
MARYAM BAKOSHI

Thank you very much, Rafik. Hello, everyone. Welcome, everyone. Welcome to the NCSG policy call on Friday, the 17th of January, 2020, at 18:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, we will not be taking a roll call. Attendance will be taken via Zoom. Thank you very much, and over to you, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Maryam, and thanks, everyone, for attending today's call. That's the NCSG policy monthly call. This is the first of the year 2020. So maybe there's been some delay, but Happy New Year. I hope that we will work on several policy topics this year for the NCSG to be effective and influential in the processes.

As you can see, the agenda is the usual one because it fulfills the purpose of this call, which is first to try to have that opportunity to cover the GNSO Council meeting matters to go through that agenda and allow the councilors to get input and feedback from the members attending the call but also for those who cannot by checking the recording and also to try to have some briefing or snapshot of what's going on with the PDP Review Team and all relevant activities within CANN. So that's why we have this template.

At the end, we have others [inaudible] when we try to [inaudible] any other business topics or anything that we deem important for us to discuss.

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.

I see there are maybe some new faces. I hope that the purpose of this call is clear. Feel free to ask questions any time and ask for any clarification or more details. We'll be happy to provide more and explain the topic.

Let's go with the first agenda item. We'll go through the GNSO Council meeting agenda. Maryam, please go share the council agenda.

Okay. Maybe for those who are not familiar, the GNSO Council agenda has the same format or template that's used all the time, which is structured by how the meeting is managed and also how we deal with the topics discussed during the call. You will find several details.

First you can see the first item: administrative items. We don't need to cover that. That's just about the statements of interest or asking if there is any comments about the agenda.

The second agenda item is the opening remarks or review of project lists and action lists. This is usually the opportunity for the council to do a review of all open action items that are coming from the previous calls and see the status or the progress and also to get highlights from the project list. The project list is quite an important document that was revamped or tweaked in many aspects to be really important tool for the council and also for the community at large to have a clear idea about the status and the progress for PDPs and also other non-PDP activities managed or initiated by the GNSO Council.

So, for anyone who wants to get an idea of going on, I advise you to check that document. From there, you can see the progress, the background, a short summary of what's going, what are the actions and

next steps, the timeline, and also links to the relevant workspace, and so on. So, if you want to get a quick snapshot of the GNSO Council or the GNSO activities, like the PDP, that's the document you should check first. It's easy to find on the GNSO website or in the GNSO Council meeting agenda.

For some reason, I think we have an old agenda from last year. So [we got the] program here. Let me find the ...

MARYAM BAKOSHI:

My apologies, Rafik. I will try to ...

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. In the meantime, we'll try to find the correct ...

[inaudible]. So, if you have any questions or comments, please feel free to do so.

Okay. I think we have the correct agenda—the recent one. After the opening remarks/project list, we start with more substantive topics. The third agenda item is the consent agenda. As its name says, that's an agenda that the council clearly says is not controversial or we already have a consensus on. We just need either to vote or approve the actions there.

For that consent agenda, we have a motion to approve the nomination of Amr Elsadr to serve as the ICANN Fellowship Program mentor. That's coming as a recommendation or appointment from the GNSO Standing Selection Committee.

The second action—this is to approve or to confirm—is the confirm of Julf Helsingius as the Chair and Carlton Samuels as the Vice-Chair for the GNSO Standing Selection Committee.

As the consent agenda, expect that it will be voting yes for those two, for the motion and for the action. But what can happen is sometimes any councilor can ask to remove a topic from the consent agenda and to put it in the main agenda for discussion. That's quite a rare situation. We expect such a request to happen prior to the meeting. But it's possible.

Anyway, for this time, I don't think we have any issues. I guess we can congratulate Amr for the selection. We just need to vote yes next week, hopefully, if there is no problem.

Any questions or comments?

Also, thanks to Julf for volunteering to be the Chair of the GNSO Standing Selection Committee. This is important, I think, for NCSG to be represented and also to have one of the members that's vouched for and is getting consensus from the different parts of the GNSO to be representative of the GNSO for this role to mentor in the Fellowship Program.

Let me check if there is anyone in the queue. For some reason, I cannot see the full list.

Okay. I don't see anyone in the queue, so we can move to the next agenda item. We will start to talk more about substance. Agenda Item #4. That's a council vote. It will be a vote in the addendum for the

review of all rights protection mechanism is all gTLD charter to integrate Recommendation #5 [the IGO-INGO] access to curative rights protection mechanism final report.

Here we have another milestone of a topic that we started discussing at the GNSO Council since August 2018 when the IGO-INGO access to curative rights protection mechanism delivered its final report with five recommendations. Knowing that there was a lot of issues in that working group and knowing the GAC position regarding the recommendations, what happened at that time is that, after a few months of discussion and review, the GNSO Council approved four of the recommendations. We put Recommendation #5 on hold and we initiated dialogue with the GAC to see how we can deal with that.

One of the proposed ways was to initiate another PDP with a different scope to review that recommendation and to work on that. What was suggested was not to create a separate PDP but to add a separate track or another track to the ongoing RPM and, to make things less complicated, add an addendum, which means we are not changing the charter of the RPM itself but adding this extra scoping document or charter to work on Recommendation #5. You can find more details and information and the background explanation about this motion.

How did we work on the charter? We had a small team, and we had two representatives from the NCSG on that small team to work on the draft. The document was shared with the council for review and came back for edits and also was shared with the GAC for the input. So basically it went through several iterations and reviews.

After the AGM in Montreal, we had to make a small change in the small team, since one of the members of that drafting team left the council because of term limits. They continued to work on that charter with the council leadership team. Now we have this final version for the addendum. It was shared with the council for review a few days ago.

So we are here now to vote on this motion. We tried to, from the NCSG side, remove any language that we don't agree with or what we could see would have a side effect later on. It's not that we are happy with this process, but we are trying to find common ground. So we are here to vote on this.

This is just the background. I know that this topic was as hour for the council table at least for now, but we're looking for improvements or questions on this matter. So let me see the queue.

Any questions?

Yes, Amr, please go ahead.

AMR ELSADR:

Thanks, Rafik. I have three comments. I'll try to make them quick. First, this final draft of the motion is, in my opinion, significantly better than how it started out. That is in no small part thanks to our councilors, NCSG members representing us on the GNSO Council. We discussed this motion over previous calls, and they took feedback from our members. I think they did a good job of putting in some edits into this to make it a little better.

The second thing I wanted to note was, although this isn't specific to the motion itself, I suppose, but the topic in general—this will be more important, I guess, to discuss when the work track actually starts working—that the whole topic is kind of weird. I don't know the nuances of it, but it just strikes me as a little odd that certain parties are trying to get special protections for IGOs and INGOs, effectively making ICANN contractual obligations override some of laws and jurisdictions that may apply to them.

You'd have to go into more detail in the motion itself and the topic to really get this, but basically what they're doing is they're seeking, because curative rights are, as you can see on the screen, UDRP and URS ... UDRP is the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy, and URS is Uniform Rapid Suspension. That's when there are conflicts over the rights of a domain name. For example, if an IGO or INGO feels that its rights are being infringed upon by a registrant that has registered a domain name, they can seek to either take over this domain name using the UDRP or seek to have the domain name suspended using the URS.

But the thing is, with these policies, if the respondent—the original registrant who has been penalized as a result of these policies—decides to go to court to challenge the decision of a UDRP or URS, that is possible. So what the IGOs and INGOs, I guess, are seeking to do is to make this less possible or more difficult in cases that have to do with UDRP or URS proceedings they're involved in.

Like I said, this is an issue for the work track itself, not with the scoping. So it's not an issue with the charter amendment or the motion itself. I just thought I'd give my impression of what's going on here.

The third issue that just struck me as a little odd was the process by which this work track would be doing its business, particularly how it's going to be populated. So this work track is going to have appointed members similar to what we have on the EPDP, which we're going to talk about in a little while. So it's basically going to have a set number of members appointed by the different GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies, as well as any other ICANN supporting organization or advisory committee that would care to participate. It will also allow for observers. So you can sign up to their mailing list and read their e-mails, but you can send e-mails to the mailing list if you're not appointed by one of the ICANN groups.

I think this is a little strange. It's not typically how PDPs are done. This work track is being added to another PDP, which is reviewing rights protection mechanisms, and that's not how that PDP working group is working. That's an open working group on this topic specifically, whether in that working group or in the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Protections PDP, which concluded. This topic is being carried over to another PDP. Both these PDPs have interest from different groups that are not necessary members in any ICANN supporting organization or advisory committee. That's not us. That's another group. In some cases, our interests are aligned with them. In others, they aren't. I just think it's just odd as a process, and it seems to me that, because this issue has been going on for years and years, I think that community members and possibly even ICANN org are just really exhausted with this. They're trying to look for a quick fix. This is all assumption on my part. So they rigged it to make sure that this is small, manageable group that can

work this out. But I'm not entirely sure that this is the most accountable way to get it done.

I would still vote in favor of this motion if I were one of our councilors, but I'd probably think up or drum up some kind of comment to attach to my vote and note this. It's not the best of precedence in my opinion, and I hope we don't see too many of these moving forward. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Amr. So you [inaudible] [several points]. First, we tried to change all the language and to influence this drafting process. So, with what you explained about the topic, I think it's better that I could ever do. It's quite a narrow issue. Its of interest to really a smaller group, which is the IGO and INGO. They want to have that immunity [for] what they are bringing as argumentation or reason from a legal standpoint. It's quite specific.

[Of improvements to] the whole thing, first is how the first working group functions. It took four years, if I'm not mistaken, to deliver five recommendations. There was even an issue from some members of that working group, [like] the working group Co-Chair, that impacted the work for months and created some delay. It went to escalation that led even to the GNSO Council leadership intervening. Even in that group, a few members were participating actively—maybe a dozen of people, maximum. Also, there are some people saying it was dominated by the domainers and that the IGO-INGO didn't really participate and that they were not happy with the outcome, and so on and so on. We had the GAC making advices and reaching the Board and also expressing

their concerns during the GNSO Council and the GAC joint meeting [in] several ICANN meeting.

Taking that into account and also knowing about a lot of what we discussed with the PDP 3.0 and the experience we had with the EPDP, we should not really underestimate how other groups see now the EPDP as a way to participate or to structure working groups.

We can also add Work Track 5 and their SubPro. I can[’t] tell you that we really had tried as much as possible to avoid the bringing of what happened in Work Track 5 to this work track, like having leaders or the GAC to have a real say on the outcome. We voted to keep it under the GNSO Council oversight and control.

So, in general, there will be a push in the future for many groups to have an EPDP-like membership structure. Even with the PDP 3.0 improvement, we are suggesting that the drafting team should look at the different alternatives and select or propose what they see as appropriate. But I do believe in the future that we’ll push to have this kind of limited membership PDP.

Another issue, I think, for this working group, even if we discussed the number of representatives and keeping the balance within the GNSO side and also against or compared to the other SOs and ACs, we know for this topic that many stakeholder group and constituencies find a lot of problems getting volunteers to participate because this is really a topic not impacting many parts. It’s really narrow. We, for example, think the NCSG can appoint up to four representatives. I have no idea if we’ll be able to fill that. So we’ll see if we will be able to do so or not.

Last, I think we should vote. We tried to participate in good faith in the process. We are not happy. We expressed our displeasure from the beginning that we are trying to accommodate and it's not the best way, but we could change the language, make several amendments, and influence a lot in the process and also remove many things that we were not happy with. So this is the outcome of the council work with the different groups. I think we need to show that we participated in the process. We are not necessarily happy, but I think we should vote. We need to pay attention.

I'm putting all those comments in. I will try later on to even write them down because we need to be careful about the changes that are going to happen in terms of how we are managing PDPs or how we are organizing PDPs and by the GNSO Council with the PDP 3.0 [inaudible] because there is a push on how we can structure this. I think, from a strategic point of view, the NCSG needs to think carefully and to weigh the pros and cons of how things are changing and if they are beneficial for us or not.

Let me see if there is any questions or comments.

[inaudible] sent to the chat that I could not see. But anyway, if there are no comments or questions or any concerns, I guess we can move to the next agenda item.

The next agenda is not a motion but a council update from the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group. When the council leadership and the staff started working on preparing the agenda, it was mostly about having an update from working groups—the SubPro and the

RPMs, not for the EPDP because the EPDP already did an update at the council meeting.

In the meantime, we received a formal request—a project change request—from the RPM, updating their changing their timeline for delivering the final report. It was moved to August 2020. So it will be around the Olympics. It will be quite interesting to see if they will deliver in that period.

What we call a project change request is a new mechanism, a formal mechanism, we created as an improvement from the PDP 3.0 to really keep the working group accountable and responsible about managing the timeline and inform the GNSO Council about any change and to give the reason for changing and see if the council can approve that or not.

We will get the presentation from the working group leadership and the liaison and hear from them on why they thought they can only deliver by August 2020. That's the best-case scenario, so it means there is always a risk that they might not get things by that date. So we will hear from them and know what the reasons are and how they are going to mitigate.

Stephanie, please go ahead.

Stephanie, if you are speaking we cannot hear you. So can you please unmute yourself?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Sorry. I'm having trouble with my interface/reaching the controls. I'm way back at this IGO-INGO issue. I couldn't get my hand up in time. I

typed a lot of things in the chat. I didn't realize you weren't able to see the chat. I think this is a really, really dangerous precedent. It's excellent that we got much better language in there, but, on two counts, as I put in the chat ... Number one, if the GAC just hunkers down, takes a position, and says, "Too bad. Go away. This is what you're going to do," they do that on various committees and they're being rewarded for that behavior. They've got no incentive to change. Government works in 20-year timeframes, so that's fine for them. Number two, it is going to impact PDP 3.0. I don't know how our councilors are going to hold that off. I'm really worried about the streamlining process. We all know we're being killed by PDPs, but the GAC solution is not the way to go, I don't think. Number three, what do we actually do if, with the way this thing is set up, we can't get in there and stop something bad happening because of the new structure?

I think we maybe need to outline our concerns as the NCSG in a paper that's attached to this resolution. That probably will do nothing but go on the record, but at least it should go on the record. Thanks. Just my two bits on this.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie. Just to clarify, don't think it will have any impact on PDP 3.0 because that process is finishing or finalizing its task in the coming weeks. So, with that, by February, we'll just start implementing the different improvements. We are already implementing some of them.

For the NCSG representation, we have already our, I think, four representatives we can select in that working group. I hear that some groups will have difficulties to fill their own slots—for example, the registrars and so on.

At the end, even if we will vote yes, since the GNSO Council in the next week will have the strategic planning session or meeting, we'll discuss how we can schedule or plan those activities. So, even if we approve, it doesn't mean it will be kicked [off] quickly. It might take some time because, for example, we have to select the chair, like we did for the EPDP. So we have a call for interest, an expression of interest, and will also ask the different [SENCOSOC] to send their representatives and so on. But it doesn't mean we will start right now. Like I said, it's next month. So it might take time before initiating this process. This is something we can have from NCSG when we discuss at the SPS meeting about planning the activities and PDPs for this year.

With regard to making a statement or attaching, we just need someone to really volunteer to draft this one. I'm not volunteering for this but asking if a person or a group of persons can work on this. We can send this formal statement for when we vote.

Coming back to the RPMs, any questions or comments? For the deadline, the meeting is next week—Thursday—so that should be before that one. Any comments or questions.

Okay. You're all quite silent.

Sorry, guys. Give me just one minute. I'm trying to catch up with the chat. I think this is one problem we tend to forget. It's not easy to chair, talk, and read the chat comments. So give me just one minute, please.

Okay. Thanks. So, again, for the IGO-INGO, if people want to volunteer, please do to draft some statement. I think it's also the councilors that should take the lead here. We can share it during the council meeting itself. It needs to be done. Please take into account that we have just a few days before the meeting.

Since there is no questions about the RPM topic, I guess we can move to the next agenda item. This is the council update from the Cross-Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds. We have the ongoing public comment for the final report from the this cross-community working group (Auctions). We have one representative, in fact, from that cross-community working group, and that's Julf. So, since Julf is here, I guess I can ask him to give some updates on what's going on and more details about the final report. For information, we already have some draft comments that were shared on the mailing list a few days ago. It's for members to add comments and edits to that draft comment. Let me ask Julf if we can share some updates of what's going on in that working group and what we can expect for that council update.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thanks, Rafik. I'm not sure I can add a lot more. It has been a very long process. It's [been a lot of to-ing and fro-ing] back and forth. A lot of what the working group has been working on has been very, very

procedural [and stuff.] You have to remember that this is not a group that decides how the funds are going to be used but how the structure is going to be around who's going to decide those. There's been a lot of to-ing and fro-ing about the different models and—I'm trying to figure out the right wording for it—strong pressure to minimize it down to one alternative before going to public comment. But we managed to at least keep several alternatives on the table. I think that there will still be a lot of discussion after the public comment period.

I'm happy to answer any questions.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Julf. Maybe a question from me. I guess now basically what the working group is asking is about the two options and asking for the community to show support for one of them, or something like that.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Yeah. Of course, can we actually get the report on the screen and show those alternatives? I think that would be helpful. There is a [soft page] that summarizes them reasonably well, but I don't, of course, have it handy.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Maybe just a reminder: what are the options? One is creating an internal department in ICANN to manage the funding. The second is to have that department but working with an outside non-for-profit organization that has experience in the field. Something like that.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Exactly, yes. The one that got dropped was of completely outsourcing it.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Julf. I see Stephanie in the queue. Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: First of all, I'd like to thank Julf for stepping in when I had to step back when the EPDP got going from this blessed committee because I cannot believe it has been two years and we don't have more certainty or even fleshed out options on how to do this. I don't see that there's been a whole lot of progress on this committee. Thank you for patiently sitting through it for the past year-and-a-half or however long it's been.

I just wanted to note that this tendency to throw things out there of the PDP without actually proceeding in the work and making a recommendation and then expecting the community to decide again is undermining the effectiveness of the PDP. I wondered if Julf had a comment as to why we're the community being asked to decide on this without adequate recommendations. I mean, they were thrashing about on this when I left, and I don't see progress. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: If I can answer that, one big problem has been that, of course, as often happens with these, while there was a lot of initial interest in participating and the participant list is very long, the number of people in the actual meeting has been extremely low. Let's say the organization

hasn't been very helpful in coming up with information when we asked for it, too. I'll try to express is diplomatically. Thanks.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Right. Do you have a preferred option, Julf? I have followed the discussion occasionally, and it's not really clear how we should fall on this, to me, anyway.

JULF HELSINGIUS: I have strong concerns about if we need it completely internally because we have seen that the accountability is not what we would like it to be. But, on the other hand, we have to remember, if we go and partner with an outside organization, we first have to find who we want to partner with. That's going to be a new process again. As you said, we already spent two years.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, I must say—I'm sorry to hog the microphone here—the recent experience with the PIR sale hasn't encouraged me about finding outside partners that are interested in the public interest. It's not parallel, but that's the kind of way we solve problems at ICANN. So outsourcing it has never been one of my preferred options. I've tended to side with Eliot that we can do it ourselves if we set it up properly. So we're between the devil and the deep blue sea on this one. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Exactly. I think the best we can do is press for enough self-accountability and transparency, but we have seen that that has been an issue in the past.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Right. So some sort of hybrid model with the proper accountability structure.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, guys. I don't want to interrupt this discussion, but also I'm wondering if others have any comments or questions. Just to remind that we have a draft comment that is still under review. I think that the penholder was asking for input. So this is a good opportunity to share some comments. And it is in the document itself. So that's a note to everyone.

I think it's more a question here to Julf. This is the public comment for a final report, and it's kind of strange. It doesn't seem that the cross-community working group reached a final recommendation because this is the idea of having two options and asking for a comment. So what's the plan here, if the CCWG is only going to deliver its [inaudible] final report?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Well, I'm trying to be diplomatic here. I wouldn't like to point too many arrows at anyone, but there has been a problem: whenever we don't reach an agreement, we just agree to put it all in the final report and let

the community comment on it. So it's a very open-ended final report. So I'm definitely questioning the word "final" there.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. So it doesn't seem like there's optimism. So we'll see what we will get as an update from the chair of the CCWG and understand the next steps. This is another process that took also a long time. I think people even are getting tired and exhausted. I think there was even an issue about the active participation in the CCWG.

Let's see if there are any comments or questions.

I don't see any—oh, yeah. Benjamin, please go ahead.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE:

I wanted to comment on the auction proceeds and the options they came up with because I participated in some of the conversations. In terms of the modality to spend the money—by the way, can you hear me?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yes, we can.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE:

Okay. So they had several options. One was to give the funds to an external body, and everybody in the group said that is no-no. They weren't going to work with that. So was why it was maybe [Option] A, B, C: there were different people across the room with different options.

So most people agreed to let ICANN look for a foundation or an organization that is already aligned with whatever the ICANN community agrees to use the money for and have a mechanism within ICANN, a group of the ICANN community, to monitor and agree with the recommendation that the foundation wants to do with the money. So it's giving it out but, at the same time, still having some form of internal control, which the community is going to be okay with.

So I think that seems to go well with everybody in the cross-community working group. They seem to be fine with. I think that's why they put it out there. But they kept other options there to [inaudible] everybody understand that they considered various options. So I think it some form of hybrid, unless I missed it, because I was in some of those conversations. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Benjamin. I guess [inaudible] during the council update. We can ask those questions but also we have this opportunity to share our position through the public comment. So we have that discussion on the mailing list, so it's a good opportunity to offer more background and the context and how deliberation was conducted in that working group from reading the "final" report to see what could be our position.

Benjamin, I assume that's an old hand. I see no other persons in the queue. I guess we can move to the next agenda item.

Can you please scroll up a little bit so I can read the ... Scroll up. The next agenda item is another council update from the IDN Scoping small team. This scoping team was mandated by the GNSO Council to work on

the IDN variant TLDs. So this is coming from the Board asking for the GNSO and, if I'm not mistaken, also for the ccNSO for their position on how we should deal with the IDN variants. It was not solved during the New gTLD Program. Also, we have, in that regard, the IDN guidelines that's following another process. Since this topic has some policy aspect, that's why the GNSO Council was asked about how to deal with this. We needed to work on this issue to have a scoping team that was composed of people having that operational experience and who also worked on the topic of IDNs for a while. It's lead by Edmon Chung from .asia. We have a few people there from registries. I don't think we have someone who volunteered from the NCSG. This is, again, something that is recurring. We need to have some people with expertise on the IDN issues. They can help when it's coming to the matter of policy.

Anyway, we will hear from the scoping team, and we are expecting their proposal and what should be the process that the council should initiative—for example, an EPDP or a PDP and so on—to deal with this matter.

I confess that I've been trying to follow this issue for a while. I have a hard time understanding what is asked of us on what specific issue. So we'll try to understand more what is the proposed solution. It's more like a process matter. I understand there is discussion within the scoping team about what is really the policy matters and also the kind of operational issue and what are the dependencies. They spent some time working on that. There was some disagreement. So we'll see how we can proceed from the GNSO Council side.

Any questions or comments on this one?

Yes, Amr. Please go ahead. I hope that you have a better understanding than me on this topic.

AMR ELSADR:

Thanks, Rafik. No. Sorry, I don't. But I'm interested. I've been trying to follow this a little bit since it has gotten on the council agenda, I think sometime, halfway through last year—maybe last summer, I think. As the EPDP wraps up its work, this might be something I might personally be interested in getting involved in. But, for the time being, I'm not sure I can.

I did have one question, though. When you referred to the scoping team, is this a team of GNSO Councilors, or does the team have appointees from the different GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies? Because, if it's not limited to GNSO Councilors, and if the NCSG doesn't have anyone who has stepped forward to try to work on this, I might be interested to do so. But, if I do, I can't promise that I'll be very active over the next few months while the EPDP wraps up its work. But I might at least be able to pick up at a later date. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

This is a good question, Amr. We're experimenting with the idea of the scoping team to delegate some kind of specific issue because of the complexity or the expertise. First, I don't think, for this one, we [inaudible]. So I think there is someone from Verisign who's not also on the council. But I don't have right now what the composition is. I don't think we have someone from NCSG. I guess we have some call for

volunteers, maybe, but, again, this is an issue: to get someone to participate.

There was also another scoping team regarding the transfer policy. I think we have only one person from NCSG. I don't think even the other groups, other than the registrars, volunteered for that scoping team. So the scoping teams are not limited to the council. It's more like the council is delegating [for org] to have these kind of people with experience on the topic to make recommendations to the council, like how we can proceed. But, still, at the end, it's up to the council to make a decision.

I hope that responds to yours. I will try to double-check about if it's possible to join now because they had several meetings and they are probably close to finalizing their work.

Anyway, I think if we will have this similar structure in the future, it's important also to have the presentation from NCSG.

Is there any questions or comments?

I don't see any. I guess we can move to the next item. I'm not sure I saw that someone [lost] ... I mean, I was silent for a while. Let me double-check. So the last agenda item – oh, Any Other business. So hopefully we can finish this quickly. First is about the planning for ICANN67. So it's just about the schedule. It's not so much to share now, but, again, we asked the PDP Working Group leadership about their preference or request to have a slot for a meeting face-to-face in Cancun. Probably it will be similar to what we had at the Montreal meeting.

The other topic is the council response to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group request for [input on] 27 recommendations. So we had the small team of councilors. Surprisingly, two of them are the NomCom appointee councilors, and the topic is of interest to them: to work on the council response. I don't think the response was shared yet with the council, so we won't really have so much time to discuss it. Some of the questions, if I recall correctly, some of the questions coming from this implementation team are regarding the GNSO Council input regarding the skills or what is required or expected from a NomCom appointee and so on. So it's, I think, a good opportunity for the council to share thoughts based on the previous experience. We had some NomCom appointees that don't participate or they attend one ICANN meeting and they disappear for two years. So it's how we can solve such a situation, acknowledging we had really good and outstanding NomCom appointees. So it's an opportunity to participate in this process.

Any questions or comment?

It seems you guys are having fun in the chat, and that's not fair when I'm trying to cover the agenda.

Yes, Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I appreciate that we have had excellent NomCom folks—Julf is one of them—but we've had some real disappointments. I think we need to reinforce some standards of participation for those folks if they never come to a meeting. It isn't just the NCSG. Our commercial buddies had

somebody who didn't show up all year. It's really a waste of a space. I think we should make the point that this isn't a consolation prize for not getting the Board seat. People sign up for this. They want to be on the Board. Then they're offered a consolation prize. I think that we need to interrogate them a little more fully. If they don't get the Board seat, are they at all interested? If not, let's not just throw them the consolation prize of sitting on the GNSO, which goes on their resume and then they don't do anything. Thank you. I don't know how you make that point more diplomatically than I just made it, but I think it needs to be made. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie. I guess, when the draft is shared, the councilor can review and share some amendments.

Seeing nobody else in the queue, I guess we can finish with the last item, and that's the council consideration of proposed GNSO Council additional budget request for fiscal year '20-'21. So basically we have just those two additional budget requests from the council for now. Something that we had before—a request for the strategic planning session—we hope will be in the normal budgeting. We should not request every year for the same. And, also, the travel support for PDP leadership to ICANN public meetings. This is to get the working group leadership—Vice-Chairs, subgroup leaders, and so on; all those folks who are in different types of leadership within the working group—to be supported to attend ICANN meetings. We have five slots, I think—I'm not sure; five or four—per ICANN meeting. I think that at least we have someone from NCSG who benefitted a lot from this one. So it's an

important we have to get those who are leading working groups to attend ICANN meetings. I'm highlighting this just for information because I'm not sure that everyone is aware about this.

This is about the APR. I hope, if there are other suggestions for the council for anything else, we should ask for budgeting. Just for information, the NCSG and the CSC are [inaudible], so they can make their own APR. But that's a separate process. Probably it's Stephanie, Bruna, and Juan know much better than that and what's the plan. The deadline is the 31st of this month. So it should be done soon, I think.

That's it. Stephanie, I'm not sure if it's an old ... Probably it's an old hand, but I'm just double-checking here.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

No. Actually, it's a new had on the subject of the ABRs. I think we need to put in a request for funding to help us further engage new people because we have quite a turnover going on. I think that, given the complexity of ICANN, we've brought this up before and we've been blown off, frankly, by senior management and ICANN org. They're not engaging on our problems here. It's a lot for a new person—somebody who has been a fellow a few times who is interested but not necessarily participating on PDPs—to get in, get their feet wet, and then stand for office. We need a better buddy system, a better way of bringing people along. As it is, people who are interested don't necessarily win the fellowship lottery. Then they don't show up. While it shouldn't be only about the face-to-face meetings, it is certainly the case that getting the chance to meet with people and participate and develop those

relationships is important. It's not as if, in the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, we meet as a business community and have our own private meetings and get to know people that way. Certainly, we get to know them through some of the civil society efforts. But I think it's not sustained, say, as it is in the commercial community, or the GAC community, for instance.

So I think we need to ask for some money to bring additional people to meetings in the name of developing our leadership community. So, if nobody objects, I'm working on an ABR to do that.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Stephanie. Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS: Hello. Thank you, Rafik. Are you guys able to listen to me here in the [inaudible]? Is my audio okay?

RAFIK DAMMAK: It is.

BRUNA SANTOS: I'm sorry. I'm a bit [inaudible]. Anyways, just on the ABRs, once again I'm rephrasing or putting some attention to the deadline, which is the 31st.

On the [NCCNs], related to what Stephanie had just said, we were thinking of maybe submitting something like that, but I don't know if in

that sense of if we should be going straight ahead into some sort of capacity building around advocacy or advocacy around our principles at the ICANN community. And something that would also be related to cultural diversity and things like that. I think this will be giving less flags around our issues and being more, I don't know, [hands on back].

Stephanie, maybe we can work together and submit two ABRs and hopefully get one of them or the two of them approved.

Also, on the ABR situation, if any of the membership has suggestions for us for things we should be doing and things we should proposing to the ICANN community for funding, we are very much open to the suggestions. So just a quick intervention on this. Thank you, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Bruna. Thanks, Stephanie. It's good to share with everyone. I think you can follow up anyway on the list. At least on the NCSG list.

Let's move on to our agenda. To start, we'll get some updates from the EPDP or the review teams, if we have anyone participating in those working groups to share some updates.

I guess we can start with the EPDP. They're in an intense period and a few days away from the face-to-face meeting. If there is anything to share from our representatives to the EPDP team who are present on the call, that will be agreed to. So any updates or something to share with us today?

Yes, Amr, please go ahead.

AMR ELSADR: Well, actually, Stephanie has got her hand up. I'm happy to let her go.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: No, you go, Amr. I talked a lot. I'll come after you.

AMR ELSADR: Okay. Let me look. Looking at the participant list on today's call, I'm wondering if maybe I should just take a couple of minutes to explain what the EPDP is all about. EPDP stands for Expedited Policy Development Process. The GNSO, which the NCSG is a part of, develops policies for generic top-level domains. It uses the PDP, the Policy Development Process, to do this. The EPDP is different in that it's a slightly shorter process and it is meant to be a lot more focused. It has a tighter scope and is meant to address very specific issues with the intent of getting those done quickly.

The current EPDP, which is called the EPDP on the temporary specification for gTLD registration data, is addressing specifically that gTLD registration data. So this is the information that a registrant submits to its registrar or reseller when it's registering a domain name or signing up, like, new accounts.

Historically, the domain name registration data services—they are commonly known as WHOIS—have traditionally been publicly published. So anyone could go do a WHOIS lookup and find out personal information of a person who has registered a domain name, like their

name, their e-mail address, their physical address, their phone numbers, and so on.

A few years ago, with the European Union, it had become apparent that they were consolidating all their domestic laws into a European Union-wide regulation, which would be enforceable, and made the way the domain name system WHOIS [works] difficult to continue in the way that personal data is being processed.

I think almost two years ago now the ICANN Board adopted a temporary specification, which is something that the bylaws allow for. I think I saw Avri on this call – yeah. Avri is on the call. Avri is a member of the ICANN Board and a veteran of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. If I'm not mistaken, the ingenious idea of using the temporary specification was hers. So this was the first time that ICANN had used a temporary specification. It was a very timely solution for a pressing problem, where the ICANN Board is allowed to set policy for a limited period of time—for a year, basically.

But, at the end of this year, this policy would need to expire and would need to be replaced by a more permanent policy, which is what the EPDP team has been working on.

The EPDP was split into two phases. The first phase ended, I think, about ... Well, the final report was published, I think, in February or March of last year. I don't recall exactly the dates when the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board adopted the recommendations. But right now, the EPDP team is finalizing Phase 2 of the EPDP, which concerns

third-party access to registration data that is now not public anymore. This data is now redacted from the public WHOIS.

Basically there are a number of special interest groups that have an interest in having access to this registration data. They have an interest in having it disclosed to them one way or another. A lot of these groups are basically working to try to find legal means of replicating the old WHOIS while a group like ours is more concerned with registrant privacy. Some other groups, like the contracted parties, are very concerned about their costs in implementing whatever solution we come up with, as well as any liability issues they may face if we don't come up with a legally sound solution.

Right now, we're trying to wrap up an initial report, which should be published sometime within the next month, I think. The EPDP team is meeting in Los Angeles, I think, in about a week for a face-to-face to try to get this done over, if I recall, a two- or three-day period. I won't be there, but Stephanie will—so other representatives to the EPDP team.

There are a number of outstanding issues that the EPDP team is trying to race through to finalize the initial report. These can basically be divided into two categories. One is areas of disagreement between the two groups—the one group that is trying to ensure privacy for whatever reasons the groups have, and the other group, which is attempting to replicate then old WHOIS system to the extent possible. So we're racing through different topics, addressing only the areas of disagreement. A lot of the work is being divvied up into small teams to try to fast track the work and then bring it to the plenary.

The other issue is that there are outstanding legal issues that the EPDP team does not necessarily have a strong handle on. Remember, we're talking about a fairly new regulation. I think, over the past two years or so, we've become generally knowledgeable on what's involved in the general data protection regulation, but none of us are legal scholars on the matter. So ICANN has contracted with a law firm on behalf of the EPDP team to answer some of our questions. Right now, one of the things we're doing is negotiating the questions we need to send them and what kind of answers we're looking for and how they might be helpful in getting us to wrap up our work.

So it's a bit of a mess. It's not easy to summarize. We haven't been doing the greatest job of sending updates to the NCSG, but I believe we have been doing so regularly on these monthly calls. You should probably expect more input from us over e-mail within the next few weeks because this is when we are going to start having to prepare our own public comment on the draft initial report, or the initial report, once it's published. There will be a public comment period, and the NCSG will need to provide input. So you'll definitely be seeing more traffic from the NCSG representatives on the EPDP team over the next month.

Maybe Stephanie would like to add some stuff. I don't know if anyone has questions. We'd be happy to answer them. Thank you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Hi. I would just like to add to that that the emphasis on meeting privacy obligations is a newfound thing. It's not as if the contracted parties went

to a prayer meeting and came out the door as privacy advocates. Their lawyers informed them of their liability. That's how the temporary spec came about.

Quite frankly, a lot of the dance in the EPDP [2] has been, "Will ICANN take the liability for disclosure to third parties off our hands? And if so, how?" Most of the contracted parties have realized that they cannot remove liability for disclosure to third parties from their shoulders. ICANN would have to take a much more coercive rule in managing registrant data because, at the moment, its controllership—I'm sorry to get into the arcane details, but that's what this group is about—rests on the fact that it sets policy and it controls a group within ICANN that policies the enforcement of the contracts with the contracted parties: the GDD. The sanction that it puts in the place—the ability to remove the accreditation of a contracted party—is the power that it holds. That gives it controllership. The data protection authorities are well-aware of that contractual relationship and that authority.

But the contracted parties have a whole lot of information about their customers. They're the ones that get the billing. Many of them make their money on web hosting and that sort of thing as well. So the contracted parties cannot shed their responsibility for all that other data that doesn't appear in the WHOIS, a principal piece of which is the financial data. Not that I'm suggesting that it should be in the WHOIS. Far from it. But it's an iceberg, only the tip of which appears in the WHOIS, or did.

Unfortunately, we've been dealing for over two years now on this committee and the RDS before it, and we still don't have a conclusion as

to how that controllership is sorted out. So you will see a document that is coming out soon that doesn't actually provide realistic options. I think that this is a problem, and it's because nobody is willing to bite the bullet and make that fundamental decision. Controllership is factually based. It is not a policy decision, nor it can be sorted out in a multi-stakeholder group.

I'm not a legal scholar, but I have spent my whole career in data protection, so I would argue that this is a really frustrating experience. Nobody listens to you, and we're not making great progress on this.

However, it's coming soon. I would like to invite people. The discussion of the comment that we're going to write on the EPDP report when this disclosure instrument comes is a good chance to get people engaged in how to write a comment because there are so many issues that will be buried in this thing. That's really where we are affected in our comments: to unearth the stuff that's buried and bring it out so we can't dump it and ignore it in our policy development process. So I would invite people to get engaged on this now and start reading the background documents. They're all up on the EPDP website. We can perhaps coach people through. It's a good learning experience. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie. Amr, I'm not sure if it's an old or new hand.

AMR ELSADR:

It's a new hand. Thanks, Rafik. Just to follow up on Stephanie and to just add a very quick observation of my own, if you would like to read up on

what the EPDP team is doing, please do reach out to Stephanie, to myself, to Julf, or just send a note to the NCSG mailing list. We can direct you towards some of the resources that you could look at. Like Julf has said in the chat, it is a lot of reading. It's a ton of reading. If you do make the effort to read this, speaking for myself, I would be really grateful and would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Because we've talked about a few policies today and I say a lot of names of people who I'm not sure have participated in any policy development processes before, this EPDP and any policy development process in the GNSO really is about costs. Any party has its own costs involved in whatever business they're engaged in. Trademark owners want to protect their brands. They want to protect their trademarks. They don't want anyone infringing on them. They don't want anyone diluting them. If they are being infringed or diluted, they want the cheapest, easiest, and quickest way to handle them. A lot of the time, whether we're talking about rights protection mechanisms or we're talking about curative rights, like the UDRP or the URS, which we discussed earlier, or if we're talking about access to registration data, like we're doing on the EPDP, a lot of the debates are really not about trademark holders' rights and not about privacy rights. If you look at the core issue, it's about shifting costs from one actor to another. So it's a constant struggle between, for example, us on one side—are very interests are very much aligned with the contracted parties on this particular issue—against, for example, those representing trademark interests, law enforcement interests, and cybersecurity professionals in the private sector. So everyone is trying to make sure that they can get the most out of this policy in terms of decreasing their own transaction costs in any way

they can. Where they can, they would be very happy to shift those costs onto other actors.

So I just wanted to mention that because I thought I heard the issues of finances and cost come up. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Amr. I don't see anyone in the queue, but if anyone wants to ask a question or has any comments, please do so. It's a good opportunity to get more clarity on what's going in the EPDP. Thanks again to Stephanie and Amr for giving all those updates. So more things are coming, I think, in the next days and early next month.

The tools for the EPDP. For RPM, I said that one update is about the change in the timeline about delivering the final report. With regards to [substance checking], if anyone participating in the RPM Working Group can share some updates.

Okay. I don't think we have. The other working group is the SubPro. They are working for their final report. I'm not sure there was some discussion for the need to have another public comment period because of the changes. Having another public comment means probably changing the timeline and delaying the delivery of the final report. Regarding the [substance], we are asking anyone participating in the SubPro if they can share some updates. If I'm not mistaken, Bruna, you are there. So, if you have anything to share, please do.

Okay. If we're putting you on the spot—

BRUNA SANTOS: No. I'm a little behind on the [inaudible], so I'm not really able to provide any updates on this. But I can do it on the list later on, if that's okay.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Sure. Okay. So we'll wait for more updates from the council and SubPro. We'll ask for some recent update, hopefully.

I'm checking from those who are participating. This is another working group that is now going on for four years. One of the, I think, challenges, for people who are involved there is to keep participating actively and follow the discussion. It has some impact in the long run.

We're on the PDP Working Group. Other than that, we have review teams. The RDS Review Team already delivered its final report. We sent our comments. So I think that's the done. Now it will be with the Board to review, I think, the comments, the report, and make a decision on how to deal with the recommendation.

I didn't hear anything regarding the Stability and Security and Resiliency Review Team. It had some problems before after it was initiated. There was a lot of effort to get it back on track, but we are not hearing so much updates. And they still have to put their initial report for public comments. So that's something to check.

For the ATRT, they put their report for public comment. That's ongoing. We have a small drafting team to work on drafting the NCSG comments. They have a few days left to do so. For this one, it has a strict deadline. They are not going to allow any exceptional extensions. I'm not

surprised, I think because it's co-chaired by Cheryl, and Cheryl, I think, is as a person that is doing a lot of project management. She really wants to stick to deadlines and not give any extensions. I think it's understandable as an approach to encourage more discipline.

But, from outside or standpoint, we need to deliver our comments. So what I said is just my guessing, but I'm not sure anyway. So that's one public comment to cover.

I think that's it for all review teams. With that, I think we can move to the public comment status. If we can share the page.

I see a question from Avri about the RPM and URS. I guess we covered that. The whole Phase 1 is about URS and other rights protection mechanisms except UDRP.

Let me go quickly through this public comment and share the status. For the proposed future root zone KSK rollovers, we have a small team working on drafting the comments. I think we have Tomslin, who is on that drafting team. So that's ongoing.

The next is again the ATRT draft report. We have a small team working on that. [So we are chasing] them. Bruna is committed to deliver on time.

The next proposal: dates for ICNANN public meetings. Also, we have two volunteers to work on that. I think this is a quite simple public comment. It's a good opportunity for those volunteers to start drafting your comments. I hope we've helped them to do so and encouraged them to do more in the future.

The next is the proposed final report in the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group. We discussed that during the council agenda, and we have updates. So we got already a draft comment for review. It was shared on the list. If you have any comments or suggestions, please do so in the Google Doc that was shared.

The next one is the proposed amendment to the .com registry agreement. For this one, we don't have any volunteers. I think it's important to cover this one, at least to review the amendments and also the letter of intent. With all the discussion about .org, probably when there was the amendment or when there was the renewal of the registry agreement, I think it's a good opportunity to be systematic on the reviewing or commenting on the changes to the registry agreement for the different TLDs. So we need volunteers for this one.

So I'm asking here if anyone wants to jump in and to lead in drafting the comment for this public comment of the proposed amendment to the .com registry agreement. Anyone?

Okay. Anyone? I don't see anybody. But, please, if you want to volunteer, do so.

The next one I think is the final draft for the fiscal year '21-'25 operating and financial plan and draft fiscal year '21 operating plan and budget. We have a small team working on this. This is also an important public comment to cover. We also need, I think, here the Financial Committee to weigh in, since it's about the budget and finance. It's important because this sets the resources and funding for the different activities, like the PDPs. At least, for example, for the GNSO Council, it has a

standing committee for the budget that is working on the council comment. But, from the NCSG standpoint, we need to send our comment and to participate in this process.

With that, I think we covered all the public comments. Is there any questions or comments? I know it's a little bit dry as a topic, but it's a good opportunity if you want to ask a question or for a clarification.

Okay. I don't see any. So let's move to the last agenda item. That will be Any Other Business or Others. I'm asking here if anyone has a topic to suggest.

Yes, Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks, Rafik. I have a couple of items. Number one, I'll be sending out today calls for ideas for the one-on-one with Goran. What should I talk about? I'm not sure that these calls are all that productive. But, anyway, you get out of it what you put into it, I guess. So ideas are welcome.

Also, ideas for our meeting in Cancun. I have already said to [Yan Sholta] we had a very good discussion at the last meeting in Montreal. They are coming back with the results of their very in-depth study on the accountability of ICANN or the legitimacy of ICANN, rather. They're coming back with the qualitative results. So that'll be really interesting. So I'd like to give them a big block on the agenda, if nobody objects. So I'll be looking for input on what we should be doing in Cancun at our meeting.

The other thing is that the selection of Board Seat 14 – that is the one that Matthew Shears currently holds—is coming up. We have agreed to procedures on how the business side of the Non-Contracted Party House select our Board members. We have had a relatively un-acrimonious couple of years with Matthew. He’s interested in running again. I have invited him to talk to the members and answer questions and discuss Board issues and the seat. The first reasonable date we can come up with is January the 30th. I’m about to send out the invitation for that.

If anybody has any thoughts on that process, I would be happy to hear them. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie. I’m not sure you’re asking with the [question] about the process, but maybe just for clarification: I think for internally how we will manage the discussions, that’s up to us. So we can work on that. But, for the election itself with the CSG, we have now agreed on a process with [Ahmed] on how we will go with the different steps. I expect them really to—the CSG ... They want that we will have to follow that process, even if we can agree on one candidate. So I guess [inaudible]. We can manage, starting with having the call with Matt. I think it’s a good opportunity to discuss with him and initiate that dialogue.

Any questions or comments on this?

I see Bruna is in the queue. Bruna, please go ahead.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you, Rafik. Just a quick question on the Board seat. Is the timeline earlier than our planning meeting for the intercessional at Cancun? Because maybe that's something that can be discussed there. Maybe you can answer this question and I can say what I meant to say right after.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bruna. In terms of the timeline, I need to check. So I'm not sure if it's good to leave it to Cancun because I think we have to give the name formally, I think, by June to be within the schedule because it's not just [inaudible], I think, all the seats elected. We have to do that by June. So I need to double-check, but anyway, there is nothing preventing us, I believe, from having any discussion during Cancun, in particular with the CSG. But I will leave this outcome with initiating the discussion with them and hear from the CSG side on how they want to proceed.

Stephanie, is it an old hand?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Actually, a new hand to respond to Bruna. I neglected to mention that we have to plan the intercessional. I am remiss. I was supposed to send out last week a Google Document that staff has prepared looking for suggestions as to the agenda.

Now, the preliminary agreement that reached ... Because, basically, we wanted to have an intercessional, and the commercial parties said, "We

don't want to spend the effort going to a separate meeting to have an intercessional." I'm actually busy trying to find the report on the feedback of the last intercessional. They have finally agreed that we can hold an add-on day in Kuala Lumpur. It was going to be Cancun, but we didn't have enough time in Cancun. The EPDP is capturing a lot of the spare time in Cancun. So, basically, it was not suitable. So we are planning for Kuala Lumpur, which of course is in June. That'll be way too late to discuss the Board seat because we have to have a name by then.

Nevertheless, I need to get you folks engaged on what we should be doing at the intercessional. The compromise that we came up with or that David Olive suggested was to have breakfast with the business side of the house, separate into your own groups, do the work that you want to do in your intercessional, and then meet again for cocktails or something at the end of the day – a brief recap. Something like that. That's probably as good as we're going to get.

In my view, we need to talk about revitalization and how we engage our members and how we share the work and burnout and all kinds of things like that.

Yes, we did—I'm reading the chat here—agree for a short session, but we haven't planned it yet. So good idea. If you have any ideas about where to wedge that into the schedule, Bruna, I would love to know because we have to get that on the radar sooner [or] it isn't going to happen. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie. Yeah, there are several topics covered here. We have a meeting in Cancun with the CSG, I think, and then we have the intercessional for Kuala Lumpur. There was a question, I think, from Amr about the meeting with the Board in Cancun. I guess we will expect from you several e-mails to the list to initiate those different threads.

Bruna, is it an old or new hand?

BRUNA SANTOS:

It's for other stuff. Just referring back on the intercessional, what I've asked Maryam is for us to maybe revive a little list we had on the intercessional just so we can continue the discussion there as well. It's an internal NCSG list.

I just wanted to mention as well about anticipating for ICANN67. We're also getting some suggestions from membership that they have. So we want to facilitate maybe a meeting that's more capacity-building-oriented. So maybe just a space for members to ask questions about one policy questions or two policy questions or subjects on this. So if there's something the membership wants to discuss there more specifically, or we on this call, the Policy Committee can also help us identify one or two subject that we can have a meeting on that's membership-exclusive for us to listen to each other and chat and then hear a little about stuff. So that's one idea.

That's it—no, not policy developing/coaching again because we have been identifying this kind of gap between who's going in and our expert

members. So just an informative space. If we think it's not necessary, then we can just drop the suggestion of the session. But maybe a more informative space than trying to smash whatever policy updates we have been doing on the NCSG calls, which is, like, ten minutes for each. It's kind of unfair to everyone. So maybe 30-45 minutes on one or two policy points. That would be great. If we can identify them, other than EPDP [inaudible] or just EPDP or anything else, we would be happy to do so.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Bruna, for all those details. I'm not sure, Stephanie, if that's an old or new hand.

Okay. I'm not sure if it's an old or new hand, but it's some kind of hand.

If there is nothing else as a topic or nobody wants to ask any question or make comments, I guess we can adjourn the call for today. Thanks, everyone, for attending and for this discussion. [I] tried to improve as much as possible. Hopefully we're getting more updates in the next meetings.

With that, thanks again. See you soon..

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]