

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Welcome everyone to our council meeting 208 on the 22nd of August at 18:00 UTC. Please all councilors put in your Zoom ID ccNSO council or something that can actually differentiate you from any other participants, so it's easier for the vote. We do have one today, so with that I will also take the opportunity to put in the chat the wiki with all the documents that we will use today, so you have it at hand. And before anything else, thank you Tatiana for joining us one more time. As everyone in the council knows, Tatiana had to leave the ccNSO council to pursue new adventures. I want to take this opportunity to thank Tatiana for her robust and very thoughtful contributions to the ccNSO council. Her wide view and vast experience in ICANN is tangible and greatly appreciated, so thank you Tatiana. We care a lot for you and does anyone else would like to say anything to Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: I just want to thank you and we're going to miss you and good luck.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've already said numerous things, but as usual Tatiana, it's been great to have you and I'm looking forward to seeing you soon.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, I hope you're coming to Istanbul so we can say goodbye properly and I'm super curious to know what your move is or if you're allowed to tell us so that we can stay in touch and hopefully, you know, it's au revoir, not adieu.

---

*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.*

CHRIS DISSPAIN: [inaudible] Tatiana.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So with that Tatiana, anything you'd like to say?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, absolutely. So for those of you who don't know yet, I'm sorry I should have shared, but I was waiting for ISOC to announce me to their team. Nick, on Monday this week I joined Internet Society as a senior advisor for institutional relations, so if everything goes well we will definitely stay in touch because I'm going to be in the UN process and WSIS+20, in the ITU WTSA, in the IGF, in the OECD and keeping in touch with technical community hopefully on these issues. So I am going to be around and first of all I want to thank Alejandra for inviting me to join to say goodbye properly. I'm so grateful to you, Alejandra, that was such a nice surprise for me. And to everybody else, thank you so much for your support, for your kind words, for your friendship, for making me feel at home here, although I don't belong to the ccTLDs, but all of a sudden that has been the best community for me in my 10 years, more than 10 years at ICANN, and I will always be grateful for this and I will forever remember this time. Thank you so, so, so much. I will leave this space in a minute so you can properly continue your meeting, but thank you.

---

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: These meetings are open and, you know, you want to have the full experience, right? So, you know, you don't feel you have to leave and go for a drink or anything.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Exactly what Nick said, you don't have to leave, but I would like to thank you for attending one more time. We wanted to, well, say goodbye even virtually, but if we, as we see, we will coincide in the future and I'm at least very positive about that and hopefully we'll see each other in Istanbul and give you a proper hug and, again, thank you so much for everything you've done. We really appreciate you. Now we need to move on with the agenda. So, with this, it is important to note now that for the next meeting we'll need to fill some vacancies that Tatiana is leaving, for example, in the triage and IGLC council liaison, but that's something for the next meeting.

So, with that, we are moving to 1.8, which is if the meeting is quorate. Claudia, can you please tell me?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, we are quorate, and we have apologies from Olga and Jennifer.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you and noted the apologies. With that, we move to item 2, which is the update of statement of interest. Does anybody have any updates to their statement of interest? I see no hands up. So, with that, we'll move on. We do have some any other business already. I know Bart wants to talk about the 360 evaluation and DNS abuse survey. Also,

---

Chris sent over the email, a topic regarding the voluntary fraud grace period and I know that Nick also wants to talk about the DASC charter review. So, all those are noted for AOB. Does anybody else have any other AOB? I don't see any more hands. In any case, when we get there, I'll ask again. And to be more efficient with our time together, I propose to limit the meeting as much as possible to the main topics. So, unless anyone objects or has any immediate questions, I want to consider items number 3 to 10 as dealt with. Is it all right with everyone? I see some thumbs up in the cameras. I don't see any objections. All right. So, with that, we will move.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could we just gently scroll down those items just to sort of double check, because most of these are completed. As you say, I completely agree with your approach in terms of the efficiency of dealing with business and using our time efficiently.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yeah, well, I'll name the items quickly. It's the relevant correspondence. It's the minutes and action items. It's the intermeeting decisions by the triage committee. It's the updates, all written updates, and the update for the ccNSO website redesign, which is in the same condition as it was before, working on the wireframe.

With that, now we move to item 11. It's the update of chair, vice chairs, councilors, and regional organizations and secretariat. During the call, we will extensively talk about the meetings that are listed there in ABC. I do have one more update here. It's the pilot holistic review call that the

---

SOAC chairs had yesterday. This was to choose the candidates to be part of this review. At first, there were 12 primary candidates. Then there are three more incoming from the SSAC and one more incoming from the board, so 16 primary selected candidates. Then a secondary candidate was selected to balance region and gender diversity. In total, we have now 17 members. We also discussed potential co-chairs, and we have four candidates. They will be contacted in order of preference to check whether they are willing to do the job. Unfortunately, we couldn't have a representative from the GAC in the call, so this still is a little bit on hold until they approve with the steps taken, but this is what was discussed yesterday. Does anybody else have any updates?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I put one on the list from the tech working group.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Do you want to say it out loud now, Stephen?

We just put out the call for presentations for Istanbul.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you for that. With that, we'll move on to item 12, its appointments to members, to committees, and working groups. We don't have any today, so now we move to the item 13. It's the adoption letter on the deferral of the third CSE effectiveness review. So we decided to defer the third CSE effectiveness review, and we have a

---

letter to do so, and this is a letter jointly sent by the GNSO council as well. We shared it with them, they didn't have any comments so far. We also raised it during the SOAC roundtable. So just a summary for the record, the second review closed in March 2023, a little over a year ago, and the CSE and GNSO councils adopted the final report in April of 2023. So the board was informed about the outcome, including the recommended change to the bylaws to extend the period between reviews from every three years, starting in October to five years after the conclusion of the previous review. As a result of this short time between reviews, the recommendations from previous review will most likely not be implemented. And finally, this review is again overlapping with the IANA function review, which is also in relation with CSC and PTI. So with this we have an overlapping of resource. We drafted the letter jointly, it is in our documents. Do we have any questions or comments regarding this item? I don't see any hands. So may I have a mover?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll move.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. And may I have a seconder?, I saw Sean first. So do we have any questions regarding the resolution itself? I don't see any hands. So please let's vote using your green ticks, if you're in favor, or your red process, if you abstain or object. All right, I see only green ticks. So this has been approved. Thank you very much. So with that, well, this

---

resolution will be published and after it becomes effective, I will send this letter on behalf of both the GNSO and the ccNSO councils.

Let's move to item 14. So we have the update and introduction of two changes of the ccNSO travel support guideline. So we discussed the need to address this guideline on our previous call. The basic request from council was that the travel funding committee, with the assistance from the secretariat, would propose updates to the ccNSO travel funding process using the continuous improvement framework that we have been using so far to ensure that this guideline, well, fills and meets our needs. The travel funding committee with the secretary have reviewed the guideline and as I understand, they wanted to introduce an update today. So Peter, would you like to let us know?

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, thanks. This is Peter for the record. Thanks Alejandra. Yes, the committee met twice and we had an email exchange and with the support of Claudia and Joke streamlined the guidelines and took mostly what we consider too much detail out of it. And also because I was the new kid on the block, having a fresh read, did some more editorial adjustments or adding precision and text corrections. We had the final session an hour before this call, so we haven't completed the update to be suggested. What we would like to do with the permission of the chair and the vice chairs, of course, so that we are able to meet the start right on time for ICANN 82 to ask for an intermediate decision. So the final text would be shared on the list with the opportunity to comment and hopefully get no objections in the next two weeks so that the process could be started with that new guideline. The guideline actually is the high-level document and the idea is to give the committee a bit more leeway in applying criteria to be able to compare the applications rather

---

than having a matrix that spits out a random score, more or less, which doesn't give the committee too much to decide, actually. So that's the basic idea. And then on the improvement, what we're going to start is measuring the success and the interesting question, of course, what is the success, and that's in the guidelines. The goals are assisting active participants to join the meeting physically and also encourage and help new people to start up, to get up to speed, network in the community, to be an active ccNSO member in the future. We'll have a quick plan to, in a year or two, do an evaluation of how these support grants may or may not have helped achieving these goals. I hope that's it. And Wafa is on the call. She might be able to add if she wants.

WAFDA DAHMANI:

No, you have told everything. No, Peter has done good. He has said everything.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Peter. Thank you, Wafa. Peter, just so I understand, the next steps is that the Travel Funding Committee will circulate to the Council the proposal, so we review it first, and then that's it, or you will consult with the community as well regarding this.

PETER KOCH:

My understanding is that this will be subject to community consultation, review, whatever. I trust the Secretariat with the formalities here.



---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Just to check that. Because since you said that you wanted an approval to use that for the ICANN 82, so maybe there's not enough time to use it and to get the community approval for that. Is that what you meant?

PETER KOCH: I am sorry. I might have misrepresented the actual ask. The point was to pass this by Council between now and the September Council meeting to be able to start the rest of the process on time, so we end up at a point in time where we can embark and Joke are raising their hands. So, I'm stopping immediately because I'm confusing everybody else.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, no worries. Joke?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you. Thank you, Peter. Just wanted to clarify when Peter said ICANN 82, that was the evaluation round of the travelers for ICANN 82, but actually that round starts prior to ICANN 81. That's around mid-October. The next application round is foreseen, and the committee will meet at ICANN 81 to make a decision regarding ICANN 82. Maybe that clarifies. If we would wait until the next Council meeting to send the final draft proposal of the guideline to Council and to have another discussion in September. That would move the process up considerably and then the committee would not be able to use the new approach, the new guideline for the ICANN 82 round. I hope that clarifies.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:           Okay, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:           Maybe just normally what happens during four guidelines is say we got the draft. I think it's finalized, but it's nearly finalized, will be circulated to the Council for review and then it will go to the community for and this could be done in a week. Say with the Council, they know it's coming. So early next week, we can send it out. And then in one week, if there are any comments from Council's travel committee and the secretary will see them, update it accordingly and then circulate it to the community for one week for comments as well. And then it's ready for adoption. So, if necessary, you can do it in three weeks, even before the next Council meeting, but next Council meeting would be listening to Joke would be fine as well. So you do have some leeway. But the real trick is to consult first Council, get their review and then send it to the community for their review and comments and then finalize it with the Council. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:           Okay. And now it's perfectly clear, at least for me. Thank you. And of course we're not saying anything now but please be very aware when you get these emails so we can provide feedback as soon as possible so if anything needs to be amended it can be done as quickly as possible so these guidelines can be used to the ccNSO funded travelers for ICANN 82. Thank you. So, with that, now we're moving to item 15. So, the item is the generic letter to invite ccTLDs to join this ccNSO. And yes, it is a question. So, to introduce this topic, I need to share with you that

---

recently I was approached asking whether the ccNSO council could write a letter of invitation for a specific ccTLD manager to become a member of the ccNSO. Apparently, such a letter, yeah, is necessary in that particular country to become a member of a foreign group like the ccNSO. We did some research and it was confirmed through other channels that this was the case. So, as you know until now the council has never solicited ccTLDs to become a member of the ccNSO. However, we do post on our website the benefits of becoming and being a member of the ccNSO. So, after some discussion, Biyi, Jordan and I came to the conclusions that we could put a generic invitation letter to become a member of the ccNSO on our website that can be downloaded and used by those ccTLDs who may need one. So, this is the topic. So, any comments, questions or thoughts on this?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Stephen here, I think it's a great idea.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is a generic invite on the website enough?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, we think so. I'm not sure how it would look that the ccNSO is targeting specific ccTLDs. So, because again this is a voluntary organization which anyone can join. So, that's why we thought, okay, let's not make it difficult to people who actually want to join if they need this. Well, we haven't yet gone back to this ccTLD that needs it with the suggestion to see if it would be enough, but I think it would.

---

Maybe we, when we draft it, it would be in such a way that it's understandable, even though generic, that, that it fulfills the needs that of the ccTLD. Ali.

ALI HADJI: Thank you, Alejandra. Do we have some idea how many ccTLDs we have to join us now? To have some idea, for example, from Africa, how many ccTLDs we have to invite them to join us, to join us, to join the ccNSO?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, we do know which ccTLDs are members and therefore which are not. So, we do have that information.

BART BOSWINKEL: Alejandra, it's not as easy. Yeah, it's not as easy as you think. One of the issues is, as you all know, there are some organizations that run multiple ccTLDs. And they say there is one exception, but most of them are member for one ccTLD. So, which we invite them, yes or no, to become member. Say, you have this, say, new category of IDN ccTLDs, and I just want to mention one which runs about 17 IDN ccTLDs. And the ASCII ccTLD. So, that's all within country. Do you want to invite them all? Yes or no? So, these are, it's not an easy question to answer, Ali, from Africa. And for every region, you have the issue. So, in that sense, that was one of the reasons from the past. But it's also to show, say, the original thinking at the time was, say, when the ccNSO was established, not to actively seek membership to make very clear this is a voluntary organization. So, that's another reason. So, that was the original

---

thinking for not reaching out to individual ccTLDs. I hope that addresses your point, Ali. Thanks.

ALI HADJI: Okay. Thank you. Just really, it was to have some idea what, for example, in Africa, what we can do for this if we had this idea about this. Okay. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe what is easier, if you really want to do it, have a look on the website. Of the members, it lists the region. So, you can easily see who's not a member.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Moving to Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thanks, Alejandra. Peter, for the record. So, my understanding was that this is not to start an outreach campaign, but it was a suggestion to turn into a self-service what was a specific request. With that in mind, and one might be the side effect of the other. So, once we have that letter, we could send it. But on that specific request, before we do some formalities around that, I'd suggest to go back to that ccTLD and ask them whether that fulfills their requirements. Because if that's complicated in one country, it might be differently complicated in another, and then you need to address the excellencies in a proper way and so on and so forth. The text might be generic, but I don't think there

---

are too many complicated countries, well, so many, but too many TLDs left that we can maybe trust the secretariat with sending that letter without any more formalities on our side. And that letter can be tailored towards the needs of the to-be applicant or to-be new member. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Peter. This reminds me like what ICANN does for ICANN-funded travelers, that if you need a letter, or not even the ICANN-funded travelers, but for anyone attending an ICANN meeting, if they need a letter to apply for a visa, then they have a generic one, but then of course you need to add specific data. So, okay, that sounds doable. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Based on my hearing, what Bart has said and what Peter has said, I rescind my support for a generic letter on the website. I think we do need to focus on the specifics of the letter that respective ccNSO member needs to convince their overlords that this is a good thing to do. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: All right, so with this, would it be a good next step to draft a generic one just to have the ideas that should be in that letter as in what the basic text should have? And then we've, well, of course, agreed upon all of us. And then when we have that, then we can reach out to the ccTLD to see if this is what they need. And then we decide whether this letter should

---

be or not posted on the website, or should we have it posted in any case or in any way should how do other ccTLDs would know this is a possibility? That's a question. So, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you. I don't think we should post it on the website. I think what we should do on the website is put up something, a paragraph that says, if you're interested in joining, but you need an invitation letter, contact the secretariat. I think we should develop for our internal use boilerplate invitation letter, but then it has to be has to be customized likely as Peter pointed with the proper salutations, the excellencies, etc., for each individual usage of it. That's not like it's going to get a lot of use, but I think we should have something ready to go boilerplate. So we can find out if we have a prospective member that needs an invitation letter. Okay. Here's what we got. What else do you need in it? So we're at least prepared to respond in a timely manner, not have to develop it from scratch for each one that comes forward. I mean, this is rather unique, but I don't see the need to post the boilerplate on the website. I think just, if you need an invitation, contact us would suffice. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay. Thank you, Stephen. I did see Chris's hand go up, but then down. So that means it's down.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I agree with Stephen.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you, Chris. Biyi.

BIYI OLADIPO: Yeah, I understand what Stephen said about not making it generic and not putting it on the website, but we need to be very careful about precedence. So we don't set the precedence is that we might not be able to defend in the future. Up to date, we've never had a situation where we have to invite someone to join the ccNSO. So if we're having this kind of situation, I think we should be very careful about it. And that's why from the outset, I've always supported the generic letter, which is not addressed to anyone. And if you need it, you can just pick it up and then present it. But if we start inviting, it might not a different thing. We've always said the ccNSO is a free on common hop on, hop off vehicle. If we're changing that, then maybe we can address letters to people, but if we're not, then we'd need to be very careful about them writing letters.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Biyi. And now Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm not sure I understand the concern. Putting a generic letter up on the website doesn't achieve anything, because apart from anything else, as others have said, for it to be effective and useful, it needs to be addressed to the right people. And a generic letter simply undermines the effect of an actual letter. If we're saying, if you're a country, if you're

---



---

a ccTLD manager in a country that, for whatever reason, requires a letter from an organization from overseas inviting you to join, then sorry, but we're not going to do that. So you can't join, and that's fine. But if we're not saying that, and I don't think we are saying that, I think we're saying, if you come to us and say, I very much want to be a member of the ccNSO in order for my government, I'm a government department in order for my government to agree, or I'm a university in order for my whatever it might be to agree, I need a letter of invitation. I can't see why that would be a problem. I'm not sure that it's actually setting any precedent. As Jordan has quite correctly said, if we're going to send it specifically, it needs to go to the name of the manager in the database. Can't go anywhere else. And if we agree that we can do that and we will do it if we're asked, then having a sort of central boilerplate couple of paragraphs that you can put the pretty bits around the edges to be specific to a particular entity, government, etc., then that works for me. But I'm not sure that I understand why there's an issue with sending one out if we are asked to do so, as long as it doesn't say anything unusual other than please join, and as long as it goes to the manager as listed. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Chris. So okay, I think with that, the next step will be to write the boilerplate text, and then share it within the council. And after that, we'll move forward. Pablo, any last?

---

PABLO POBLETE:

Thank you, Alejandra. I was wondering if in that boilerplate letter, rather than to, like, it has been mentioned, if a prospect comes up to us and says, I am a department of a university, of a government, please send me an invite letter. Rather than to put in that letter, please join us, it would be more like boilerplate letters stating the benefits of participating in the ccNSO, and why would a TLD operator would benefit from participating there, and so on. And that's that, without saying, please join us. And that way, I guess it would be interesting for whoever is asking for that particular letter. I think that most of the time what they would like to see is what is that organization all about, and why should we care, and why should we join them. And if we can answer those questions, then we don't need to say, please join us. It's just they will decide whether or not they want to join us, if that was the concern.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Well, thank you, Pablo. I think let's start with the draft, and then we can continue the discussion on the content on the mailing list, so we can, well, have something more substantive, I don't know if that's the word to discuss about, rather than having all these ideas floating around. We've taken notes of all your comments, and I thank you very much for that, and they will all be taken into consideration. So, let's move on, and the draft will be circulated, and you will have an opportunity to add your comments there, and to see that it's what we mean to have.

With that, now we move to the substantive matters and decisions on our agenda, and we are on item 16, and it's the update and next steps regarding the request for clarification and confirmation board caucus ccPDP review mechanism. So, in item A, the review and support

---

response by council, as you know, well, the board caucus that oversees the assessment of the feasibility of implementation of the review mechanism policy, asked us in April, about four months ago, to provide clarifications and or confirmation about the policy. At the time, we decided that a group of councilors and members of the ccPDP working group would prepare our response to the questions, without changing the recommended policy, and the council would need to sign off on the responses. At the time, we appointed Jordan and Stephen as co-chairs.

As you recall, it was raised more than once whether the process the board is using is within the boundaries of section 15A of the annex B of the bylaws, that says the board shall need to discuss decisions of recommendation as soon as feasible after receipt of the board report from the issue manager taking into account procedures for board consideration. We may formally want to ask the board caucus to explain this specific session in the cover note but we will talk about it in the next item, in item b on topics to include in the cover note.

So now I want to focus on the introduction of the responses and for this I'd like to give the floor to Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you. I'm very pleased to report to the council that the work of the group assembled to respond to the board's questions regarding the review mechanism is complete. Bart circulated the final draft to the council a day or so ago. Minding that the text of our responses is locked down but there are some formatting issues that need to be addressed with the document before the council chair can submit our responses to

---

the board assuming of course the council approves the work product that we produce. In all, as you may recall, the board submitted something like 43 questions to us, but as we worked through them, it became apparent some of their questions were multi-part. And so, in fact, the group developed 59 distinct responses to the questions posed by the board's ad hoc group. Of these, 18 were easily disposed with with a simple correct response to their inquiry. 27 required detailed responses, and for brevity's sake, the remaining 14 questions were handled by reference back to the detailed responses given for the other questions. I'm very pleased to report that the group achieved complete consensus on all matters. Before I turn the floor over to Jordan for any remarks he might have, I wish to express a heartfelt thanks to our incredible secretariat, and especially Bernard Turcotte, whose expertise in all matters ccTLD and ICANN review mechanism related was invaluable, as were his wordsmithing skills. And finally, I want to give a big thank you to all the working group members. This was out of band. We thought we were done, but we had to get the band back together basically. So, with that, thank everybody. I encourage council to read through our responses, because we are going to have to make a decision on this as council before anything further happens. And with that, Jordan, do you have any remarks if you're available?

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Stephen. Hi everyone. Thanks for this substantive introduction. Stephen I guess I would just urge people as they're reviewing this text as a council member please wear a hat that says, are there any fatal flaws here, and only raise those. Don't raise editorial suggestions or ways to word something a little better. It isn't necessary at this point. The work

---

product is good enough to send to start the conversation with the board. So, I hope that doesn't sound too mean. But we could have kept going on this and going and going and going to make it more and more perfect. The point is to start the conversation because we're trying to finish the PDP, not extend the process any further.

I also just want to say I think that after we get through that part of the process and when this is finally, I don't know what you say with the ccNSO policy slipping down the slipway into the ocean, we should do a bit of a retrospective on what happened here and how we stop it happening again in the future, and because the delays and the extra work, and if we work out ways not to need to do that next time, that would be good for all of us and for the board and for the staff. So, yeah, the other thing I'll say is when you read the response, you'll see that there is a key thing here about what a substantive review versus a procedural review is. This is what happens when lawyers come into contact with policy. So we have deliberately, it isn't an accident that we haven't given them an answer in those terms. It's been carefully deliberated on in the group. So if you happen to be a lawyer, not looking at anyone in particular, and you think that the answer, yeah, looking at you, Nick. And if you think that we haven't answered that question clearly enough, it's on purpose. And it's better not to, because that's not a fight or an argument that we think we should get into on those terms. So I think I'll leave it at that.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Jordan. Well said.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you both, Stephen and Jordan. And now, are there any questions or comments? And I see Nick's hand up.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Well, you know, I can't not rise to a provocation like that. But I completely support Jordan's comments, actually, apart from the lawyerly bit. And I just wanted to say that sometimes, look, when we came, I mean, I was part of the original team on the review mechanisms. And there is a balance between being very prescriptive as to what we think should be done and settling essentially the policy objective and leaving it to ICANN in terms of their implementation to achieve what it is that we say is the policy objective. And I think they were being deliberately obtuse in a number of areas. And I think when we go back to them, yeah, we did not want to essentially do their homework for them. And we were. And this is one of my favorite legal phrases, which there's a good approach, which is completely justifiable legally, which is constructive ambiguity. So, you know, we don't want to basically help them too much. And it is partly their job to implement and to put into effect what we see as the policy objective. So I'll just leave it there. I mean, this is a super complicated thing, and this is not the end of the road when it comes to this process. Cheers.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. With that, I would also like to mention for Jordan's comment on having a review after the PDP, it's properly, let's say, finalized. Yes, there is a process for reviewing the work done and see

---

---

what, well, just to do a self-evaluation of sorts, and then these things can come up. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks. I just wanted to pick up on what Nick just said, because I agree with much of what he said and what Jordan said, and I just put it in the chat. I'm right, aren't I, that the next step once the board accepts this policy is an implementation review team. And on that basis, that is something that we would be involved in. Is it not?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, we do have a guideline for that, that it was developed to try to accompany the implementation process, but I am not really aware of how the process is. So Bart, do you have any light here?

BART BOSWINKEL: In principle, yes. So maybe that's something to include in the cover note as well. Alert the ICAN board again on, and say the caucus in this case.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: We didn't get one of those for the retirement process.

BART BOSWINKEL: No, because we're still developing it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That was my point, right? Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL:

It wasn't developed at the time. So we do have it right now, and it's one-sided. So this is the way ccNSO will behave. If you look at the, say, maybe you recall we had an extensive discussion at one point, or say under the auspices of the GRC, where we invited Karen Lentz of ICANN and Marika Konings on the GNSO to share their experience. And based on, say, that session, the GRC developed this outline. And this is really structuring the ccNSO side, and it will be something like the IRT, Chris. So what needs to happen is, I think in the cover note, we need to, that you alert them to this guideline and say the ccNSO is ready to form this group, which will include members of the working group to assist in the implementation, provide feedback where needed.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I think that covers basically what I was going to say, which is two things, really. One is, as Nick has said, and Jordan is dissing the lawyers, the place for the lawyers is actually in that implementation review team, because that's where they're going to have to implement it, and it needs to be viable and stand up. But secondly, I do think it's worth saying in our covering note, any, you know, if you feel there are any questions in here that we may not have answered in too much detail, please be aware that we believe these are matters that should be covered in implementation. And it's probably worth making the point that we think we've dealt with the policy now, and now it's over to implementation, a matter in respect to which we will be intimately involved. Otherwise, it'll just keep bouncing backwards and forwards



---

forever and that's ridiculous. So referring it to implementation is, I think, the sensible way forward. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. We will cover the topics to include in the cover note shortly, but I don't want to get ahead of myself, so we'll talk about this particular part briefly. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I agree with Chris. We cannot have this bounce back and forth. This is like, here it is, you asked, we answered, now do make a decision. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. So as I see now from this particular item where we are, we have already circulated to us the responses for us to review them, and we should take into deep consideration what was said today, that if we find anything that is substantial, that it requires immediate attention, then of course say anything, but let's try to keep it like, the good enough should be good enough and not go for perfection. So let's have a week to review it. So afterwards if there are any issues raised or anything that needs to be edited, there's some time to do so, and afterwards we'll be Jordan and Stephen together with the secretariat will make one more editorial pass, and then it will be done. Does that work for everyone? Green ticks, please, if you agree, or red process if you don't think that's a good approach. Okay, I'm only seeing green ticks, so that's the way we will move forward. Thank you.

---

Now, going into item B of this, it's the topics to include in the cover note, so now that we closed the discussion on the responses, we need to discuss what we want to include in these cover letters, so my understanding is that we have to, previously there we were talking about inviting the caucus and staff to discuss the requests and the responses, so we would avoid this back and forth of letters. So shall we still include that in our letter to have this call meeting, virtual meeting to discuss them? I think it would help to not leave it as in, so here you go, there you are, that's it, because if eventually there are any questions, it's better to address them right then and there. So that was coming back to what Chris you were saying of how we deal with the next steps on this. So shall we invite them? I see I agree, I see a thumbs up, I don't see any objections, so okay, so we include the invite for this conversation. We should include as well a response on the foundational assumption made in the cover note from Katrina, which paraphrased, asks to confirm that the review mechanism policy is limited to a procedural review, so the substantive material review of an IFO decision is not subject to the review mechanism review. And also as I mentioned earlier, we would include a formal clarification of the scope of section 15a of annex b, what can the ccNSO expect to be included in procedures of for board consideration, and finally what we just discussed, an alert of companionship of the implementation process, and include the guideline that was developed for this purpose. Did I miss anything that should be included? No, I don't see any hands up. Okay, may I have some volunteers to draft this cover note?

---

BART BOSWINKEL: Alejandra, just one point, listening to the previous conversation, the point raised by Nick, Jordan, and Chris, what might be useful is indeed to really alert to the implementation process and the outline, because I think people are not really aware, but it's item four now for the cover note.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, that was the last one that I mentioned. So, may I have any volunteers for the drafting? Jordan, got a hand up, or volunteering?

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, both. I was going to say you might as well just make the council members of the group do that drafting.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, definitely, only the council members. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Good suggestion, Jordan. I'm in.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, so Jordan, Stephen, anyone else who would like to join them in the drafting? Peter, your hand is waving, yes? Chris as well. Okay, and Chris as well. Peter, Nick, Chris.

---

BART BOSWINKEL: Let's circulate it to the, it looks like all the council members who are on the team with the exception of Sean.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yeah, Sean says he as well, but on camera. It is a little hard to see you guys only on camera, but okay, so that's it. Well, with that.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. And thanks to everybody again for all the work, staff and working group members.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen. And indeed, thank you all for tackling this heavy duty task. It's almost done. So, let's continue with the good work. So, with that, I am moving on with the next item. It's item 17. It's WSIS+20 exchange of letters. What's next? So, the activities that we've done to date is on the 11th of July, there was a call with the drafting team to prep for an informal call with Sally regarding this matter. On the 15th of July, we sent a letter. On the 16th of July, we had the informal call with Sally and the drafting team. Then on the 9th of August, there was a call with Elena and the drafting team to get our, let's say, our thoughts together and see that we were not missing anything. On the 14th of August, I gave a heads up to the SOAC chairs on our monthly call. On the 15th of August, there was a roundtable with the SOAC chairs, but unfortunately, the time ran out and it could not be presented properly. On the 19th of August, our plenary topic didn't get selected. There was a tie with ALAC's proposal, so it was a random decision and ALAC's

---

proposal got picked. So, this is where we are. We haven't heard back yet. I understand that people are working still in the drafting of this proposal, but we haven't received anything yet. So, should we do anything more regarding this topic? I see Chris says no in chat. Any comments? Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Well, you were in the discussion in the SOAC chairs. Do you think we should do any more?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, it's hard because even though some are very, well, let's say willing to do some part of anything, if we don't have the substantive matter to call them that it's what being drafted now, it's difficult. So, I think the only thing that we could do is, well, ask [inaudible] so, where are we? But that's about it, because unless we have this informal group kind of presented to everyone, we're talking about something intangible. So either we're going to...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So they're going to write something up, basically, is your expectation. It might just be worth...

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, emails should be sent out to SOAC chairs and leadership.

---

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, maybe if they haven't sent one by the end of next week, you send them another email saying, how's this going? And we leave it at that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just to make sure what we're talking about here is the At-Large proposal, right?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: We're talking about the informal group that we want to be created for coordination regarding WSIS+20.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, I'm so sorry. I misunderstood. Okay, my apologies. Do you mean the informal group that Elena is going to organize?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry, forgive me. I admit I was thinking about something else. So that did not get mentioned on your call yesterday or whenever it was? Your chair's call?

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No. In the roundtable with the SOAC chairs? No, unfortunately, we ran out of time. And in the last minute, it was kind of mentioned.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. I'm due to speak to Elena tomorrow on another matter. So why don't I ask her?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. I think it doesn't hurt to ask, like, hey, we're waiting on you. Because after that's done, then there's nothing more we can do. And yes, I did. Maybe the confusion was because I brought up that the topic that we proposed that was related to WSIS+20 didn't get selected.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That was what my note was about. And just to say, even if you haven't had the discussion yet, and not much has happened, there is that email from Becky McGilley, which is encouraging, because it says that they're going to take the lead, and they actually got their name forward to speak at the GDC, which is, I think, a movement forward. So I just wanted to mention that in passing. Yes, as Peter has said in his chat note. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So then Chris will mention this to Elena, and we'll wait. And if nothing happens next week, then I'll send another nudge. So with that, we move on to item 18. It's the follow-up discussion on ICANN's How We Meet initiative. So on the 19th of August, there was an informal call on this. It

---

was clarified as I forwarded you the email from Sally, but it was, again, clarified that they did not intend to make any decisions or that the group should take any major steps. It was thought initially more like a brainstorm than anything else, and that the paper that was circulated might have caused that confusion, and they apologized, and everything's clear now. So in summary, it was talked about how to make the work more efficient, as in less redundant or repetitive. Sometimes it's perceived that people are not feeling heard, and some debated whether they were not heard or not getting what they wanted, and that's when things cycle and don't have an end. There were proposals to use project management techniques and to have time bounds. Also, it talks about the enemy of the very good is the perfection, so something to consider. Also, it was talked about whether the ICANN offices were actually needed or if not, but it was said that that's something for the next CEO to finish because that work has been done, and it's, as Sally put it, like in a nice package to be given to Kurtis so he can make that final decision. Chris, I do see your hand, so I'll finish my summary and I'll give it to you.

So regarding meetings, it was mentioned to improve travel flight costs. It was mentioned that there's a new partnership ongoing. If flights could be, well, booked faster, they would be cheaper. There were some suggestions on how to improve meetings costs, as in having fixed locations. Also, the SOAC chairs and vice chairs got a high-level summary of ICANN meetings costs, and I did request more data to be able to provide, well, insights, as in cost a little bit more detailed and include not only the ICANN meetings, but other in-person activities that happened in between ICANN meetings that ICANN funds. So that's my



---

summary. I know Biyi was also there in the session. I don't know if you have anything to add, Biyi?

BIYI OLADIPO: No, nothing to add. That's basically the summary of discussions.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Biyi. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks. Two points that may be helpful for you going forwards. One is this, you talked about people feeling they are not being heard, and does that mean they're not getting what they want? Yes. Previous surveys in ICANN have said, oh, there is a complete lack of trust, and the board threw itself into this complete spin of, oh, my God, no one trusts us, no one trusts each other, it's a disaster. When you actually dig down, what you find out is that the people who say that they don't trust others are the people who don't get what they want. And the way they express that is to say that they don't have any trust, because they ask for something and they don't get it. So the board worked extremely hard to try and redefine that discussion so that it wasn't built around trust, and it now appears to be being built around we're not being heard, which is interesting. And the second point I wanted to make was you talked about fixed locations. In 2013, 2014, we had a very clear understanding that if we hubbed, and we talked very specifically about hubbing in Kuala Lumpur, in Malaysia, in the Asia Pacific region, and hubbing in Amsterdam, I think it was Amsterdam, it might not have been, it might

---

have been somewhere else in Europe, and hubbing in LA, that would significantly reduce the meeting costs, because you would be able to book two, three, four, five years in advance. And there were certain sections of the community that simply refused to accept that, and said it was inappropriate, and it wasn't fair.

Now, things have moved on a bit since then, I suspect. So I would encourage you to really push the concept of hubs. It is an incredible cost saving. It means you can have face to face meetings, you know where you're going, you've got your date set, you know the facilities, there's no question about what the facilities are. And given that these days, we don't have galas anymore, and we don't have, you know, huge amounts of presentations from important people, it's probably a very sensible way forward. I can recommend Norfolk, where I live, but unfortunately, there isn't a venue big enough to cope with that many people, thank goodness.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Chris. I'll definitely take that into consideration. I'm not sure when we will have a follow up on this one, but I think there will be another one, and I'll let you all know when that happens, because it seems that it's going that way. Anyone else? Okay. So with that, we are moving to item 19. That's the tentative ccNSO blog schedule of ICANN 81. So Claudia, could you please put them on display so everyone can see it? Okay, thank you. Thank you for that.

So this is where we are. It hasn't changed much since the last time it was shared. Well, just to be on the safe side, I'll check on some points.

---

Please be mindful that we will have a council workshop on Sunday. Also, the plenary is confirmed, so it will happen on Wednesday on the block two. With that, the working title that ALAC proposed is Shifting Paradigms, Multistakeholderism, Geopolitics, International Law, and New Internet Infrastructures, and you have this summary in the email. So if anyone would like to join the calls, let me know so I can forward your name to the planning team.

With that, we do have joint meetings, we have a meeting with the board and the GAC. And for the GAC, I believe it's almost set there in Wednesday block one, but still needs to be super confirmed. The topics are introducing the policy gap analysis. The supporting of the multi stakeholder model in context of WSIS+20, and also relevant takeaways from the second DNS abuse survey. We do have also the full board ccNSO council session on Tuesday, the last block. So, it would be a good idea if we could start, I know it, there's time until then, but it's good if we have any topics that we would like to discuss with the board to have them as soon as possible so what if you think of something, please do send it to the mailing list and we will be compiling them there.

We saw that there were some, there was the bylaw amendment that was put out to public comment and then Stephen also sent us an email. And there is a tentative empowered community session on the first block of Thursday. This is not being confirmed yet but then it makes sense to have it there. And if you remember, we decided to have a more tight communication with the registry stakeholder group and we do have a mailing list for that. And I see that they are interested in the WSIS+20 topic that we are pushing forward. So, we don't have the plenary now but I understand that the IGLC session will be very much

---

focused on that. So it would be a good idea to invite them to that session, since we don't have plenary. So, does anyone have any comments or questions regarding the block schedule? Stephen, "having the approval action from us on the morning of the last day is frankly an insult to the ECA." Oh, I don't think so. There are still several things that they that are happening there. But we'll see. Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Yeah, I did suggest this as an AOB item but just to say, on the Saturday afternoon block four, we have the DASC working session. And we had a DASC meeting so we had a full SASC meeting earlier this afternoon. And one of the things which is coming up is a review of the DASC. So what I thought was that this is an in person meeting. And what I found when I was leading the review of the OISC for example, it was nice to talk to members of the committee that I was reviewing to actually meet with them in person. And it's quite a long time between Istanbul and ICAN 82 in Seattle. So what I thought was if the council were agreeable and could set up their review team, that that would be a good opportunity to spend a bit of time asking us any questions or going through or initiating that review process. And I thought the fact finding interviews with the committee members in person is quite a useful thing to do. So I guess in terms of the workflow of that review, now is a good opportunity to start to think about that. And that's really what I wanted to get across. It's up to the review team, obviously, but I just say that from the DASC point of view and as chair of the DASC, if that works for them, then we would be very agreeable to get that rolling. Because I think, you know, try to do the reviews in an efficient way. I have to say this, I was not particularly efficient in my review of the OISC. So we

---

learned from our past mistakes, but I think it's a great, great opportunity if that review wanted to hit the road running to start off in the ICAN 81 meeting with the face to face given the long time between 81 and 82. So that's just my point, thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. Duly noted. We still have two council meetings before that so I think it is enough time for us to include it in the agenda.

BART BOSWINKEL: May I suggest that we do it for the next one, because the second one is end of October, just before the meeting so that we have, say as an action item that for the secretary to propose a similar kind of template for review as we did with the OISC. I thought that was that was helpful, wasn't it Nick, that template.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: It was very helpful. And to be honest, I think these reviews can be done a lot quicker and better than how I led the last one and which, but that requires a little bit of planning to get people lined up and to have the meeting set up in advance. So I'm just trying to help in that.

BART BOSWINKEL: So we put it as a suggestion we put it on the agenda for the September meeting, including a template. Thanks.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, so that's added to our action items. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just to say, I just wanted to mention to Stephen, the session on the empowered community, I'd respin your thought. It's slap bang before the public forum, which means that actually it's a perfectly located, A, to get people in the room, and B, to enable those who wish to talk about it in public to talk about it in the public forum. And I don't think you should be as down on that location of the time as you are. Thanks.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, I rescind my remarks. Thank you Chris for that clarification. I apologize.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you Chris and thank you, Stephen. So with that, let's go back to the agenda. We are now entering the any other business. I know Nick managed to sneak in before, but that's fine. So now, I will ask Bart to give his AOB.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, two things. I had two AOBs. One is the 360 review. Officially you have until today. We have received 11 and a half review of the 18 I would say. So I really urge those of you who have not completed it to do it as soon as possible. Because I think what I've learned and heard from the previous reviews, your fellow councilors, really, really, really, really appreciate you providing feedback to them. So, it's not only the

---

receiving end, but please provide the feedback. So that was the first AOB.

The second one is, and I know Nick you just circulated the email to the other email list, but there are at least 14 ccTLD managers or people related to ccTLDs on this council meeting. Please urge your organization to complete the DNS survey. To date, what we've noted, there were, say, four completed DNS abuse surveys, 12 pending, and I fully assume that's not just councilors. So, please councilors, check with your organization whether they intend to submit a response to the DNS abuse survey as well, because it's not only as Nick said helpful for, say, the DASC, but it's definitely helpful also for the role of the DASC in future, but also to inform the broader community, as Nick said, about what the ccTLDs are doing with respect to mitigating DNS abuse. These were my two AOBs. Back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Bart. And now, Chris, you have also an AOB, and I think maybe a comment?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yeah, no, just a very brief one, which is to say that you've seen, hopefully everyone's seen the note from Owen at Namecheap about the Registrar fraud stuff, which is going on outside of ICANN, Nick and I and others on the DASC had a call about this, sorry, discussed this on the DASC call this afternoon, and I think if it's all right with you, we can take it into the DASC and have them reach out to Owen and figure out what to do, although it's not specifically domain abuse, it results in

---

domain abuse, so if we can just pop it into that little section for now, Nick and I will take carriage of it and deal with it, and that was all I wanted to say, if that's okay with you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Chris. I think, since we actually don't have a definition of what DNS abuse is, and we are open to that, I think it fits there perfectly, and I don't have any particular objections unless anybody else has one. If not, I do have one question, though. When I got your email, I was wondering if there's any, let's say, website or anything where we can read more about it, or it's just a conversation that just happens, because when I Googled it, I did not find much.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, it's just a conversation currently happening. There's nothing written about it at the moment.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, because I think it's very, very interesting, so thank you for that. With that, does anybody else have any other business? Okay, I don't see any hands up, and with that, we will meet each other again on the 19th of September at 12:00 UTC on our meeting 209. Thank you all for joining, and I wish you a very good rest of your day or night. Take care, all.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**