
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the NCSG Monthly Policy Call on 13th February 2023 at 11:30 UTC. Today's meeting is recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. And have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance will be taken from Zoom participation. And I do have apologies from Emmanuel Vitus and Tomslin Samme-Nlar. And I'm turning today's meeting over to Manju. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Brenda. Hi, everyone. So as Brenda suggested, Tomslin can't make it today for the meeting, and I'll be chairing instead. So excuse for my inexperience. This is going to be my first time chairing this policy call. And I think we didn't have any other agenda than just reviewing the Council meeting agenda this week. So we'll just get started. And I'll pause after every item, I guess, to see if everybody has anything to raise. So thank you, Brenda, for scrolling down.

First, to administrate matters. Of course, we don't care. And opening remarks, we don't care either. And the consent agenda probably would care a little bit because we have Taiwo Peter nominated for the mentor for ICANN Fellowship. Congratulations to Peter, one of our NCSG folks.

And then we are adapting the revised chapter charter for the budgets and operations town hall. So this thing, if I remember correctly, the budget and operations town hall was Budgets and Operations Committee. So they're changing it to town hall as it's not to be less exclusive. And to just not allowing more people to join but just to--

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.

because they think it's not so much work in this committee and there's no need to maintain a committee if the amount of work is so little. So they opt to change the formats of this committee to a town hall, which is a mailing list, and they're just going to post their review opinions of budget operation of course, of ICANN.

And knowing this, instead of having meetings per week or biweekly or monthly to just review this kind of seasonal thing, like, not a regular thing. So that's what this motion about. And as it's not a very contented object subjects, it's in a consent agenda. So I'm pausing to see if anybody has any other. I don't see any hands or opinions in the chats. We'll go on to the next item, which is Council votes. We're going to discuss the Vanda Charter for the transfer policy review PDP. Oh, sorry, Frank, I see your hand up.

FRANK ANATI:

Yeah. Hi, everyone. I'm Frank Anati from Ghana. And this is my first time of joining the meeting as a new member. So I wanted to introduce myself. And it's great to be here.

MANJU CHEN:

Okay. Thank you, Frank. Thank you for being here, and welcome for your first meeting. Do you have anything? Okay, no. Thank you. So the item 4, like I said, it's a vote for the transfer policy review PDP, and they are changing their timeline. So we were supposed to have either Raoul or Juan to kind of enlighten us on why they're changing the timeline, but I don't see either of them in the participant's list. I'll just briefly share

what the chair of this PDP working group has shared with us in Council, like, why they're changing their timeline.

So this PDP, they were phased. Initially, that was Phase 1a, Phase 1b, and then Phase 2. And like last year, they have finished the Phase 1a and published the initial report. But as they continue to review the public comments for the initial report and working on Phase 1b, the team realized that there are many dependencies between Phase 1 and the Phase 2 they planned. And they thought, well, if there are so many interdependencies, it's not possible to finish Phase 1b before they reveal a lot of items in Phase 2. Even Phase 1a was not possible to be finished because they just as they're reviewing public comments, they've realized there are too many dependencies.

So what they decided is they don't do phases anymore. They're just merging everything into one big phase. So I'm sharing the slides they shared in the Council meeting, in the chats. So supposedly, they were planning to kind of deliver the Phase 1b in March this year, and then they will have a combined Phase 1b final report in August this year, and then they probably will finish Phase 2 in 2026.

But now that they're not doing phases anymore, they will be combining 1a, 1b, and Phase 2, and finish them all in 2024, which is next year in August. And then they will have a final report the year after 2024, which is 2025 in February. So that's the big change. They thought it's actually quicker.

Well, so for the first plan, the whole thing will finish in 2026, but now if they are foregoing the phases, it will be finished in 2025. So instead of

phases, they're doing one big phase, which is not going to publish regularly initial reports because if there was 1a, 1b, and 2, there will be a lot of reports. Now they'll only be publish one report, one initial report and one final report. So that's the main change of this PDP they're proposing. I hope I was clear and I'm stopping if anyone has any opinion or questions.

So I don't see any ends, and I don't see any comments in the chat. I assume we can go to item 5. So item 5, we're talking about the Council committee for overseeing and implementing continuous improvements working group. So there are the two topics the CCOICI has been working on. One is the working group self-assessment recommendation reports, which we have covered in last month's meeting. And the second is updates from statement of interest taskforce.

I thought I'll brief you on the second item, which is the statement of interest taskforce. Because there's some of us in NCSG, we'll pay a special attention to. And I'm going to put the link in the chat too. And Brenda, can you open this document, and we can probably see the text for everyone. So this is the text of this statement of interest where we're discussing. I mean, if you have run for any elections or put yourself out for any kind of working group or any nomination process, you will have to fill in a statement of interest per GNSO operation rules.

And some have been arguing that this statement of interest is not enough. For some special working group or from some kind of sensitive topics, they feel like if you are going to join this working group or any kind of team to work on a topic, you should be more specific about your

interest, which prompts this special statement of interest, kind of improvement to the general statement of interest.

And this is one of the text the task force has been discussing and couldn't really agree on because, of course, if we can see from the text, some of the stakeholder groups or some people they feel like if you are working for a client to be on a working group, you should really say that because or else people are assuming. Well, they don't know anything, so they can't assume anything. Right? So that'd be a problem. So that's why they're proposing that if you are representing a client, you have to say so. And if you can't disclose because of some kind of agreement between you and your client, then you must provide high level description of the entity that you're representing without disclosing its name.

But there has been this back and forth between, well, mainly the Contracted Party House and the IPC, because IPC thought this kind of text is not clear enough. It's hard for a lawyer to decide or to make clear what this text means and what they have to disclose without disclosing other client and all that kind of stuff. So we're still discussing this and we are having another meeting this one state. So this is not finished. We were expecting it to be finished before the February meeting, and we can vote to pass both the working group self-assessment and the statement of interest recommend report.

But I think there's going to be delay for another month because this is not done yet. And that's for this item, item 5 on the Council agenda. And I'm passing now for any questions or opinions. And Brenda, we can change back to the agenda. Thank you very much. So I guess, without

me in the audience, nobody's going to raise their hand anymore. Oh, Rafik. Thank you very much.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Oh, sorry. Hello. Can you hear me?

MANJU CHEN: Yes. We can hear you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: And sorry for the noise. Okay. Just questions. So are the members who participated and this committee happy. I mean, to be honest, I didn't review the changes in this. So really, I don't have any strong position there. It's just a document and kind of moral, let's say, moral engagement or pledge, but it won't change so much. But I was wondering about any position or comment from those who participated in the drafting, if there is anything that can be useful for us to know.

MANJU CHEN: So thank you, Rafik. So I am actually not representing NCSG on this taskforce. I actually am a Council liaison to this taskforce, so I'm not wearing NCSG hat when I'm in this meeting. And the person representing NCSG in this taskforce is David Cake. And I don't think he's here. And before David Cake, I think it was Stephanie. And Stephanie is not here either. But I think if I remember correctly from what Stephanie have been sharing on her presentation and her kind of her opinion on this task, she was definitely more into the people should be revealing

more of who and what interest they're representing when they're participating in working groups.

So it's more in line with, I guess, the registrar and the registry. And I won't say that IPC is opposing the revelation of the information. They were more arguing about how the text to require regulation was not clear enough for them to decide what information to reveal and to what extent they could reveal. So that was the discussion people are kind of having struggle with. And I think we're happy as long as we have this in the statement of interest requiring people to reveal if they're not really representing their stakeholder group, but another company and wall, or another lawyer firm, or whatever it is that pay the money to participate in ICANN.

Of course, that's why statement interest was about. Right? Because we are participating based on our different interests. And I'll see what happen on Wednesday and I'll report back. And I'll probably ask David next time to be in the meeting to report back to what has been discussed in the meeting. But as I said, it was supposed to be we were expecting this discussion to wrap up, but it hasn't. So it's going to only be a discussion in the Council this week, and we will not be voting. I hope that kind of explained, well, not really, but to answer your question.

So without any other hands or comments and chats, we'll going to item 6. So item 6 is not really anything I think we would have any kind of interest. It's just, like, in the NCSG ICANN76 meeting planning. And I think we can go straight to item 7. So this from the title, it's really hard to decipher what this item is about.

But in essence, it's just the staff well explain to us what PDP, wait, I see, what a policy status report is, because what this came from is that. So as a goal for the Council to kind of improve our PDP process, the council has decided that we will review the policy, well, the PDP and the policy regularly, but of course, not monthly or yearly, probably every five year to just see if the policy is working as it was envisioned to.

So how do we check this is that the council will require the staff to prepare a policy status report to just check is this policy working as the recommendations envision in the first place? And when this was proposed that we have this policy report status reports, people were uncertain about what this policy status report will look like. They're not sure what contents the report has.

So they were like, can you just give us more details on how this report is going to look like and what functions does it serve? So this item is really staff will be educating us about how this report works and what it will be look like, and what kind of contents so that that's who did we say is our new mentor.

So that's this item is about. And I'll pause here to see if anyone has any question. And to Raymond, I guess you were talking about the fellowship mentor. It's going to be Peter. Taiwo Peter. Sorry, I forgot the last name, from NCSG. And I'm not seeing any hands or any other comments on the item. So let's go to item 8. Item 8 is a discussion on uniform domain name dispute resolution policy, UDRP review next step. So as probably some of you will remember, there was this PDP on review of all rights protection mechanisms and all gTLDs. And there was Phase 1 and Phase 2. And Phase 1 has finished.

Phase 1 is about all the rights production mechanisms for new gTLDs. So the trademark, cleaning house, sunrise, something, something. And not the UDRP because UDRP was the most ancient one, but it was working fine. So they thought in phase 1, they'll review the new RBMs, and then in Phase 1, they'll review the UDRP. So after finished Phase 1 and Council was not really optimistic about starting Phase 2 right away because by then, I think back then there was the EPDP on SSAD, new gTLD, SubPro hasn't finished, and all of this work were ongoing. And there's just so much where people can't afford another PDP they don't have time.

And also because Phase 1 IRT was about to start and people are like, well, we have the same people for Phase 1 and Phase 2. If we're having them doing Phase 1 IRT and Phase 2 PDP is not going to be possible because we have one person. He has a life. He or she can't devote all of her time to just review this PDP forever.

So that's why your Council decided to kind of delay Phase 2 because, well, from what we're saying, UDRP has been working fine, and we think reviewing it can wait. And as that was the status. And now the IRD of Phase 1 has started. Phase 1 of the review of all RPMs has started. We are having, I think, the chair of the IRT to come and share what has been happening in IRT and just discuss whether we will delay the Phase 2 furthermore or anything else.

So that's this item is for. We had Cathy on the review for RPMs. Well, she was actually one of the co-chairs of this PDP. Sorry, I'm reading a chat. Okay. I guess this is about this item. Do you want to share more, Pedro? Okay. Then I'll probably just read out your comments because I

thought it'd be helpful for everybody who's not able to read the chat, because they're on their phone, or whatever.

So, Pedro, is saying that I wrote our contributions to the public comments. I guess, is the public comments for this PDP, the review of all our RPMs Phase 1 final report. And considering how there are contributions, this appear to be good news, which I'm not sure. Probably delaying the review of VDRP.

And there were a lot of pro-IP rights holders' comments. But we should keep an eye up for opportunities to address some particular issues. Clement pointed out a few important ones. Yeah. So I don't think we're starting the Phase 2 anytime soon because as all of we know, SubPro is now the thing. People care. We have DOD agents published and people are eager to discuss it. And, of course, next month when we have our policy call, we will report back what we have discussed in the Council.

So on the side of item 8, do we have anyone else that has questions, opinions? No hands. No comments. I think we're doing pretty well. I hope we can have you give you more time, free time after this. And for AOB, we have SSC process feedback, which I have to confess, I haven't really study this, so I don't really know what is this going to be about. Probably just how we select people on to be on the SSC. We will have update on the closed generic facilitated dialogue. As you all know, well, Kathy Kleinman, she is not representing because no one is representing any [00:28:13 - inaudible] groups in the dialogue, but we have got Cathy in this dialogue.

And, I guess, our vice chair in the council, John Michael [00:28:27 - inaudible], he is going to update us because he was in the dialogue too. We don't really know what has been happening to the dialogue because it's, I don't remember the name, like Chatham House or something like where you can disclose only what was discussed without saying who said who, or who said what. So you can you cannot disclose the names, but you can share with people what was discussed during the dialogue. Chatham House. Well, I don't remember. Yes, Chatham House. Thank you very much. So, yeah, that's the dialogue.

And they're having another session for the dialogue during Cancun. So that's about it. That's the Council's agenda for this week. It's a rather light, I guess, agenda because, I guess, we're kind of saving all the other stuff for Cancun. And if anybody has any other thing to share, please, this is your last opportunity. Or else, I think we can have 30 minutes free extra time for your day today. Avri has kindly shared a high-level summary from closed generic meeting, if you're interested. Hello, Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Nothing [00:30:23 - inaudible]. I just want to thank for chairing the call today.

MANJU CHEN: Sorry. Can you repeat?

RAFIK DAMMAK: I was just thanking you for chairing the call today because I know you did just [00:30:40 - inaudible]. That's it.

MANJU CHEN: Oh, thank you very much. So I was too thirsty. I was talking a lot, busy drinking water. Oh, thank you so much. Thank you everyone for bearing with me about for rumbling through this agenda. And as I said, as I promised, we will report back if anything major happens during our Council meeting this Thursday, which I hope nothing major happen. I see Julf was, like, he drops. Whereas I was expecting the chair of NCSG was probably have something to share.

If not, and anyone else if there is nothing else you wanted to share, I guess I'll give you 25 minutes back for your day. Thank you all for participating. Thank you all for again bearing with me. And I hope to see you in Cancun, and we can drink Margaritas together on the beach. Thank you everyone. Thank you, Brenda.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]