
ICANN Transcription

Joint ccNSO & GNSO Councils

Thursday, 11 July 2024 at 13:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/PgMZEW>

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar Page:

<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the joint ccNSO and GNSO Council meeting taking place on Thursday, the 11th of July, 2024. I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Recordings will be posted on the wiki agenda page shortly after this meeting. A reminder that we're in a Zoom webinar room. Councilors are panelists and can activate their microphone and participate in the chat once they've set their chat to everyone for all to be able to read the exchanges. A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphones nor the chat. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN's multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to the GNSO Chair, Greg DiBiase. Please begin.

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.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you so much. Welcome, everybody. This is the meeting between GNSO and ccNSO Councils. We have these meetings regularly. We were unable to meet in the most recent ICANN meeting, ICANN 80 in Rwanda. And so we are holding this meeting to make sure that we continue the cadence and address all the important business between our two constituencies.

The leadership of GNSO and ccNSO has put together a brief agenda on some things to discuss. We've sent that around to the GNSO and I believe it was sent to the ccNSO as well. Yeah, we're very excited to see all our friends in the ccNSO and have this conversation. I'm speaking as chair of the GNSO and I have one of my vice chairs, Nacho Amadoz, with me as well. Alejandra, would you like to say anything?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Greg. Hi, everyone. It is a pleasure to be in this joint meeting together. And I would like to send some apologies from some of our councilors, Jordan and Chris, send their apologies. Unfortunately, they couldn't make it. Here with me, it's also, well, many councilors, but especially Biyi, who is vice chair of the ccNSO and chair of the ccNSO. So with that, shall we kick it off?

GREG DIBIASE: Let's do it. Yeah, and also a note, apologies on my side. Tomslin, our other vice chair, was not able to join and sends his apologies. Yeah, let's go ahead and talk about the first thing on our agenda, which is the Customer Standing Committee. Alejandra, I think you're maybe a little more familiar with this than I am. Do you mind giving a little background before we dive into this issue?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sure, sure. So the Customer Standing Committee, it's the committee that actually keeps track on IANA naming functions. And this is where, well, the registries are mostly related. Here, the Customer Standing Committee has, as many other groups in ICANN, a regular review that it needs to go through. The most recent one ended in April last year, and we had a set of recommendations from them. The reviews are something that the ccNSO and the GNSO specify exactly how they want them to happen. It's on their scope to do so. And from the most recent review, we had some recommendations that are yet to be implemented, because again, it just finished last year. One of them was a full review of the SLAs framework. Another one was to appoint alternates for our members. Since the quorum, it's 100% for decisions to be made. And each of us have two members. So these four need to be there at the meetings for decisions to be made.

And the last recommendation that was shared, not the only one, but the last one was that the group said that they would really recommend to have a bylaw amendment on the frequency of the reviews, because right now the pace, it's a little too tight. It was written that the first one should be done after two years of the first meeting, and thereafter every three years. But now, after some practice of this, we have witnessed that the pace, it's rather tight in the sense that the previous review ends, and then another review needs to start quite soon, so it doesn't allow enough time for the recommendations to be implemented, and therefore to have a meaningful review. So right now, we are in the position of having to start another review on the 1st of October, and that's the background of it.

So the discussion is around what to do with this review, because we did send a letter together to the board requesting this bylaw change, or this bylaw amendment, that it's a fundamental bylaw, but unfortunately nothing happened since we did send this letter, even though a couple of reminders were sent. And now we are facing the new deadline to kickstart the review. So I leave it at that, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: So just to make sure I'm understanding, if the bylaw was executed, that would change the time frame to five years instead of three years, and instead of the review pending now, it would be pending in two years from now, or five years.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I would say four, because the reviews year should count from the ending of the review, so if it ended last year in April, one year has passed, so four remaining years would be there, unless I'm mistaken, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, thanks. The recommendation from the second review team, and that both councils supported, was to start a review five years after the conclusion of the previous one. So the previous review concluded in March, and the councils adopted the final report that supported the recommendations, I think in April, so that would mean April '28. If it was implemented in time, the bylaw would change. I hope that clarifies it. So five years after conclusion of the previous review, not implementation, conclusion, so time enough to look for implementation, etc.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. And I see one question from Damon in the chat. Has the board acknowledged receipt of the letters, or has it just been no response so far?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, I remember, yes, I haven't checked my email now, but we did have a conversation about this, the next ICANN meeting in person, so we did mention this again, so they are aware of it.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. So then the options before us are to, oh sorry, Bart, is that a new hand?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, that was a new one. Just to address this point, the letters, say from Sebastien and Alejandra, were included in the correspondence, and so there was this acknowledgement, and it's definitely known by all that it's there, because once it's on the correspondence page, it is recognized as such. There was a small issue in the sense of the original letter was sent in June, and it was resent in October, and hence it was published in October, after the conversation in Hamburg between the ICANN board and the ccNSO council on this various topic. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: So then, if I'm understanding correctly the decision before us, if we want to go ahead and start the review again, or if we should defer, given the recommendation to move to five years, and I guess presumably the idea that the bylaw is on ICANN's agenda, is that, or do a smaller review? I think that was another option.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Well, we haven't had any communications regarding when the bylaw amendment will start, so that's an unknown. So I guess in front of us, it's more a discussion on whether we want to defer it, and maybe for how long, or if we want to do a minimal review or a full review. I understand that the CSC would prefer for us to defer it, because obviously the recommendations are not completed, so it would be a waste of resources and time. So that would be the proposal.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. So I think we can open it up to councilors. I guess my initial gut reaction is that it might make sense to defer, and maybe send another letter or talk in person, or really emphasize at ICANN 81 to ICANN that there needs to be progress on this bylaw amendment as recommended, but I'll see if others have initial thoughts. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Hey, Greg. Yeah, it's Damon Ashcraft for the record. Yeah, I would recommend that we follow up again with the board, and that would probably do so at one of the council meetings with the board, either before the next ICANN meeting or at the ICANN meeting, and say, look, by the time we get to Istanbul, it'll be over a year, and say, look, this has now been on your plate for a year plus. When are you going to substantively respond?

GREG DIBIASE: That makes sense to me. I see a good question from Nick in the chat. Are we proposing to defer for a specific period of time? One year, 18 months? One year? I don't know. Alejandra, do you have a preference? Or is deferral the ccNSO's preference? I guess I shouldn't be making that assumption.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, we haven't yet decided on a time frame, but we can discuss now what would be our preferred... Okay, let me backtrack a little bit. Definitely, we need to send a joint letter, so I think it would be a good idea for us to get an agreement on what would be the best idea. Maybe deferring it until the bylaw amendment is done would be one, or at least one year, whichever comes first.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, that makes sense to me. You'd phrase it as, yeah, one year, or until the bylaw amendment is concluded, whichever comes first, and then we can... If it's not completed in one year, we can discuss. So when was your most recent letter, Alejandra? Does it make sense to send one like this month? That's from the ccNSO and the GNSO?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, I think that would be ideal. So maybe we could have a small drafting team, and then we share a Google Doc, and then we can all chime in with the [phrasing] and editorials. If you want, we can kickstart it, and then we share it with you, and then we all can contribute to it, and when we're happy, then we can agree on sending it.

GREG DIBIASE: That sounds great to me, and I'm seeing support in the chat for deferral until bylaws are amended, or I think it makes sense to put in the one year checkpoint. Okay, great. So seeing no disagreement, Alejandra, maybe we'll work on that joint letter and agree to defer for one year, or if the bylaw amendment... Well, I guess if the bylaw amendment is passed, then it goes to four years.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Exactly, but at least we review in one year.

GREG DIBIASE: Right, right.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And with this, also thinking in logistics, well, we do have a ccNSO council call next week, so by the next council meeting, we can either approve it

or approve it online, but just to give time to the drafting and to this one for discussion.

GREG DIBIASE: Great, maybe that's something we can add to an AOB in our council meeting as well. Okay, great. Thank you, Alejandra, for the explanation. Thank you, Bart, for the background materials. I think those were really helpful in getting everyone up to speed on a pretty niche issue. Shall we move on, Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay, so next in our agenda is the next item, the meeting strategy. Mary Wong of ICANN staff recently sent out an email with a document that posed the question about how we meet and should we change the meeting format. I know on our side, I think a couple of people had talked to Sally at ICANN 81, but I think Mary's email that was sent out and I forwarded, I think maybe yesterday is maybe the first time folks are hearing about this, so I think this is relatively fresh, but that document poses some questions given budget constraints, I think maybe even environmental concerns and other factors if we should take a fresh look at how we meet and whether changes should be made. So I think that is the topic, Alejandra. Any other thoughts on how you describe the issue at hand?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, when we proposed this topic for our joint session, it was something that Sally mentioned in one of our meetings in Kigali. She said that this was something she would like to discuss further and then the email from

Mary arrived with a more formal request. So we haven't discussed it internally in the ccNSO Council yet, but we thought it would be a good idea maybe to share some thoughts already if there were any on this. Of course, the main idea here is on how to be more efficient with the resources that we have and also to think of if the way we are meeting should stay or should be changed in a way.

For this, I do have also the understanding that they don't want to create a cross-community working group and make a big process out of it. It's more that we discuss it internally within our groups and then we give feedback to Sally and the team regarding this.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

I think in the letter I sent, I asked for feedback from our SOs and ACs by the 24th of July, so sort of a tight time frame for a big question. I guess I'll ask if any councilors have initial thoughts on this, maybe substantively or maybe even process-wise if this is the right way to go about it. Susan, I see your hand.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah, thanks, Greg. Hi, it's Susan Payne. I appreciate none of us, I think, have really had much time to think about this, but I would be interested in if there were any initial reactions on the process to be followed. I think we tend to get very bogged down in process and this is how we've always done it and so we have to do things this way. But on the other hand, I think when last the meeting strategy was looked at, it was a cross-community working group of some form. Does the ccNSO have any strong feelings about this idea of proceeding in a slightly more nimble and less formal manner? I'm not really expressing views, I just would be interested to know if you have any initial thoughts on it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, we haven't yet discussed it at length in the council. We will next week, so by then I will have a better answer to that because we haven't put any thoughts into this already. So the idea of having these more informal approaches is something that at least myself I've been trying to back down a little bit because it puts a lot of pressure on the chairs to come up with decisions on the spot, which is not the best way to do so because even though we may be the spokesperson for a community, we are not the community. So we do need to go back to our communities and do a lifting of opinions and then we can of course speak of let's say consensus view on things. So I do understand in a way they want to be more efficient about it because they're pressed on trying to be more efficient with resources, but maybe the process is not the best. But that's my personal view.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. Yeah. Alejandra, at least I'd agree with you on the point about putting this on the chairs. It's difficult. I don't think the chairs have a very formal, necessarily a formal process for gathering feedback. They're just sending out to the list in the middle of summer. I don't know. Maybe that gets all the feedback that's required, but maybe not.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: We can of course send back like, okay, we don't like this approach. We would like a more, even if express process, but that should be hearing everyone's voice. We can always say that.

GREG DIBIASE: Interesting. Okay. Lawrence?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Thanks, Greg. So ICANN 81 was the first time I heard this idea [inaudible]. And with the communications from Mary Wong, it shows that there is some appetite within the community for this kind of review. Speaking to some concerns that I heard, it was more or less the fact that the policy meetings were much more streamlined to be smaller in nature. We weren't having a lot of interactions with the board, like the community or the AGMs that we have. And the policy meeting attracted a lot less participation as we did see in Kigali. And so I think some of the view that ICANN can save some dollars by pruning down or scrapping that meeting entirely.

My thoughts basically are that if we were going to be limited to having just two meetings in a year, the scale of the community meetings that are quite larger and the AGM, which happens to be the largest meeting for the year, we might also put a lot of pressure on our processes such that the kind of work that we currently have to deal with will have to be done at those two in-person meetings. So I really see that there might be some need to rationalize activities around cost, but I don't think it should be at the detriment of the in-person meetings. We should be looking at how to scale up the policy meeting. And even if it's a public forum of some sort where community feedback can be sought and also having opportunities to interact with the board. If we have to go back to broadening the scope of the policy meeting, I think it's going to add some more value to our work rather than scaling it down. I know that we are still walking around the process of how this engagement should happen, but I just felt that I should drop those few thoughts. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Lawrence. I feel like that's a pretty good description of, I guess, the tension at hand, especially when it comes to the policy meeting. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yeah, Lawrence, I just want to say well said. I agree with that. I think there's a real risk as far as just eliminating a meeting. And so I agree 100%. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Damon. Kurt?

KURT PRITZ: I think two things. One, the first is I think it'd be helpful to look back on the work that was done, I don't know, was it 10 years ago or something like that where a cross-community working group sort of reformed the meetings to give us the present lineup of community meeting, policy meeting, and AGM, and compare how meetings are conducted now with the recommendations of that group. I remember, for example, the policy meeting was supposed to be where the PDPs in the case of the GNSO or other policy creation or other working groups met more intensively to do substantive work. So instead of each working group maybe meeting once during an ICANN meeting as they do, even during the policy meetings, the purpose of the policy meeting was really to give those groups the chance to meet face to face and have several meetings and make substantial progress. So I think it'd be interesting to look at what was intended when the meetings were sort of revamped 10 years ago and see if we've achieved those aims.

And then the second is we should start out, I think, talking about what our objectives are. So is our objective to reduce costs and is our objective to make the meeting more effective? Is the objective to make the multi-stakeholder model either more effective or more accepted in other fora or something like that? So I think those two things set a baseline with what was intended last time and if we're achieving that and then see what are our goals for this. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Kurt. That makes a lot of sense to me. Okay. I think that's some great baseline ideas to get our thinking started

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: May I add just one more comment? I just sent a link in the chat, but I thought I didn't send it to everyone, but I hope I did. The meeting strategy was implemented in 2016, so eight years ago. And the ccNSO did a couple of reviews on the meetings when this happened and also when COVID happened and we had to-go virtual. So we will discuss this in our next council meeting and we, of course, can send you a summary of our discussions.

But one thing that I wanted to highlight is that maybe it's not all or nothing, as in either we have an in-person meeting or we don't have a meeting at all. It's the virtual option. It's also there. So just to think about it, because in my personal opinion, I do believe that if that the meetings in a way set up goals for the work that we are doing, and yes, having only two very far away could harm the pace on which work is done. I don't know this for sure, but it's just a feeling. So there's that. And the other thing to consider, it's the funded travelers because that was mentioned in Mary's email as well, if I'm not mistaken. So those are other things to have in mind.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Okay. Well, I think that's a great starting point on this discussion. I think we can make sure that we're sharing our thoughts between our respective groups, Alejandra, going forward. Okay. Anything else on this topic? So I think the next part, we're just going to have a couple quick updates from each group to give a sense of what each of us are working on. Says top three for me. I chose two because one's a little long. But do

you want to start with the ccNSO kind of topics of interest and then we'll go to the GNSOs?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Okay. In our agenda, they're in a specific order, but I'm going to change it because it makes more sense. So I'll go with the third one first, that it's the ccNSO purpose and goals. And for this, I will ask Bart to help me with the sharing of documents, just to show you these documents. It's not to go well into much detail with them.

So this document summarizes the purpose and goals of the ccNSO and this is how we focus all of our work. So we are a global platform for ccTLD managers and we also are, of course, a supporting organization within ICANN and we have three goals. One is to evolve the global policies. The other is the growth and development of ccTLDs and the third one is to contribute to ICANN's broader work.

With this, it's how we then, let's say, triage all of our work. And Bart, if you can go now to the Gantt chart. So we have this tool that's called ClickUp, where all the current activities of the ccNSO are recorded, all of those that require at least two months or more. And they are all classified, as you can see on your left, it says Goal One, Policy Serving. So everything policy related, it's there. And then if we would go further, we will see all the other activities that are in the other goals until we go to the foundational ones.

And just to look at this Gantt chart every time, it's a little bit difficult. So there is now what we call the quarterly activity monitor, where we see in one page what is currently happening in this quarter of the year and we only highlight the changes, if any, like in yellow, we will have things that are changed or in red, something that are urgent, and how we are doing with all those activities. So this is something that I wanted to share with

you on how we do things. So maybe it makes more sense on how we work.

And that gives me the intro to the other update that it's on the policy gap analysis. So we're working, we had a small council team going through the policies that we make that they are not that many. And they did a good work in gathering all the related documents, not only the policies, but all the related documents that actually will tell IANA PTI how to do their work relating with ccTLDs. And these all came up with a specific case of a ccTLD that IANA didn't have any written procedure on how to handle that specific situation. And then it was decided, okay, why don't we see if there's any other gaps there? And now that the work has evolved in a way that we now are having a working group to look at this. And this is a fairly new one that we just approved. And they will be the ones to carry on this work on reviewing all possible gaps and then suggest to the council best way forward if we need to have just a study group, if we need to, or if we go all the way to a ccPDP. I don't know if any other councilors were involved in this work would like to say something else regarding the gap analysis. I see Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Hello, everybody. Yeah, the small working group has identified several potential issues and it's obviously going to have to be bumped up to a working group level to do a pretty thorough investigation similar to how we did back in the day with the FOI to interpret exactly what was meant in RFC 1591. So I hope to see this work get underway.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Stephen. And maybe I could also stop here if there are any questions of everything that I've said so far. If not, then let me move on to the other update and it's that we are working very hard on our continuous improvement. So we've used several techniques to gather

information from our communities that have proven to be very useful. One of them is the World Cafe and the other is the Open Space Technology. These are, let's say, strategies that help create a more sharing adequate environment where we have the people not sitting down with laptops looking at the screen, but actually sitting in round tables and discussing the topics that we want to learn a little bit more of.

We've done two World Cafes right now. One was on how to shape the ccNSO for 2030, and we wanted to gather from the community what was needed to improve or what should be kept in order for the ccNSO to remain relevant, at least for the next seven years. And the other one that we just did in Kigali was on improving the voting process, because we identified this as a process that could be improved, and we wanted to test as well a framework for continuous improvement that we chose. And first, it has two phases. First, we defined what to accomplish and how to tell there is improvement and what change is needed, and later used that information to actually make a plan, execute it, then study and see if there's any other improvement to be made. So this last one is still on the way, so I don't have much input on that, but it's something that I wanted to share about this. I don't know if other ccNSO councilors would like to mention something regarding our continuous improvement. Yes, Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

Hi, Ale. Hi, all. The one thing that I'd like to contribute is that the World Cafe has served as this safe space and very comfortable space where people are allowed to express themselves in various ways. It could be orally, it could be writing, it could be just drawing on papercloths that we have on the tables, we take pictures, we share among ourselves, and it has proved to be quite successful. And it seems to me that this is a way forward to explore topics that we have no information about it and that we want to gather the feeling of the majority of the people. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pablo. So any questions or comments? This topic also comes with the overall, well, now we have the pilot holistic review and also the cross-community group on continuous improvement program. So that's how, well, we started doing that before, but in light of that, I wanted to mention it to you guys. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you for that, Alejandra. The World Cafe sounds interesting. Any questions from GNSO councilors on any of Alejandra's updates? Okay. Well, great. I'll share just a couple of things on the GNSO side. First, you shared kind of that helpful, I think this was a diagram of things you're working on. I'm just going to paste in chat here that at the GNSO, we have a link with a couple documents that show kind of everything that we're working on. There's a portfolio management tool and project list which shows all of our projects and also what we call an action decision radar, which shows, as we work through these topics, what are the next decisions to be had? So if you're ever interested in kind of catching up with what the GNSO is working on, the link I just posted in the chat is a good place to start.

More generally, I think a lot of our work has been focused on the SubPro recommendations for the next round of gTLDs. If you'll recall, the SubPro working group submitted a number of recommendations to the board. There was a subset that were adopted, and then there were a subset and then there were a subset that were not adopted, not rejected, but we worked with the board to improve them based on or to adjust them based on board concerns. So we developed what are called supplemental recommendations, working with the board to basically refine the original recommendations. We've submitted almost all of the supplemental recommendations, I think all but two were adopted by the board. I'm sure councilors can correct me if I'm wrong. And we still have one remaining supplemental recommendation that the council is still working on, and

that's on singulars and plurals, which the board expressed some concerns about the difficulty of distinguishing between singulars and plurals. So we're trying to work on a, I guess, more workable system for that going forward. So I guess the big picture, the work is progressing. Almost all the supplemental recommendations have been submitted to the board. We're still working on that last one. I believe we're still on pace for, I think, April 2026 for the AGB to be released. So that's taking probably the most time out of any other topic. I'll stop there to see if councilors want to add anything or correct anything that I said that might be useful.

Okay. I must have gotten it completely right. And then just another thing that is on our agenda, I guess in the near future, we've been discussing the issue of data accuracy, and what we mean by that is registrant data accuracy. A scoping team had looked into this and noted the lack of data to assess and scope the problem, looking at actual registrant data to determine if it was accurate or not. However, we ran into an issue in which under new privacy regulation, like the GDPR, ICANN can't request registrant data in bulk for that purpose, for assessing whether data is accurate. So we're kind of looking at other sources of how we can get data on this issue, other ways to move forward. So that's kind of the thing that had been on hold that is back on our plate, and we're thinking of ways to basically advance the topic, how additional data can be found, and then also looking at the other inputs that are coming down the line. There's things like NIS2 and the European Union that might have an impact on how these processes are done. So I think those are kind of the two biggest topics we're handling right now. But like I said, there's other documentation that at any time, councilors can go look and check on us and see what we're working on. So that's my brief update if anyone has questions or clarifications. Okay. Well, seeing none, I think we can move to our AOB item. It is the technical coalition. Alejandra, was this the note on the WSIS concerns? Or am I getting mixed up?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: A little bit of both. Since we're on the topic. Well, this particular coalition was presented in the latest internet governance sessions that we had at the ccNSO. So getting to the relationship with the WSIS+20 concerns, I would like to ask you all if you guys are looking into that at all, if you are following it, because in the ccNSO, it's been a topic since it came up, and we are constantly, well, having sessions related to it. So just wanted to know where you guys are with that.

GREG DIBIASE: So I wouldn't say that GNSO has taken concrete collective action regarding WSIS, but we have had regular updates. A lot of our councilors are pretty informed in the process and have been updating it. And I know there are individual councilors that are involved. And we've had, I think, briefings from ICANN like the other constituencies have, but I wouldn't say we have formal agenda items that we've been working on as a group as it relates to WSIS. It's, I think, more of making sure our members stay informed, inviting speakers, whether that's the ICANN or councilors that are knowledgeable to give updates. But I think any action has maybe been done by members as opposed to the council as a whole. Does that make sense?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It does to me. Let me check the chat. Okay. There are some members that are part of the technical coalition. Well, I unfortunately didn't procure a specific speaker on the topic, but if any of the ccNSO councilors would like to share their views on the technical coalition, please are more than welcome to do so. Yes, Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, I'm happy to talk to this. I mean, as you know, we're one of the founding members of the technical coalition. I think it's just, well, there's a number of different aspects of it. First of all, it is very lengthy and complicated with these UN processes. We sometimes complain about ICANN's processes being obscure and opaque. Well, that's nothing compared to the UN. And I suppose that's the point, which is that if you look at the sort of longer-term drift of high-level internet governance from a multi-stakeholder towards a more multilateral approach, that's exactly the point. We're looking into potentially some of the core technical functions and standards being overseen by more opaque and less transparent processes with less input from the community, just only from governmental representatives.

So in terms of this technical coalition, the objectives are to ensure that we as technical community members maintain a say in that sort of thing. And particularly where it comes to technical standards, the stability, the fact that it has worked so well for the last 20 years in terms of technical operations, the transparency we get at the root zone operation, ways that the IETF and those standards are all maintained. And a lot of it is community volunteers and civil society technical contributions.

And, well, I think there's a general, I'm not speaking for the council here or particularly for the coalition, but there's a general lack of enthusiasm for the way that ICANN seems to have been approaching this, given it is potentially an existential issue for them. They seem to be extremely defensive and passive over the whole question. And I suppose that is something that we look forward. These things, as we know, you can't just wait till 2025, which is the 20-year renewal of the WSIS. These things tend to be precooked before then. And there's an important stepping stone this September in terms of the Summer to the Future and the Global Digital Compact, which will provide us with a very interesting bellwether as to the direction of travel.

So this is very live at the moment. The final text of the Global Digital Compact with references to the multi-stakeholder process or multilateral element and whether there's new oversight bodies setting up at the UN level are expected this week, basically. And we talk about the timing. We have no input to this, but now we're in the summer period. And then it goes to vote at the UN in September.

So yeah, there's a lot of things and we very much welcome our friends. Thanks, Jennifer, from the non-CCs community. This is across the houses in terms of country codes and gTLDs. We're all technical community members, whether we're gTLDs and ccTLDs. I suppose this is just one of those areas where I think there's a very strong converging interest that we work together and combine our resources. It's very resource-intensive, so we should crowdsource the smart ideas and share information and coordinate sort of well. And I think that's been quite nicely evidenced outside of the formal processes of the ccNSO and the GNSO, but behind the scenes groups of us work together and try to encourage a bit more proactivity on this from ICANN. I'll shut up. I could talk about this for a lot longer. I get quite passionate and frustrated about how I kind of been approaching this, but yeah, to be continued.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you so much, Nick. Any questions or comments?

GREG DIBIASE: Alejandra, I think you said there might be a letter that you were sending.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. At the council, we have discussed on how ICANN is approaching this matter and we have drafted a letter that is to be sent soon, still not sent. I might send it right today because it's already approved. So yes, we are doing that to express some concerns on the approach and

request a little bit more proactive leadership from ICANN regarding this matter.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. I think our councilors would be interested in the concerns raised by the letter, so it's good to hear. Any comments from GNSO councilors on this topic? Seeing none, Alejandra, I think we've reached the end of our agenda. Pretty good on timing.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: One more thing, because I remember Desiree wanting us to talk or give a little bit of an update on our pilot holistic review process of candidates. Just to let you know that the ccNSO has already sent its appointments to ICANN. That's done. The next step will be when chairs need to meet and see the full slate.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. I think the Standing Selection Committee is still working, but we should have our candidates shortly, if I'm correct. Susan asked, do you happen to have the detailer link on the ccNSO candidates, Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, I did send the email, but I don't think we have it published.

BART BOSWINKEL: No, it's one of the things is some people who use the ccNSO or requested the ccNSO to select them have not been informed of the outcome because we didn't know their email addresses. So I think it's only prudent that the people are informed first before they see anything published.

GREG DIBIASE: Susan's trying to know before the actual members. Wow. Just kidding. Okay, great. Well, thank you for this meeting, Alejandra. It's really nice to meet with you all. I think we're discussing whether we'd meet in ICANN 81. So we'll continue those discussions and hopefully it works. If not, we can continue to have meetings like this, but it's great to see all of you and stay informed on all the important work that you're doing at the ccNSO. Thank you so much.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you so much to have this meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]