
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – ccNSO: Technical Working Group
Wednesday, June 15, 2022 – 15:00 to 16:00 AMS

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO Technical Working Group Session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I, along with Kimberly Carlson, are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this 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 this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar

Thank you all very much. And I will now hand the floor over to Eberhard. Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Thank you very much. Welcome to our Technical Working Group face-to-face meeting. It's technically not a public meeting. But as

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.

we usually say, everybody is welcome to be bored. It's basically an opportunity for the members of the group to get together and to basically discuss a few items like the ones that we have shown on the agenda.

Unfortunately, it appears we don't have a quorum. From what I can see on the attendance list, we only have got three or four members of the group. It doesn't matter. We can discuss all items, of course, with the exception of the election of a chair and two co-chairs, which we will do on the mailing list if we don't have a quorum.

That said, I couldn't travel because I was thinking I was a COVID contact and a couple of days [before Tech Day], I was feeling quite ill. And my COVID test is negative so I probably just have the flu and could have traveled. But it's probably the right thing not to do it. And I'm feeling it's getting better day by day.

That said, any administrative announcement? Bart, have you got anything on your lists? Probably not.

BART BOSWINKEL: I don't have anything. Kim, do you have anything from the previous call?

KIMBERLY CLARKSON: I have nothing.

EBERHARD LISSE:

Thank you very much. Then we discuss the meeting that we had. Cristian Hesselman was so nice and left me his notes that he had from which he did a wrap-up. And I must say I will take them to write up a little report. All in all, I must say it worked out very well. The presenters were interesting. Presentations were done well. I must say I haven't had much ... There was one issue, technically, where the presenter had to reboot his laptop and that cut a little bit in discussion time. But otherwise, that all worked out.

And in particular, the technology, Zoom, having two windows, having two rooms, worked very well from what I could see. I could see both rooms at the same time. I can pin one of the rooms on the other. I use a two-screen system so I can see both rooms at the same time. That works very well. I think using two rooms is an option when we start doing purely face-to-face meetings again, though I probably will never go away from the hybrid system for Tech Day because we get more people who can't attend the meeting can then participate and can also present.

That said, all in all, it worked out very well. The presentations were done well. The technical staff and secretarial staff who ran the meeting, I would like to thank them again but I will put it in my report as well. Are there any comments with regards to this week's Tech Day? We only take comments when we see hands in the participant pool but we don't see any hands. I see two hands

now, Erwin Lansing and Stephen Deerhake, in that order. Erwin, you have the floor.

ERWIN LANSING:

Thank you. I completely agree. The technical setup of the hybrid meeting worked fine. I would prefer being the room to see more in-room presentations. 70–80% of the presenters were online. It felt online-first rather than hybrid. Of course, that is not something we from the community can decide ourselves. But it would be preferred to see a little bit more so it's more in the [connection] of 50/50 or something. And then we can try to change the [inaudible] for the day so it's online, in-room, online, etc. But I agree. It was a good meeting, good topics as well.

EBERHARD LISSE:

Thank you. I agree. I would like to see more in-person participation. But as said, we do not have control. And I would not like to reject a cool presentation because the person can't come. Now we have the technology, predominately we will go for onsite. But if there is somebody who says, "I've got something interesting, and I'm sitting somewhere deep, and I can't afford to fly," then we have options. I also like the option of the second room in case we have an overflow. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, doctor. I think the technology really levels the playing field for precisely the reason you described, where if somebody's got something of interest and they can't afford or physically can't get to the actual physical meeting, that they can still participate and we can still get the benefit of what they have to say. So I would argue, yeah. We need to keep using this format and this technology. Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Okay. Any other hands? I don't see that. Okay. We have circulated on the mailing list of the working group a new charter. This is an internal issue for the working group. The discussion is not so much for a general population or for general discussion. It's not one that needs input by the Board. It's not one that needs a public comment period. The charter of this working group has been revised occasionally. It's the third revision.

Is there any comment with regards to the charter from the members of the working group or the participants who have had access to it? We only would call it a single reading. We have got four or five people now so we probably have a quorum. But I still will defer the election to the mailing list so that all non-present participants have a chance. Anybody from the members on the call have any comments on the proposed new charter?

In short, it basically streamlines what we have been doing. It makes some mild changes in the way this has been written up.

But in substance, it doesn't add much. We also formalized the election of a chair and two vice-chairs. In particular, I proposed that the chair and the two vice-chairs have a three-year time. But on the first time, the chair gets elected for three years, and one of the two co-chairs for one year, and one for two years.

We had so far only one set of nominations. In other words, the current incumbents are standing for reelection. So technically, there is no second [panel] on the list. But I still want to give a bit of a chance because there is only a few people in person attending. Any comments from the members with regards to the charter? Once we're having it finalized and it's been approved by Council, it will be published like in previous times. I don't see that. So I propose, then ... Sorry.

JACQUES LATOUR: I have a question.

EBERHARD LISSE: Jacques, I didn't see you on the pod. I can only see you on the pod. Sure.

JACQUES LATOUR: So I did read most of it—almost all of it. So what exactly is the role of the co-chair?

EBERHARD LISSE: Support the chair.

JACQUES LATOUR: No. I mean outside of the supporting.

EBERHARD LISSE: Moderating the meetings in case, for example, if I can't be there. I'm also getting elderly. Should I be unable to participate or to continue, then we have got experienced people who know what we're doing and how we're doing this to carry on so there is a bit of continuity. I don't like to have this one-person enterprise. We have done this in a similar way up until now. You have been a co-chair, even if you didn't know it. And I personally prefer we carry on doing it. But as you remember, I run everything through the list so that all members, including the co-chairs, see everything so that there is no decision-making unless it has been done by consensus.

JACQUES LATOUR: Perfect. Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Any other? I like that the work of the co-chair is so little that he didn't know it.

JACQUES LATOUR: That’s my kind of work. Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: But that point is, I don’t like one-man enterprises and then something happens, or I can’t come, or something. I don’t like this. As you noticed, every decision, every presentation runs through the mailing list. And if there is any comment from the mailing list that they say, “No. This is not an adequate presentation for our meeting,” then we usually defer it. So I like to do these things by consensus so we need to have a formal structure in place. This is what Council wants and I agree with it. Stephen, you have a question?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No. I was just responding to Brett Carr’s question in the chat.

EBERHARD LISSE: I don’t see the chat. I didn’t look at the chat. Okay. Brett Carr asked the extremely important question, “How would one become a member of the Tech WG?” We have a list of members posted on our website. And we found that we have a number— one or two people have left. Jay Daley has left because he went to the IETF and that would be a conflict of interest as far as he’s concerned. Norm Ritchie retired. Simon McCalla resigned from Nominet.

And we have a few participants who don't really contribute much or show much. We will ask for a show of life, a proof of life. And if we don't hear, we will trim the membership list a little bit. Otherwise, just write an e-mail to us—to me or to the Tech Day Working Group—and we'll send it to Council. Council approves.

We are actively looking for members. So anybody who wants to join, just send an e-mail to me or to the Tech Working Group, techday@ccnsotechday, and I'll forward it to the list. And then we'll forward it to Council. Usually, it works. Anybody who has showed an interest has been approved, usually. And we are, basically, in need of revitalization of our membership so we will do a membership drive, anyway. Any other questions?

JACQUES LATOUR:

I'll go after Stephen. Do you have your hand up?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Did I hear you correctly that you cannot see the chat?

EBERHARD LISSE:

No. I turned it off because I was looking at the members. Otherwise, I don't have enough space to look at who is participating.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. You have a question in the chat. Would you like me to read it to you?

EBERHARD LISSE: “For ensuring transparency in the proceedings, should the virtual space use the exact replica of the physical space used?” I don’t think this is really necessary. We take minutes of our meetings. We publish all our presentations. The only thing that we would not publish is internal discussions with regards to elections or that are of a confidential nature. That happens extremely rarely. So even this meeting is not public, actually. But we don’t mind. And if there is 55 people participating, it’s even cooler.

But I don’t think we need to make more effort, which is costly to ICANN, to structure meetings accordingly. All of our members speak English. And that’s one of the requirements that we will have—that the members of the meeting must speak English—because we cannot conduct our business via e-mail when we have to go through translation. That wouldn’t work. Otherwise, it’s quite open. Does that answer your question? Jacques? And Stephen you can take your hand down if it’s ... I see a yes.

JACQUES LATOUR: I do have a question. On the topic of when we do call for presentation, the content—curating topics—is that something we

can talk about? How much do we do, not do? It's not documented in the charter.

EBERHARD LISSE: What do you mean, curating?

JACQUES LATOUR: When you do a call for presentation, when you get the presentation, the only thing we do is we have a timeslot, like an amount of time. But we don't verify the presentations in advance to make sure that they are relevant for Tech Day.

EBERHARD LISSE: I have, up to now, always prided myself on not having to exercise any editorial control. It makes sense. Maybe we'll put a note in that, of course, the Tech Working Group has editorial control. But as I said, I have tried to avoid. And so far, we have been able to avoid. Usually, one of the more experienced people in a particular subject—I don't happen to know everything, I'm just saying—usually pitches up and says, “Yeah. I've heard him speak. He is good,” or, “This is a marketing presentation,” or, “We have heard it two times before.” And then we do this.

But I agree with you and we will put this on the list that we'll modify the charter to say that, on this—make it clear that the Technical Working Group has editorial control.

JACQUES LATOUR: Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: It was a good remark and you can take your hand down. Any other hands? Somebody asks for the e-mail address. I will post it just now into the chat. There we go. So if you want to communicate with us, to apply for membership, or you want to join, or you want to send a presentation, I have just posted the e-mail address. You can always e-mail Kim, myself, Bart, or any other of the members. It will always go through.

Okay. So we'll call this a first reading of the charter. We don't approve the charter. I will amend it slightly and then I will put it, again, to the working group's mailing list so that we can discuss it. And when we have read it two times, we can approve it. We can, if we want to, approve it on the next meeting, face to face. But I think there isn't really anything that we need to wait for that. Council can do it.

As I said, since our quorum is a little bit small, I would prefer to defer the election of the chair and the two co-chairs on the mailing list. It's internal business anyway. And as I said, so far, the incumbents have indicated their willingness to stand for reelection. There is no other submission so technically, we are elected. But I still feel a little bit reluctant, because of the small

attendance, to ram this through. I will put this on the mailing list, and give maybe two or three weeks. And if then there is no further comment, we'll take it from there. Is there any other business?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Eberhard, can you just give me a guesstimate as to how long you think it will be before the working group does approve the charter? Because I'm going to be asked that tomorrow.

EBERHARD LISSE: A week.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. That works. Thanks.

EBERHARD LISSE: It's uncontroversial. I have heard no negative comments on the mailing list. We just need to put the suggestion. And as you noticed, I'm not working this week so I can attend to it, send it to the mailing list. When the group on the mailing list has approved it, then we'll send it to Council. Stephen asked this because this comes from Council. Council is doing a regular review of all charters. I know, for a change, TLD Ops have been asked they have said no, their charter is fine. They don't need to make any changes. It's part of the regular review of ccNSO's working groups. Good.

Is there any other business? I don't see any hands. I don't see any open mics. I don't see anything in the chatroom. So I guess that's it. Thank you very much for attending. I'm still a little bit upset that my test is negative, in a way, that I couldn't come. But to be honest, yesterday and the day before, I was too ill. I actually felt I had COVID. So it's technically, in any case, better not to come when you are in contact. So I look forward to see each other all in Kuala Lumpur. Thank you very much and goodbye.

BART BOSWINKEL: Please stop the recording.

EBERHARD LISSE: You can stop the recording. Yes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: All right. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]