
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – ccNSO: Guidelines Review Committee Work Session
Sunday, March 8, 2026 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO Guideline Review Committee work session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I, along with my colleague, Joke Braeken, are the participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will post them in the chat for your reference. During the session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their microphone. Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphone disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you. And with that, I will now hand the floor over to Sean Copeland, Chair of the GRC. Thank you.

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.

SEAN COPELAND

Thank you so much, Claudia, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to wherever you are in the world. Thank you for coming to the Mumbai edition of the GRC. We do have a bit of a busy agenda to move things off. In terms of administrative matters, I have nothing for you at this time. So we will get right into the guidelines that we want to move off our plate, either to Council or the community, and we can go right into the Board recall of which Alejandra has done an incredible amount of work.

And I will say this at the start of it, she's done an incredible amount of work here. If you have gone through all the documentation and have looked at the work, you'll know that it would kind of drive you a little bit insane to get it all right, and she's done a fantastic job. There will be some editorial or friendly changes in there that we've done. If there's anything that strikes you as something that we've missed, do bring it up now, or forever hold your peace. With that, I will turn it over to Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Sean. These documents that have been shared in the past with the GRC, how this document came to be was since we had the NomCom director removal guideline in its split form already, I moved to using that as a base for the Board recall because it has the same pattern in the sense that there are two ways we can arrive at this process. One is from the ccNSO side to initiate the process, and the other is some other decisional participant deciding to do so and then requesting for us to support this or not.

I think the best way to understand the process is through the diagrams, and the diagrams are before the annexes. Maybe if we can go to the index, we can click on where it says "Diagrams." It's a little bit further down. There we go. Thank you so much, Claudia. This is the Board recall diagram when the ccNSO initiates the process. We get a petition, and then the petition period starts. It has twenty-one days. Here, the Council needs to make a decision whether it accepts or not this petition. A difference with the NomCom director removal is that here we are not expected to have a dialogue beforehand, so that's a difference.

And then if the petition moves forward and it's within the time period, it's delivered to the Empowered Community Administration, and there we start the petition support period. That's when there's a need to find two additional decisional participants who will support this petition. If that's not happening, then the process ends. But if there are two more decisional participants who would support this, then we go into the community forum period.

If we can go to the next diagram, please. It's right below. Thank you. There we are. So here there's the community forum period that will depend, as all other community forum periods, whether we will have it online or at the next ICANN meeting. If it's online, we have 21 days, and if it's at the next ICANN meeting, the period will end at the last official day of the ICANN meeting. After that, there is a

decision period where the Council needs to meet and decide whether they continue to support this petition.

And then it needs to be delivered to the Empowered Community Administration. If it's within the timeframe, that's the end, and if it's not within the timeframe, that's the end as well because that's as far as the ccNSO needs to be involved, because the final decision would remain with the Empowered Community. If we go to the next diagram that's below... Oh, I failed to include it. That's my fault. It's in my diagram place, but I will add it here. It's when we get the petition to support. We enter in that seven-day period, and that's where we need to make a quick decision whether we want to support or not. And if we don't make it in those seven days, we're deemed to have abstained from it.

SEAN COPELAND

Does anybody have any questions about what Alejandra had to say? And are you guys following the diagrams? Are you guys at this stage willing to sign off so that we can send this on its way? We'll do a show of hands on that one. Go ahead, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA

Thank you, Sean. Irina, for the record. I want to just thank Alejandra for the enormous work done and apologize because I had no chance to read the text, but I promise to do it this week.

SEAN COPELAND

Fair. Does anyone else have any comments?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thank you, Sean. This is Pablo, for the record. I want to also join Irina's comment in thanking Alejandra for the tremendous work and for facilitating these charts that absolutely make our lives so much easier to understand these concepts. Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND

Anyone else? I noticed, Stephen, that you are agreeing with Pablo as well, so thank you for that. Okay. With that, then, let's do our little green check marks on the Zoom. Give a green check mark if you're okay for us to sign off on it. Go ahead, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Just to let you know that since this is a nice collaborative document, I just updated it with the missing diagram so it's really complete. This is what I was telling you about; it starts at the petition support period, so it's in those seven days after the petition period starts. One thing that's worth noting in this one and in the NomCom director one is that it doesn't mean that we have seven days, because those seven days will start when the other period ends. So when we get that request, we will have whatever remains of that period to respond.

If we do support, then everything goes as previously in the sense of if there are enough decisional participants supporting it, then it goes to the community forum period and the decision period, and

that's it. If at any point in the process something fails, then it's the end of the process. Just to have it complete. Thank you, and sorry for missing that one.

SEAN COPELAND

It's okay. When you see them in the different places, you start to see them there. So I appreciate that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Exactly. I thought it was there.

SEAN COPELAND

All right. I see some of you have already put up your green tick marks. If the rest of you could, or red...

STEPHEN DEERHAKE

It's not an easy thing to read, that particular part of the bylaws.

SEAN COPELAND

True. The diagram makes this immensely easier.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE

The diagram is wonderful.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Stephen.

SEAN COPELAND

Okay. Green tick marks if you agree to sign off on it, red tick marks if you don't, and I believe there's a yellow X if you want to abstain. And I believe that we have taken this off of our plate, so thank you very much, Alejandra, for the Board recall. I realize this is now going to go over to the NomCom, which is a little bit different. If you quickly want to look at the diagrams, which again, are the crux of the issue.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Sure. I think we started backwards, but it's fine. If we can go to the other document, then. So we are in the NomCom Board Director Removal, and if we can do the same thing as we did on the other one, go to the index and go to the diagrams, that would be lovely. I think it's easier to see the diagrams and the text; it's supposed to reflect that. As mentioned in the Board recall, it's a very similar process. The differences are here.

We have in the petition period an additional step that requires a dialogue with the director that is being removed. If the ccNSO is the one that is initiating the process, then the Council needs to decide either to support or not, and if they do, then we go and deliver that to the ECA, and this petition support period starts. The difference here as well is that there's only the requirement that one additional decisional participant needs to support this petition for it to move forward. For the Board recalls, it was two. Again, if nobody else

supports it, that's the end of it. But if there's another one, then it moves to the community forum period.

If we can move a little bit down. Thank you. So the community forum period, as with the other one, if it's online, it has a fixed amount of twenty-one days, or if it is at the next ICANN meeting, then it's at the official end day of the ICANN meeting when the period ends. Then there's a decision period where the Council needs to decide whether they support or not. If they do, and if they're within the timeframe, that's okay. And if they don't, then that's also the end of the process, but without the support of the ccNSO for it.

If we go to the next one, please. Ah, I missed it here. I will add it right now. Sorry for that. I apologize.

SEAN COPELAND

It's okay, Alejandra. It was very dense, and to have this is wonderful.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Almost there. And by the magic of Google Docs, there it is. So, this is when another decisional participant initiates the process, and again, the ccNSO starts in this seven-day period whenever we are notified. And then the Council needs to decide whether to support or not. And then if whomever initiated this petition gets at least one decisional participant to support it, then it continues its way. Otherwise, the process stops. And that's it. Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND

Thank you, Alejandra. Does anyone have any questions on this one? Okay. Then green check marks if you're ready to pass this off, red if you are not. Please and thank you. And there we go, two work items done. Moving along now to the board director removal document. Again, to the diagrams.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Sure. And this one just has one way because this is regarding the ccNSO director removal, and that can only be done by the ccNSO, so there's only one path. It's similar and different in many ways, but let's go through them. A petition gets submitted. There's a verification period that it contains all the requirements that we need for a petition to be considered valid. There's a dialogue step that needs to happen before making any decision. Then the Council meets and decides whether to accept or reject the petition.

If it's done within the twenty-one days and the Council agrees to move forward, then the decision goes to the Empowered Community Administration, which is the entity that will direct ICANN for the community forum period. This also has two paths. Whether it's online will be twenty-one days, and if we decided to do it in the next ICANN meeting, then it will end at the official end day of the ICANN meeting when the period ends. Here, we added in the guideline a step that says that the Council could have a meeting

and decide whether they want to continue or withdraw their petition.

This option is also available in the other guidelines in the sense that at any time, if the people involved with the request of removal decide that they want to withdraw, they can. But here, we're making it more explicit for the Council to actually have a meeting and decide whether to continue or not. If at any point here the Council doesn't meet or they don't decide anything, the process still continues. This is not a conditional step; it's just a step to add it if the Council actually wants to withdraw. So if they want to withdraw, it ends, otherwise it continues.

And then there is a comment period and a decision period. The comment period ends seven days after the community forum period, and then we have a decision period where the ccNSO needs to decide whether to continue or not. But let's go to the next diagrams where those are a little bit more detailed. After the comment period, in the decision period, the Council will meet and decide whether the matter is resolved or they support the removal of the director.

And if they do support it, and it's within the 21 days, they deliver this to the Empowered Community Administration. And as you see, there are two red conditionals there. One is that if it is within the decision period and the decision is to support, then the director will be removed. If any of those conditions at any point is not met, then the process ends. And that's it.

SEAN COPELAND

Thank you very much, Alejandra. Does anyone have any questions on this? Pablo, go ahead.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thanks, Sean. Alejandra, in the previous diagram where the Council can withdraw or continue, would that decision to withdraw be based on the fact that the person involved, the director involved, corrected whatever situation was causing this, thus no need to continue? Or is it a case of "withdraw, I don't care, I'm out of here"?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Well, in the guideline, we cannot foresee any possible scenario, but there are some conditions that the Council needs to take into consideration, like the dialogue that was had with the director and any community feedback that the Council will get from the ccNSO community. Taking everything into consideration is what we'll take to decide whether to continue or withdraw. Thinking positively, if we see a way that the path can be corrected, then that would be a reason for withdrawing this petition. But it's not foreseeable, and if we get to this extreme measure, it should be something so atrocious that it's worth considering.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Got it. Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND

Does anyone else have any questions? Okay. Then Peter.

PETER KOCH

Thank you. Peter, for the record. Just out of curiosity, and apologies as I haven't read the document before, comparing this to the other SOAC removal procedures, do we have relevant inequalities, and if we have relevant differences with others, why would we? I understand we are different.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Yes, each SOAC will be different. I would say what we have considered from others, and in particular from the GNSO, are templates that they have already drafted that need to be adjusted in these guidelines. They have been just copy-pasted; they have not been tailored for the ccNSO, but they're there as a reference of something that we can use. But the procedure is taken from the bylaws as to what the procedure states. I have not read what others have done.

For example, I would say the particular thing we are doing—though I am not sure if others are—is that we do have that Council meeting at the community forum period where we could end the process because we think we've heard enough to say, "Okay, this can be mended," or there was a misunderstanding. That would be what I consider that others may or may not have in their own guidelines, but I haven't seen others.

PETER KOCH

Yeah. Thank you. Very good response. Thanks.

SEAN COPELAND

Are you comfortable moving this over to Council? Can you guys give me green check marks if you're willing to send this on to Council, red if you're not, and yellow if you want to abstain. The yellow that I use is a little happy face.

PETER KOCH

Is there a yellow? I don't think so.

SEAN COPELAND

Irina?

IRINA DANELIA

I need to read it.

SEAN COPELAND

Fair enough. Do you want us to hold back until you read it and put this to another poll?

IRINA DANELIA

I don't want to halt the process, and I assume that at maximum I will find maybe one typo, but personally, I need to read it before I sign it.

SEAN COPELAND

Fair enough. You could see typos. We did our best, but there's always room for that. So, okay. Then we can move this on to Council for the Council meeting this week, for them to give feedback. It still needs to follow all the guideline processes; it needs to go to the community and all that, but at least for them to have an initial review check once it's cleaned up, please.

Yes. All three of them need a little bit of cleanup. Okay. So this now brings us to the statement of interest update for us to look at. This will be the last go before we send it to the community to look at. As you guys know, we have our own policy in terms of COI and SOI arising from our own activities. In a sense, we were a little bit ahead of what ICANNORG was doing, which is fine. This is to bring our procedures aligned to what ICANNORG is doing. Clearly we are our own entity.

In saying that, I'm going to presume that everyone has read this document, and I'm going to ask you guys if you have any questions or concerns about the wording that we have done here that you would like to bring to the fore before we send it to the community. You guys are really quiet today.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Well, just as a comment, since our guideline was very much aligned with the code of conduct, there were minor updates to be made, and the last time we spoke, we went through those. So this is more

like a final reading of the clean document. I think personally I don't have an issue. I just wanted to say that there was not too much change to it.

SEAN COPELAND

Agreed. I'm just wanting to skip going over it line by line, that's all. All right, you guys, green ticks if you're willing to send it on to the community for review, red if you're not.

PETER KOCH

I just hadn't read the document.

SEAN COPELAND

Okay, fair. We will move this on and now we'll go to the continuous improvement framework. Christian, I see that you are online.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER

I'm here.

SEAN COPELAND

There you are. For the record, Christian has actually been attending our meetings and has been helping us with this process and providing feedback. Both Irina and I, coming from the CIP side of things, had a lot of things to contemplate in here, and Irina's actually done really good work here as she always does.

Obviously this is based on the principles that were coming out of the CIP. You'll recall that when we were in Dublin, we did a world

cafe-style meeting to work out indicators that we're going to look at. In terms of this process, I believe that we have settled on our indicators. Now we need to start looking at our observations and if we agree with these documents. We can either go section by section, or if there's any one in particular that you would like to start with, feel free. We've done a fair bit of cleanup over the last couple weeks. So I open the floor if you have a general question, otherwise we can go section by section. Go ahead, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Sean. From last time we spoke, we were going through the indicators and we didn't manage to finish all the principles. Should we go to the ones that we already done and leave the others for later, or what's your plan?

SEAN COPELAND

To be honest with you, I cannot remember which one we actually stopped at.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

We were having the discussion of what is effectiveness and what is efficiency. The effectiveness one, I think we managed to complete. The efficiency one is also cleaned up. Maybe we did arrive to that one, but for sure the other two we didn't. Principle three still has some comments on whether we keep the indicators or not.

SEAN COPELAND

So P3.6. Has anyone actually looked at this since the last meeting?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

I haven't.

SEAN COPELAND

Okay. Do you want to get into the discussion on it? Let's go for it. So looking at this, if we're going to maintain it and we're looking at percentages of stakeholders and our surveys, this is a conversion from the meta-meter cards in the room to the surveys that we have begun to do. Are we catching within those tools that we are actually reaching our intended audience, or are we missing a step?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Are we at P3.6? I'm talking about number two, the survey response rates. Okay, I see that one is marked to be struck. I agree with that because the survey response is low, but that doesn't mean that people disagree or agree, or it doesn't say anything really. We cannot force people to respond. So to me, that's not a good enough indicator of anything. That's why I'm in favor of striking that one. Even though it's a good tool to measure a little bit, it's still not a solid indicator to show if that makes sense.

SEAN COPELAND

No, it perfectly does. Pablo, do you want to comment?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Yeah, I am in favor of Alejandra's argument because when the instrument does work, then it would be a good indicator. But when people do not participate, then there's nothing you can do with it. As a result, I am in favor of striking it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

May I? Because I wanted to go even further than that. In the whole indicator itself, as in the communication reaches its intended audience, I think it's not that indicator in particular that we should focus on, but the whole thing. I think it's too complicated for us to maintain or sustain. My argument is it's very difficult to measure if the communications are reaching stakeholders because we could be sending the emails, and the emails could be valid, but the fact that they read them or not is outside of our control. Even though this criterion sounds good in its wording and its intention, it's not realistic for us to keep. So my proposal would be to strike it altogether.

SEAN COPELAND

Does anyone have any comment to that? Irina?

IRINA DANIELA

P3.6. I'm not opposed.

SEAN COPELAND

Thank you, Irina. All right. Do you want to do a quick vote to see if we take this off? And Christian, do you want to make a comment on it at all?

CHRISTIAN

I agree with what Alejandra was saying. How I was reading it, thinking about how to quantify that would be, as I mentioned, the number of bounces back when you send an email. And if that's the case, hopefully that would be something where we address it and make sure that we have the correct email on file for our mailing list. I think that that would be a pretty quick fix, so I don't think that that's necessarily a data point that you need to track regularly.

SEAN COPELAND

Thank you for that. All right everyone, green ticks if you're okay taking 3.6 out, red checks if you're not. And we'll take it out. So this now brings us to 3.7. This is also kind of an interesting one. Are we finishing meetings on schedule? Agenda items are being completed, so on and so forth. Obviously, in this group, we like to give time back, but sometimes we do go overboard and we do have friendly reminders about that. But of course, when we run over time, it does cause people to kind of lose interest or lose the narrative towards the end. Saying that, looking at the individual items, are you content with them, or do you have questions or feel that they are not appropriate? Peter, you have the floor.

PETER KOCH

Thank you so much. Item number two asks for compliance engineering. I'm happy to add random agenda items to the agenda to achieve a higher percentage. I have two AOBs or something. I understand where this is coming from, but I'm not sure that this is adding much value.

SEAN COPELAND

Fair. Does anyone else have a comment?

CHRISTIAN

I would just note that as far as the level of effort for tracking this, staff would need to be having some kind of record of how often every meeting finishes on schedule. Also, whatever "on schedule" means. Tracking the number of agenda items and whether they were completed or not, checking the time used for face-to-face meetings or for discussion time versus reading reports. Just flagging that it would probably be a great deal of effort for staff to track all these other items on top of doing the meeting. Just acknowledging if the juice is worth the squeeze for what kind of information you really want to get out of this data. Ironically, the participant survey, which is set to strike, would probably be the easiest to implement because it's just a survey. But that's also added effort on all of you having to fill out a survey every time. So just bearing all that in mind, I'm not opposed to having a criteria that the meeting produces results, but just wanted to flag the level of effort that might be contained in that. Thanks.

SEAN COPELAND

Thank you very much. Irina.

IRINA DANELIA

We have P3.2 above, which says volunteer time is used productively. In my view, volunteer time already includes meeting time. So I would just use one criterion, P3.2, and would not introduce P3.7.

SEAN COPELAND

Okay. Does anyone else have any comment? AJ, go ahead.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

I had forgotten why I had put to maintain, but I think I was on the reverse side. At least one of those should happen. Either we are measuring... Like, in my comment on P3.7, I put here that this one feels like it covers P3.2 on the volunteer time, and it's what Irina just said. It's not just meetings, and I agree. We should keep one of them. But the thing that bugged me a little bit on the volunteer time is used correctly is that sometimes it's difficult to measure, like percentage of working group members actively participating. How do you measure active participation, and how easy is it to measure whether if a meeting ends on time? It's quite direct and objective. It was more on those sides, like what was easier and more impactful. And that was it. I definitely agree it's better to measure on outcomes than not, because not all working groups work the

same way. Otherwise, how would we measure members' time outside of working groups? It's very difficult also.

SEAN COPELAND

Very true. Then my takeaway is we want to find some way to combine 3.7 and 3.2 and strip out things that are outcome-driven.

BART BOSWINKEL

Yeah.

SEAN COPELAND

Yeah. Okay. Can you remember that, Claudia, when we come back around to this? Thank you. This now moves us to principle number four, P4.1. Mission and activities align with member needs. Purpose and goal of ccNSO aligns with member needs. This has got a heavy "maintain." Does anyone have any observation where they may say that they do not want to maintain this and why? Or any individual indicator? In particular, number four that has no status.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

May I? I see that there's a difference on the maintain and the indicators. I believe the first one, like we added the fourth. I'm not sure if to replace the first, but again, when we have the percentage of surveyed people, unless we're doing it one by one or searching for a number of people that we need feedback from, it's...

SEAN COPELAND

I think when you're looking at number four, that's going to be the exercise that we're doing with the IGLC in Seville and we're doing with the MPC. So it's not a survey in the sense as so much as the review.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Yeah. I mean the first one there, as you see on the maintain or strike, we have only three. But we have four indicators, so one of them needs to go.

BART BOSWINKEL

I've added the last one after the initial review. So you said one, two, and three need to be maintained. That was the outcome. That's the suggestion from Irina, and I've included number four, but if you talk about purpose and goal statement, regular review activities, again, purpose and goal, this is what we do with the portfolio. That's the portfolio exercise we do and the monitor. So you don't do anything and see progress against it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Oh, and Sean, you were saying that the first one relates to the regular reviews. So that's the percentage of people that we interview that say that something needs to be... Ah, okay. That makes sense. Okay, thank you.

SEAN COPELAND

Does anyone want any more questions on this? Nope. Okay, green check marks if you're willing to keep this as it is on a full maintain. Then we'll move this up. We're a little less clear on the voting on this one, you guys. Are you wanting to think about it a little bit longer? We'll table this one then till the next meeting as well, so you can think about it a bit. Going on to the next criterion, diverse, active participation is maintained, and the first item is a strike: the participation tracked by unique ccTLDs. The remaining three are maintains. Is there a change in position from anyone or any discussion that you want to do on these ones? Go ahead, Christian.

CHRISTIAN

Thank you. I just had flagged in a comment a possible place where the ccNSO could take credit for conducting a diversity survey exercise, which was imagined by work stream two, recommendation one, which is something that the community still has on its plate to implement. That is like a survey with the seven elements of diversity that was created by that work stream two working group. The survey is done and written up. It just needs to be conducted by each SOAC. So I don't know if that's something that the ccNSO wants to do, or if that's on the front of anyone's minds. But just thinking about the CIP exercise and implementing continuous improvements, if the ccNSO were to do that, this could be a place where it could use that data, or at least just take credit for that effort to say that the ccNSO has conducted a diversity survey. And you can do with that as you will, but it is something that was imagined as something that would take place once every three

years. The CIP is something that would take place every three years. So I don't know if that would be something that they could possibly be combined, kind of killing two birds with one stone. But this could be a place where that could be taken credit for. That's all.

SEAN COPELAND

Thank you for that. We'll take that under advisement. Peter, I believe your hand was first, ahead of Alejandra.

PETER KOCH

Thanks, Sean. This is Peter. On a general note, I am most likely not the biggest fan of these quantitative measures, even if it's percent then. Speaking about four to three, learning from the review of the MPC, for example, we observed that there is a large amount of people who use this as an onboarding and are de facto observers, while at the same time, not all of our groups allow the observer status. So everybody on the list is a member, and then that skews the results in a way. So unless we offer observership as opposed to membership, at least these percentages would have to be adjusted per working group or replaced by a more qualitative measurement, I think.

SEAN COPELAND

You raise an interesting question. Are you suggesting, or would you see it appropriate then to go to Council and suggest that observer status actually be added across the board to working groups?

PETER KOCH

Thank you for asking. That was indeed my secret plan at some point. But the reason would not be to make this criterion more reasonable, but I think that having a look at the different participant member observer status things across the groups might be a good thing to do. It's probably also a large amount of work. But it fit nicely with the observation that this particular point three under four point two would likely result in misleading figures for some groups where we understand it is okay if fifty percent of the participants just observe and it doesn't limit the participation of the others and so on and so forth. Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND

Alejandra, before I give you the floor, did you want to talk?

BART BOSWINKEL

If you look at this, particularly number three, percentage of members participating in at least one activity per year depends very much on the level you're looking at, whether the working group or committee levels. You can also look at general ccNSO level knowing the distribution, for example, with voting and everything else. I would say a little less than half of the members don't even participate in voting, and that means the real members of the ccNSO. So that's another way of looking at it. I think active participation of members is in itself a little bit vague, and I think especially if you look at it in this context, you need to be very clear

what you mean with members. Is it members of a working group or members of the ccNSO? Because they're completely different entities, and this goes back to your point about diversity as well. Are you looking at diversity of the ccNSO? Because that's very limited. These are organizations who run ccTLDs. Point. Nothing else. They are the members. And if you look at people who participate in working groups, most of them are a different category. And then the second caveat is what is active participation? Is active participation attending ICANN meetings? Because this is already something for smaller ccTLDs, let alone participating in working groups, which some of them are very time-consuming.

PETER KOCH

Note though, Bart, that it doesn't say active participation. It says participate in activities.

BART BOSWINKEL

True. But we've come across that distinction and the difficulty to measure that in a previous point. More a philosophical observation.

SEAN COPELAND

Before I give you the floor, Alejandra, one sec. Just going to Peter's comments, I'll preempt the question, Joke and Claudia: how much work is it to actually add observer status from an operational point of view?

JOKE BRAEKEN

Not much.

SEAN COPELAND

Thank you for that. Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Work in progress. So, no, I just wanted to also address the diversity comment from Christian. It's been a while since I've looked into that. But if I recall correctly, the ccNSO did say that it wouldn't be able for the ccNSO to tackle it because it's not up to us who actually comes to the ccNSO. We cannot say, "Okay, half of them need to be women," if they're not the ones who are hired in their own ccTLDs, then it's not up to us to decide that. It's just a blunt example. Are there diversity points slightly different from those in other areas? Like when we try to have debates or discuss topics, we do try to have either a geographical diversity or something that would be more in line with work stream two or more specific ones. For us, it's on a diversity of governance models on ccTLDs, but that's very particular to us. So it's just to clarify that it's not that we don't want to address it; it's very difficult for us to do so, so we do try our best with what we have. And that's what I wanted to add to that. So what are we going to do then, Sean, with this one?

SEAN COPELAND

Go ahead.

JOKE BRAEKEN

Actually, Alejandra, that was very useful, if blunt, intervention. I just want to make a point in which we ourselves occasionally fall into error, but the rest of the ICANN community almost universally falls into error. The members of the ccNSO are not these people around the table. None of us are members of the ccNSO. The members are the member organizations, the legal entities who are delegated by the IANA to be designated managers of ccTLDs. And you see it time and time again in ICANN literature and so on. Nigel Roberts is a member of the ccNSO. No, he's not. He's a participant in the ccNSO, and there is a very important difference here. So if you're talking about diversity when it comes to participation, as Alejandra says, you can't say that the person that Island Networks or Nominet or .be or any ccTLD is sending to the ccNSO is the member. And you can't artificially adjust this. It is a problem. I think we need to be very careful about this, and we need to keep saying this because ICANN, particularly in the GNSO and other SOACs and very much so in staff, says "you're a member of the ccNSO." So maybe there's a way we can deal with that in some way going forward. I don't know, give people little badges saying, "I am a participant." But we need to do something here which would have a positive effect on this stuff.

SEAN COPELAND

Would it be fair to say then that you would like to hold this one and see if we can come up with better language?

JOKE BRAEKEN

I'm neutral on this. I just wanted to make this point since Alejandra brought it up, and it was a useful point. I don't think what I said is specific to this discussion, but it's something which I think we can look at going forwards as enhancing the way we write about ourselves.

SEAN COPELAND

Fair. You okay?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Yeah, thanks. So from my perspective from the ccNSO perspective, when we speak about diversity, it seems to me that the diversity that we can speak of would be most likely related to geographical diversity rather than any other type of diversity. So if we are looking at the number of new participants, it would be the number of representatives from ccTLDs from different geographical regions, something to that effect. That's one way. I don't see how, in your blunt example, how could we possibly speak of numbers of gender or anything else if we cannot control that? So in my opinion, it only makes sense to speak of diversity in terms of geographical diversity. Thanks.

SEAN COPELAND

That's a fair comment. Does anyone else want to add to that? Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL

Could I add just that I think that's a really good point, and that's something that maybe would be an interesting indicator to put here for this criteria. I see, for instance, for number four, it says ratio of participation between large and small ccTLDs. I don't know if that's another point of diversity that you want to look at, but just thinking logistically of how to measure that, we would probably need a list of who you consider to be small ccTLDs and large ccTLDs just to have that actual comparison. So I don't know if you want that, or if geographical diversity would be more interesting to look at. But just flagging that as far as something that we would need to know: what does that mean between large and small.

SEAN COPELAND

Fair. I can tell you that there are, in fact, very large and very small right around this table right now. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL

Again, geographic diversity, the council is already defined and predefined, so it really doesn't matter. You know they are diverse. Effectively, you could even say that North America is over-represented looking at the numbers. If you look at the total number of members and geographic diversity, again, you will see it across regions if you have a certain percentage. But then again, it's very difficult if you look, for example, to the Asian Pacific region, where you have all these small ones, and the Caribbean, the LAC region, and the North American one. Because by definition, the ccNSO is geographically diverse. Whether all attend is another matter. But

even in the membership, current membership, it is diverse. It's almost measuring if water is wet if you look at diversity because it was constituted and built this way.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

While that is true for presential meetings, we have a number of tools and ways in which individuals that cannot come to presential meetings can still participate remotely. So we have ways to remedy that. Thanks.

SEAN COPELAND

Yeah. Peter, you have the last word.

PETER KOCH

Another secret plan of mine. And that was not the last word. I had raised my hand on this because in an earlier meeting this morning in the study group on disaster recovery, there was an outcome, and I would have thought that Bart might mention it, about the different angles of diversity. It was not only size, it was also about the type of organization running the registry. And the hard part is, of course, then the measuring of that. So there is no doubt that whatever perspective we look at, it is diverse. But the question of participation is something different. Again, percentage is really tough, right? But maybe this thing that was produced for the study group could inform a future discussion. I don't think it makes sense to drive that further right now in here. But there are aspects that we

could look at in a more qualitative than quantitative matter. Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND

Thank you for that, Peter. So we actually are at the end of our time, so we'll have to start on our next call at 4.3. We'll table the work plan. Obviously we'll do a quick update on Wednesday to the community on what we have done in terms of A, B, C, and D. We'll touch maybe a little bit about the continuous improvement so that they know what is going on. With that, is there any other business from anyone? I believe our next meeting will be in about two weeks, if we're being nice to everyone and giving them a break. So I'll see you guys online May...

BART BOSWINKEL

Set a date. This is June. The twenty-third, would that work for everybody? Monday the twenty-third of March. Or the thirtieth.

SEAN COPELAND

Which works better for you guys? Twenty-third? Or...

BART BOSWINKEL

The thirtieth.

SEAN COPELAND

Twenty-third?

BART BOSWINKEL Twenty-third. Yeah, yeah.

SEAN COPELAND Okay, cool. We'll see you guys all online on the twenty-third.

BART BOSWINKEL And just one question regarding this one. Do you want to do the alternate thing again? Like continue every two weeks with this bit and the other week the other areas?

SEAN COPELAND Are you guys comfortable doing the split still? Okay, cool.

BART BOSWINKEL Otherwise we lose continuity.

SEAN COPELAND Yep. So with that, then I'd like to thank the people behind the curtain that are doing all the audiovisual. I didn't go back and get your names, and I apologize. Thank you regardless. Claudia, Joke, Bart, as usual, thank you for making us look pretty good. And to everyone else here, I give you back your time. Enjoy the rest of the conference, and we will see everyone around. Cheers.

PETER KOCH

Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Recording stopped.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]