuesday, so next on our schedule will be the call for the ccNSO appointee to the NomCom and liaisons in August. So, that is just an update on that one. And next, there is no resolution text in the screen. Is it now there?

DEMI GETSCHKO: It's about the last voting. I don't see why we are voting about a resolution that was not in the screen.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, I was... Sorry, I thought everyone had the agendas at hand. So, with that, can I move to item D? Yes, okay. So, we have the tech working group appointment of vice chairs. So, Stephen, could you please give us a bit of an introduction on this one? I know Stephen is in his car. I'm not sure if Stephen is able to speak right now. But if not, let me give you the introduction.

Stephen did circulate to us a tech working group report where it was mentioned that Jacques Latour has stepped down before the end of his term. And the three-year term of the other vice chair, Ondrej Filip ended as well. So, in accordance with its charter, the tech working group nominated Niklas Poussette for a two-year term and Ondrej Filip for a three-year term. So, are there any questions or comments regarding this topic? I don't see any hands. So, with that, we do have a decision to nominate the vice chairs. May I have a mover? I see Pablo's hand in camera. May I have a seconder? I see Jordan's hand on camera. And I saw you later, Demi, thank you. So, we do have a decision, I hope, in front of us now. Yes. So, any questions regarding the resolution? I don't see any hands. So, with that, may I ask you to please use your green ticks for approval or your red crosses if you object or abstain? I see only green ticks. So, thank you very much. This is passed. And thank you, Jacques Latour, for serving as vice chair, and we hope that he continues to be involved. And thank you to Niklas and Ondrej for continuing the work.

With that, we move to item 12. It's the 2025 annual council election and approval of timeline for an appointment of election process manager. So, the council election period is getting closer. So, for that reason, the secretariat has started its planning and shared a timeline with us on the 12th of July. This timeline includes a slot for Q&A at the Istanbul meeting. In addition, we do need to appoint the election process manager. Are there any questions regarding this item? I don't see any hands up. So, if we could move forward to the decision. We do have a resolution. May I have a mover? Pablo, thank you. And may I have a seconder? I see Peter is seconding. So, thank you for that. So, now we

do have a resolution in front of us. Any questions regarding the decision? I don't see any hands up. So, with that, let's go to the voting. So, please use your green ticks if you approve or your red crosses if you object or abstain. Okay. I see only green ticks. So, this has been approved. Thank you very much.

And with that, we move forward to more substantive matters and decisions. So, now we are on item 13. It's the third CSC effectiveness review and how to handle the review. So, we had already discussed a little bit this matter on our meeting in May. And at the time, the sentiment was to defer the third effectiveness review. As I already told you, we discussed this with the GNSO, who also supports the decision to defer. And we agreed to draft a joint letter to send to the board to this regard. I can also tell you that the CSC itself fully supports deferring this review. They believe that it makes no sense to start a new review when not all recommendations have been implemented, not knowing whether they will see any impact has been achieved. And given the short time frame between the adoption of the second final report that was in April 2023, and the new review would start in the 1st of October, that wouldn't give much time. They also wanted to note that this third effectiveness review will again be in parallel with the IANA function review. So, it wouldn't be very useful that way.

So, the proposed action is that the ccNSO and the GNSO council will draft a joint letter to be adopted in August stating that the council deferred the third effectiveness review and that we are of course waiting for the bylaw change to happen. So, if you agree with this approach, can I see some green ticks in Zoom? Just waiting to give you a chance. I see lots of green ticks. Thank you. And by this I would like to

ask if there are any volunteers who want to assist in the drafting of this letter. We will use the briefing that was circulated as a starting point. Olga? Volunteer? Or hand up. So, I take that as volunteer.

All right. So, as usual, we will have this in a Google Doc. It will be shared with the whole council when the draft is done. And we will share it of course with the GNSO. And once that's final, we will adopt it. Okay, no hand, just confused with green tick. Okay, no problem, Olga. So, with that, I will move forward to the item 14. Are there any other comments regarding the CSC review? Effectiveness review? No hands. Okay.

So, with that, we have the review of travel funding. So, may I ask Peter to introduce this topic for us?

PETER KOCH:

Yes, thank you. So, the travel funding committee convened for the discussion of the applications for the next after next meeting. And during that, we had a discussion about the criteria and the long-term strategy, so to speak. What do we want to achieve? What should we take into account in the future? What could be dark patterns and so on and so forth?

And based on that discussion, we had a discussion with partly the secretariat. And the idea was born to do this discussion about the quality and the goals in a more formalized manner under the umbrella of our continuous improvements program, I guess is the name. And I trust you, Bart, to take it from here with a more concrete approach. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Peter. It seems timely that the travel funding is reviewed. It's been a while since they've been using the same approach. And yes, since we have adopted the framework for continuous improvement, I think it sounds great to me to use it for this specific purpose that it's to, well, improve the travel funding process. Bart, would you like to add anything?

BART BOSWINKEL: No, not at all. I think it's, that may be one thing. It has proven to work, for example, with the updating the surveys for the MPC. So it gives you a structured basis to really look into the improvements and document it, but also record it later on. It's one of the things. It's on the secretariat's to-do list to start building a, say, a library of all these continuous improvement initiatives we are currently undertaken. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you, Bart. And well, with this, I would like to ask the rest of the Council, if you agreed with the proposed approach. Does it sound good to you? I see nodding in the cameras. And green ticks. Okay, thank you. So with this, Peter and the other members of the Travel Funding Committee, do you think you would be able to report back in time with a proposal so it can be used in the next travel funding round that would be for ICANN 82?

PETER KOCH: This is Peter, if I may, and not speaking for the other members, of course. Yeah, the schedule is quite tight, maybe, because we start very early with reviews for, sorry, maybe applications and review of the applications for the next after next meeting. But I guess in the preparation, we found a way to at least make progress on that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, well, we'll see how it goes and if it can be applied, because it would be great to already put it to the test. But thank you, Peter. So with that, if there are no more comments on this topic, I see Jennifer agrees with Peter in the chat. We move now to item 15, and it's the discussion on ICANN's How We Meet initiative. So as you may recall, I informed you at our Kigali meeting that the SO AC chairs and vice chairs, which included Biyi, Jordan and myself, we had an informal meeting with Sally in Kigali. And at this meeting, Sally introduced two topics for community conversation. One was how we meet and the other is how we work. And as a follow up, Mary Wong from ICANN circulated a discussion paper on how we meet.

So going back to the note from Mary, there are three elements to discuss. And one is they explain why would ICANN and the community need to optimize the in-person meetings to ensure that the community can remain to do its work effectively and efficiently while staying within budgetary constraints. They also speak about how the structure of the discussion or the process of having the discussion should be. That's their proposal. And also there are some suggestions and issues and topics that need to be reviewed.

But looking on the second point on the process, it is my understanding that by the end of July, which is effectively in one and a half weeks, the SOAC chairs and vice chairs will provide feedback on some agreed questions that are not yet mentioned. By the mid late of August, there will be a second call to discuss and agree on concrete ideas which can be implemented and or need further exploration. And finally, and if necessary, there would be a third call at the end of August, starting of September. To propose and review on steps forward.

As I already told you, we touched briefly this topic with the GNSO Council. Well, there is a concern on the process on how things have been presented. And I see Chris has his hand up. He also expressed his concern on how this has been delivered. And I see you. I'll get to the queue in a bit.

We have already stated in December when the cross community group on continuous improvement request came to us, we already said that the role of the SO AC chairs is limited, what the role of the SO AC chairs group as such is more like a point of contact. However, we are not mandated to make any decision. This has been discussed many times. It was also again, discussed in the roundtable in January in Washington. And now we are getting again, these big ask from ICANN to the chairs to give feedback in an even more limited time than before. With an impact that is bigger than the continuous improvement cross community work group. So with that, I'd like to give the floor first to Chris and then to Nick.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Ale. This is Chris. This is a singularly inappropriate way dealing with possible changes to the meeting structure of ICANN. In the past, those sorts of changes have happened in two ways. One, as a result of a formal review. ICANN 2.0 being the first one of those way back in 2003. Or by a separate meeting strategy working group, which I think if I remember correctly, I know Sally and I were part of that. So I must have been post Fadi, but I can't remember exactly what year that was. But it's as a result of the meeting strategy working group that we ended up with these three meetings characterized the way they currently are with a policy for the middle of the year, the AGM at the end and so on.

It is simply not the right way to go about things to ask the leaders of the SOs and ACs to take the strain of dealing with their communities' views on this and come back and provide input and advice. It's equally not acceptable to, I would suggest, take longer to draft the paper upon which you're being asked to provide input than you are being given to actually provide the input. It's a nonsense. And I think we should simply go back and say, I'm sorry, but using the SO and AC chairs to provide you with input on the structure of the meetings going forwards is simply not the right way. I can say that I know for sure that the registry stakeholder group is likely to be responding along those lines. I say that simply to provide some useful parallel and background to the council. I'm not suggesting that we have to always or should even ever respond the same way, but just so you know.

And I think that we should be very straightforward and simply go back and say, thank you, but this is not the right way. I think we could say we're happy for anything to be put on the table to discuss anything, but this is the wrong table. The table should be a working group, meeting

strategy working group. And if that's the table, then we'll contribute and will be as flexible as possible. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, I mean, I largely agree with everything that Chris said, even though I don't have the history and background for how we got to where we are today. And I just was a bit, not irritated, but a bit unimpressed, because I asked Sally the question when she came to speak at the thing, and it was a session about how ccTLDs can do good and the UN Sustainable Development Goals. And every time I go to an ICANN conference, obviously it's a huge privilege to be able to go to beautiful Rwanda and all of these sorts of things. But every time I go to an ICANN meeting, I do sort of think, my goodness me, what is the carbon cost of all of these people? And post-COVID, there's a lot smarter ways to do business in smaller chunks and better tools and all the rest of it.

So my question was much more from an environmental sustainability perspective. ICANN should be taking a long hard look at the environmental costs of holding the meetings and finding ways to reduce it, like all our organizations are doing everywhere, like in terms of moving to renewable electricity. So they must be doing some benchmarking. So my targeted question to her was very much around environmental impact and sustainability being the overriding objective. And when Mary Wong's letter came through, it just seemed to be all

about, oh, we want to save money. And that kind of pissed me off, if I'm honest, because I don't think—the financial drive is obviously an important consideration and being fiscally responsible is obviously important. But really, the thrust of the point I was making was around the environmental impact. And it must be enormous. And we should find ways to be smarter and to reduce that, like everybody's trying to do. So anyway, so that was kind of just my two pence on it. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Trying to be really brief, because we're all pushing in the same direction. I didn't like the way the paper sort of framed it to suggest that out of this discussion between Sally and the chairs came this idea. Sally brought this issue to us saying she would do it. So I agree with the direction. I think we should be pushing it back to a meeting strategy working group. And if we want to charter that with a cost saving bias, we can do it. If we want to charge it with a balanced portfolio of things to consider, cost, environment, volunteer time, effectiveness, that seems more reasonable given the stewardship responsibility we have to make the ICANN system work. But asking the SOAC chairs to do it is just unreasonable. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Thank you, Jordan. Completely agree. So anybody else? Well, so with all that has been said, it's clear to me that we need to push back on

this. So if you agree on doing so, please put your green ticks up. And if you have other ideas or object, your red crosses. I'm looking at the green ticks that are coming up. Thank you all. I see only green ticks. So very well. Well, this means we need to write another letter. This letter should include three topics, at least. One reiterates the ccNSO council believes that the SOAC chairs gatherings are not the right forum for discussion and conclusions about nontrivial matters as this one. Also mentions that the timeline is prohibitive for consultation with community members, even if we would take this upon ourselves to go and gather the information from the ccNSO. There's no reality on being able to do so. And we can even propose alternatives on how this process should look. So with this in mind, do I have any volunteers to help with this first draft? I see Jordan said something in the chat. Yes, Jordan. Thank you. Okay. And Chris. With the condition that Jordan starts, he will contribute. Noted. And yes, I'll be also in the drafting team as well. Anyone else? And Sean, thank you. And once we have the final draft, of course, will circulate to everyone and we'll approve it together.

With that, if there are no more comments regarding this matter, we move now to item 16. And that's on continuous improvement program cross community group. And for this, I'm handing it over to Sean.

SEAN COPELAND:

Thank you. Claudia, are you able to bring up the slideshow? And Irina is here as well, free to jump in at any time. And Chris is also part of this group. So, Chris, feel free to also jump in at any time. This is a discussion on the continuous improvement program, the CIP CCG group. This is something that is being done across the various communities that are

participating. And of course, right up front, I'd like to thank Irina for her help in all of this. Next slide.

So the aim of today's presentation is threefold, is to educate the community generally on the principles, criteria, and indicator framework, to answer any questions about the framework, and it is to invite feedback on the criteria and indicators. Given the nature of how we do things in the ccNSO and the difficulty in getting people to attend webinars and the like, the easiest way obviously is through council. And then if council deems that we should take this to the community as a webinar, we are more than willing to do so. And obviously it's important for us to have a shared understanding of what we are doing within the working group. Next slide, please.

So the ATR3 recommendation 3.6 revolves around the organizational review into a continuous improvement program. It's a significant cultural shift that to shift from external to internal continuous improvement mechanisms, that cannot be understated, or sorry, overstated. The CIP is led by the ICANN community and will include regular surveys of members of assessments, which is pretty regular. And of course, to develop this, we are looking for broad community input, which is why the CIP group was put together as it was. Next slide.

So this is an overview of our timeline and key milestones. You can see there are important dates are included, including the August 7th aspirational goal of providing a framework to the community. And then that will go into for public comment into November. And you can see the various phases of community input and framework socialization that is going on. Next slide.

Okay, so here you're looking at the development process. It was broken down into four phases. Phase one and phase two are complete, which focused on develop, well, sort of on principles. We'll come to that. Focusing on developing principles and informing community groups. Phase three is of course gathering feedback criteria indicators from various communities. Obviously ourselves are included. We talked about this a little bit in GRC and of course, anyone in council is more than willing to provide feedback, please do so. And phase four of course is reaching consensus and finalizing the draft framework.

This slide here shows the long-term timeline for the CIP, including assessment periods and integration with other review processes. Obviously the first assessment period, hopefully will conclude in 2027 and will result in informing the holistic review process. And keep in mind that continuous improvement requires time, people, and potentially financial resources to succeed. So when we're talking about budget and other areas, do keep in mind this as an interesting area of concern down the road. And it's probably very good that Irina is here as a member of the SOPC because this may appear somewhere along the line. Next slide.

This is our happy side of our group. You'll see Irina, myself, and Chris in that photograph amongst various other people. It's just the volunteers, so on and so forth. And while you're looking at that, just also remember that continuous improvement represents a cultural shift requiring feedback, flexibility, and ease of adoption. And this group of people hopefully is going to bring it to you along with the secretariat involved. And the secretariat involved, I would point out to you guys, is very

enthusiastic about this process, which makes it an enjoyable experience. Next slide.

So here you're looking at the principles, criteria, indicator framework that is part of our approach. The principles, of course, define the CIP's objectives. The criteria describe the conditions to meet these principles, and the indicators measure where the criteria are met. Next slide. So here you see the principle, criteria, indicator, again, related to recommendation 3.6, which kind of brings us all together. Next slide.

So the foundations principle comes from the objectives outlined in Article 4.4 of the ICANN Bylaws. And of course, the objectives include assessing the purpose, effectiveness, and accountability of the organizational structures. Next slide. So slide 11. So this is the draft principles that are aimed to ensure that the SOs, ACs, NomCom are fulfilling the purposes, are effective and efficient, are accountable. Note that these principles are predicated on an organizational understanding of a top-down process. Yet, they are also very wide open. These principles will guide the execution of the Continuous Improvement Program. I do want to point out number four to you, and I think I did this in the letter as well. I want to point out that other participants are having what I will call a semantic fixation on the use of the term stakeholder and substructure. We had a very lively conversation about this in the GRC on Monday. And of course, the takeaway from this is that from the perspective of the ccNSO in terms of the GRC, and of course, I'll leave it to you as council to really emphasize this, that from our perspective, it's a non-issue. Accountability is accountability. Other groups have very significant issues with, as I said, the use of the term stakeholder and substructure. Next slide.

So this slide provides an example of how the principles translate into criteria. So of course, efficient operations can be broken down into criteria such as having a process for planning and assessing inputs, if you were to actually look at the details that were on that particular screen. Next slide. So this slide provides an example of how principles translate into criteria. For example, you can see the principle of efficient operation can be broken down into criteria such as having a process for planning and assessing inputs. And of course, the GRC will start looking at indicators relative to the World Cafe and Open Space sessions that we have had to date. This kind of tie into developing our own criteria or adopting some of the criteria that ICANN or other entities within ICANN or within the broader community bring to the table. Next slide.

So this slide goes further into how criteria can be translated into specific indicators. And of course, you can see a planning process can be measured by whether such process exists and if it can be effectively implemented. Next slide. So it's a nice little graphic on the collaborative process. And of course, the notion that people will provide feedback on the proposed criteria and indicators as we go along. Next slide, please.

So if you look at the slide and you pull it up in your mail, you'll see that there are a couple links to some of the materials that we are using. There is a space here for the ccNSO that has these various slideshows that come out that get tuned. One day I will learn to use Google Drive and not copy to everyone within the workgroup. Next slide.

So this gives some example criteria for us to consider. So this includes assessing how structures contribute to ICANN's mission and global public interest. So it's fairly broad. Next slide. This would be principle

two. And of course, this is looking at sample criteria in terms of the structures of the SOs, ACs and NomCom. And of course, from our point of view, how we evaluate ourselves this way. Next slide.

So this one deals with operation efficiency. Same concept, how we would evaluate ourselves, how we would develop ways to assess our inputs and our outputs and managing workloads, managing workloads for a volunteer organization such as ourselves. I think we all know that's pretty heavy and is something that we do need to continuously work on. Next slide.

So this is principle number four. As I said, this is one that caused, I will say, some angst within other communities. Again, this is dealing with accountability writ large from the point of view of the ccNSO. There's nothing untoward here. We tend to be accountable to our members. Again, that's for you to decide. It's my opinion that there's nothing untoward. Think about it in terms of representation, alignment with ICANN objectives and transparency and see this as the number one area where ICANN org needs to have a light touch. Next slide. And again, this one, this slide deals with principle number five and it's about communication and coordination. So it's pretty bog standard in terms of what you would expect for criteria. Next slide.

So this leads us to key considerations and that is, of course, the question, are you comfortable with the criteria and the indicators developed? Keep in mind, it's essential to know that moving from an external group conducting interviews and making recommendations to one adopting continuous improvement is at its heart a cultural shift. There will be changes. There will be bumps. Saying that, continuous

improvement exercises rely heavily on active and consistent engagement within the community, which is always a bonus. And of course, despite the current fiscal issues ICANN is experiencing, I kind of feel that this is an opportunity for teaching facilitation along with the leadership program that we have. And I think that that would reduce costs in some regard without having to hire an external party for top-down review on a regular basis and open the door for cross-community understanding. It would be interesting to have people from different communities doing the roles of hosting continuous improvement events in other communities. Something to think about.

Finally, of course, [inaudible] towards continuous improvement, emphasizing the importance of internal collaboration and leveraging existing community resources for development, keeping in mind the concerns about inherent bias. And the next slide. Again, if you've got the full slide deck in your deck, these are additional resources that you can look at to understand what is going on if you require deeper knowledge or have interest in the topic. That's generally the slideshow. Irina and Chris, Irina as the alternate person, do you want to speak just ahead of Chris if I've missed anything?

IRINA DANELIA:

No, we didn't. Hi, everyone. And this is Irina speaking. No, Sean, you didn't miss everyone. And may I suggest we let Chris speak first and then I will take an opportunity to ask several questions to council.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So, Sean, this is just a question for me. Am I dreaming or is this a slightly different slide deck to the one you sent out in the email?

SEAN COPELAND: It is, in fact, a slightly different deck.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: A lot more information, isn't it?

SEAN COPELAND: It does. And on top of that, it was actually edited again by ICANN org for us. So it does have slightly more information. So I will make sure that you guys all get a copy of this particular one.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, because I think the previous one, the one that I certainly got, didn't have the criteria, the questions on the criteria and it just had the quest. You just had principle three and it didn't have any of the criteria listed other than principle three. So if that slide deck can be sent out ASAP so that we can be considering that in detail, that would be fantastic. Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND: Yep. Thank you, Chris, for noting that. Irina, over to you.

IRINA DANELIA:

Yeah, thank you, Sean. And as Sean and I are representatives for this community group with the task to coordinate with our constituencies, I want to take this opportunity to ask, let's say, three main questions to you. So, as Sean mentioned, we have demonstrated this slide deck to GRC and to the council. And later I will ask for some of your feedback. But do you feel as we need to have a webinar for the entire ccNSO community to present these principles, criteria and potentially indicators to everyone and attempt to get their feedback? Or we can limit with these two groups as well only? I understand we were very quick and you probably had no time to deeply get into the topic, but if we can have your reaction later, it would be highly appreciated.

Well, the second question relates to if we can go to slide number 11, Claudia. And it relates to the principles itself. So, you see now five of these principles in front of you. And the group almost agreed on these five principles, except as Sean mentioned, there is some discussion on principle four. But since we have not chance to have your feedback, I wonder if there is any strong opposition regarding any of these five principles. Or we can say that right now. Because in my personal view, well, they're probably not ideal, but I can live with it and it more or less fits the ATRT recommendations. And well, it works. Let's say. So. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yeah, I think the question for us is, I think Sean pointed quite specifically to principle four and said that is troubling to a number of the other constituencies. It isn't troubling to us because we are one structure. But if you look at just the GNSO as an example, the registry stakeholder group, the registrar stakeholder group, the IPC, etc., they weren't

independently reviewed. They've never been independently reviewed. It's the GNSO structure and the council that's reviewed. So they have huge issues with the rest of the community getting involved in their own independent substructures. And I think the same applies. I think I'm right, aren't I, Sean and Irina? The same applies to At-Large. You're also having significant challenges around this structure argument. So I'm just mentioning it in passing. We'd obviously need to think about it very carefully. But on the basis of we need to think about whether we should simply say we're fine with principle four or whether we should take a more holistic view and say is principle four maybe okay for us, but is it okay for ICANN as a whole? And we should consider pushing back if we don't think that that's right. But that's merely an initial comment. And I think there's a lot of work for us to do to read this carefully and to come to conclusions on it. Thanks very much.

SEAN COPELAND:

Thanks, Chris. Back to you, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA:

Yeah, thank you. So if I may, my suggestion would be that you look again at these five principles after Sean will distribute the new version of the presentation. And if you have any strong objections, please let us know. If no, we will let it leave as it is taking into account comments from Chris.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I have a couple of questions because evidently you want our input. And I wonder if you have a due date where you need to have that input back because that also addresses the need to consult with the wider ccNSO community or not. So do you have any particular time frame for this? Please don't say next week.

SEAN COPELAND: Next week. Yeah, no, there would be a general preference that somehow we get this all to the wider membership, you know, writ large. And yet saying that, knowing the number of people that have come on to PDP calls, personally, I'm not sure how much we would get a turnout for Irina and I sitting and running a call. But if council wants us to do that, you know, and Chris has wondered on doing a dedicated call, no problem doing it, you know, and we can see how many people come out. So, I'll take guidance from council. Irina.

IRINA DANIELIA: If I may, if we look at the time frame, which ICANN included in this presentation few slides earlier, we will see that target dates are already almost past. At least the community was supposed to agree on our principles somewhere in June. And we are supposed to deliver our feedback from our constituencies on the criteria and indicators by July 24, which is six days from now. But I believe that we can say that we need a few more weeks, definitely not months, but a few more weeks will work. And we cannot be taken to jail for not meeting the timelines. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I think it is flexible and I've had a note from the secretariat from the registries stakeholder group side of the thing saying that they appreciate that it's going to take time. And I think we do need to take time. I have a sort of process for overarching question, which is, it strikes me that I'm wondering whether it is actually useful and sensible for us to be considering the criteria until we've agreed the principles. It seems to me that if there's one way to guarantee we won't agree the principles, it's to tell us what the criteria might be before we've even discussed the principles. Because what will happen is no one will concentrate on the principles and everyone will concentrate on the criteria. And then the criteria, of course, as you get further and further down the funnel, from principles to criteria to indicators, the debate becomes more and more challenging and the nitpicking gets greater and greater. It strikes me that we should really be concentrating on the principles, which is why I was quite surprised to see the criteria in the slides that you're presenting. Sure, not that I'm suggesting that it's the same thing with you, I'm just saying. I wonder if we should, at the very least, be trying to get our community to settle on the principles. It's a much bigger debate and a much bigger challenge to present and consider the individual criteria and less than to agree with the principles. Just a thought.

SEAN COPELAND:

If we were to do a work group call on it or a community call on it, you would like us to just focus on the principles side?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I guess I think we need to think it through, but I guess that yes, because I think I'll take a simple example. I'm going to go back to the registry stakeholder constituency. How can I possibly get them to agree criteria for principle four until I've got them to agree that principle four is acceptable? And I think the same thing applies to us, even though we may not care too much about principle four, but we don't know with each of these principles what people are going to say. And I do think that it's important that we deal with the principle side of it before we move on to the criteria side.

SEAN COPELAND: I do agree with you. This is the complexity in this particular exercise, is that the fixation on principle four within other groups has slowed things down whilst marching towards a timeline. Go ahead.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I need to interrupt you because we are already four minutes over time of the council meeting and this discussion is very interesting, but I think we should move it to the mailing list. So by now, I've been told that now these new PowerPoint slides are in the wiki for this council call. And please, I will ask Sean to send an email with the questions that you have for the council so we can continue the discussion over there. And since we are pressed with time, the tentative ccNSO block schedule will also be circulated by email. Again, this is the very early draft. It's just a tentative, and we will know more when the full ICANN block schedule is settled. What I can tell you is that we are working also to organize a joint GAC session. So that's on the way. With that, I thank everyone for

joining the call. We will see each other again on August 22nd at 18:00 UTC. And have a great rest of your days. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]