

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the NCSG PC meeting being held on Monday, the 12th of February, 2024 at 11:30 UTC. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. And with this, I will turn it over to Tomslin. You may begin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Andrea, and welcome, everyone. I think it's our last online meeting before we meet in person for those who are traveling to Puerto Rico. So, as we usually do, we'll go through the Council agenda and then return to our agenda to look at some items that we have for members. So, we'll jump right on to walk through the Council agenda that the Council will be looking at or discussing later this week. And on this agenda, I think we just have on the concept agenda, we just have some standing selection committee items.

Two consent agenda there. The first is the standing selection committee members and its leadership. And then the second is the recently selected GNSO nominated ICANN Fellowship Program Mentor by the standing selection committee. That was done at the end of last month, January. Mark Datysgeld, a councilor was selected as the Fellowship Program Mentor for the next, I think it's usually two or three meetings. Yeah. So, the Council will be consenting to this selection

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.

done by the SSC. I don't know if anyone has any comments or questions on that. Seeing none, we'll proceed to a vote we have. And I think this one we will send in. Oh, I see Stephanie's hand. Steph, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks. I'm just wondering if we could get a report from our members on what's been going on at the standing selection committee, because I know Sam was on it and he's termed out now. David was on it and didn't attend meetings. Oh, yeah, he was on it. So, maybe we could hear, because, I mean, we appoint people to these things and then we never hear what's been going on. It would also be useful for new people going on to find out what's been going, what happened and who they named and the procedure, that sort of thing.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

I agree. I didn't talk with Arsene about his availability for this specific call, considering that he was the only one still on the committee in the 2024 committee, because Sam had termed out. He, yes, he was the only one there and he will be the only one who is able to give us a summary of what happened. Also, if I'm not mistaken, I believe he was also a candidate for the program mentor, the fellowship program mentor, so he must have recused himself from that selection process. But as a general update, yes, I'll speak to him, see if he can make our next meeting to give an update.

But talking about that, we've managed to get, rather, the policy committee was able to select two other members to join Arsene on

that. So, I made that announcement yesterday for Sam, but today for me. Yeah, so I'll get Arsene to give us an update as soon as possible. I'll move on now to the vote on the registration data accuracy.

As I was beginning to say earlier, this has been on our radar for a long time, I think. We all know what this is about now. So, this has been deferred, the work of the scoping team has been deferred, and it's about to be deferred again. Primarily, because of three sets of, it was discussed in the last Council meeting, I think, when we discussed during our policy call last month, the Council then spoke about it and made a call that it doesn't sound like there is, in the discussion, it seemed like there isn't any need or it doesn't make sense to proceed with this work pending certain things that the Council was expecting to make their determination.

One being the completion of the data processing agreement between ICANN and the contractor parties, and then the implementation of the NIS2 directive, and finally, the publication of the inferential analysis of maliciously registered domains. I understand, for our councilors, I understand that staff is going to make a comment that the completion of the data processing agreement is not going to still give us any data or give us any access to data.

So, they believe there is a misconception in the community that some think that at the completion of this agreement, ICANN might be able to access data for this purpose, but they intend to clarify that that would not be the case. Anyway, this is coming up for voting to defer for another six months or until some of these events occur. So, open up for

questions, comments, and discussion on a series to line up again. Steph, over to you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes. Stephanie Perrin, for the record, and I'm sorry, I've probably whiffle-waffled on this topic because that was an awful, I'm trying to pick my words carefully here, an awful committee. There was nothing small about it, and remember, this was just the scoping team on accuracy. So, that's supposed to be fairly simple, and then you get on and do the work on accuracy.

So, I think we'll have to, even if we have to defer another six months because we haven't seen that wretched agreement. And I totally agree, unless ICANN is suddenly going to step forward and become a data controller, the decisions regarding access to data rest in the hands of the registrars and registries. So, nothing's going to change. Nevertheless, the accuracy requirements, we still have to keep a sharp eye on that and look at that data processing agreement. And I noted in plowing through the budget materials that in the section on review committees, which we don't comment on, there's the WHOIS review team, which I unfortunately was a member of.

I was unable to stop the continued aggressive work on data accuracy and identity verification. Well, we got the identity verification beat back, but there was a lot of wishful thinking on continued accuracy improvement in that final report. And the budget says that 87% has been done. I would like to know, there's no, of course, breakdown on detail that I can find. I'd like to know what the heck is still outstanding,

and I hope it doesn't flow over into the accuracy scoping team. So, I'm sorry if this is a bit arcane, but you kind of have to thread your way through these missing procedures and documents to figure out what accuracy work will rear its head next. And I would remind people that the work we did on GDPR for this left open a continuous improvement factor in terms of the data collected and verification.

So, we should keep this wretched thing open, just keep kicking it down the road in case we need it, because we will need it to keep an eye on what's going on behind the scenes. I don't know how we ever got 87% of the WHOIS review team recommendations put in place unless they were done, I'd like a breakout, unless they were done by contractors behind the scenes. I'd like to know what happened there. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, indeed. I think, like you said, this is an interesting one. And sometimes it feels like there's not much interest from us on it, but it is an interesting one which we need to pay attention to. Any other questions before we move to the next item? All right. We'll move to the Item 5 then. Well, Item 5, which is the update on the SubPro small team progress.

I guess it will be an update. I think the small team intends to wrap up their work at ICANN79. So, they will simply tell us, I think, and Stephanie, you can come in here. I know, well, maybe not now, because I think I got Reema on the call to give us a more detailed update later on this. So, just as an agenda item for the Council, we will just get an update from the small team lead. We will be getting a more

detailed update ourselves today from Reema in a minute. And I see Kathy's hand up.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thanks, Tomslin. Hi, everyone. Can you hear me?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Because my microphone is not working.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes, we can hear you, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay, great.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, we can.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thanks for sending me the link. So, just a quick reminder to Council that just because you get something from the SubPro small team, doesn't mean you have to accept it. The SubPro small team has no policymaking ability whatsoever. So, Reema and Nama and Stephanie

and Tomson and I are doing the best we can in the SubPro small team, but Council has to approve it. And this is SubPro small team is a new idea that Council is spinning off some things to work on, but it has to come back to Council and it has to be approved by you.

So, I just wanted to remind you, nothing's a done deal until you approve it. So, that's a lot. I mean, this is a special process and it really needs to be reviewed closely. Thanks. And monitored and watched and checked as it goes through. So, ask lots of questions. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. And we will somewhat depend on advice from Reema and the team to also help councilors who are not participating or following this specific issue to know where the concerns are and what questions perhaps to dig further into. So, like I said, we'll get an update from Reema shortly.

KATHY KLEIMAN: That's fair.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: So, we'll just finish with this and we'll come to that. Thanks. All right. We'll move on to Item 6. That is the discussion on, well, I think we're getting an update here rather than a discussion on, yeah, I think it's a discussion on the next steps for consideration of expired domain deletion policy and expired registration recovery policy. A bit of a background, this has come up to our meetings before last year, but a bit of a background quickly is that the Council was considering to request

for a policy status report to check or, if you will, assess whether these policies are still fit for purpose.

They decided that rather than make that request for a formal policy status report, they would just ask ICANN for what they think about the two policies and also, they asked the contracted parties their view about the two policies, whether there are any issues or concerns. And what came back was that, especially from ICANN org, was that the policy text is a bit ambiguous and continues to cause confusion for registrants.

I think the one that stood out was the expired registration recovery policy. Because I think the comment or the report that came back said the expired registration recovery policy was implemented in part to ensure that expiration related provisions in registration agreement are clear and conspicuous enough, but registrants still continue to be confused. So, because of that, the Council thought additional work needs to be done on these two policies, but they needed more information from ICANN org in terms of what sort of information that ICANN has published to help registrants with clarity.

And I think ICANN org intends to update the Council about those published materials that help registrants with the confusion about expired registration recovery domains. And with that information, the Council will make a decision whether to make a formal policy status report or I think pursue maybe policy work on this area. So, I'll stop there to see if there are any questions or comments on this from the team. All right. Seeing no hands, I'll move forward.

We'll probably follow up in Puerto Rico what came out of that conversation. I think the next item, Item 7, is just a conversation between councilors about their preparation for ICANN79 sessions they'll be having and how does it look like. For our councilors there, I wanted to just point out one of the things that came out of the strategic planning session in December was that there was an agreement that the pre-ICANN79 GNSO policy webinar be taken out of the formal prep week schedule to focus on a time that is favorable to councilors. That is what staff have tried to do now. So, you'll see that session, the policy webinar is scheduled at a usual Council meeting time. One of the Council meeting times as 21:00 UTC. So, that will be on Monday, the 26th of February 2024. It's mandatory for all Council members.

So, I just wanted to point that that's something that came out of the SPS. I don't know if councilors have comments on that. Well, I didn't see any on the mailing list. So, I think it's too late now because the session is already scheduled. Yes, that is all. I think we can move to the next item, if no other comments. The draft NCAP study 2 report. I know that the year, this is about the name collision study. But NCSG, I just wanted to mention that we have commented to the NCAP study 1 draft report and to the final report of the NCAP study 1.

I've sent out an email just before our call today with links to those comments. So, if anyone would like to comment on this second study, please reach out to me. It's a more technical policy document. If some technical people are keen to look at this one, please let me know. And that's it on the main agenda. On the any other business, we have a couple of things. We have the updates from the GAC and ccNSO

liaisons. We will have a quick chat on the Board letter on closed generics.

That's something I also sent, updated our team on email. And then we'll also look at the SPIRT charter drafting team. I think we'll have an update on what SPIRT is from Kathy later today. And I think Greg will also be updating Council on the DNS Abuse subgroup meeting, the non-contracted party has had with us, NCSG. I think that recording was shared on the mailing list, but that's something Greg will be updating the Council about as well. And I see Kathy, your hand is up.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Tomslin. I just wanted to see if anyone had any questions about closed generics. And I wasn't sure, Tomslin, I don't think we've done an update here on that. Do you want me to give a minute about what's happened?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Yes, please. That would be helpful.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Okay. So, everybody now knows the closed generics are the registry owning all the second level domain names. And a closed generic is a generic word of a business or industry. So, this came up in the first round when Amazon wanted to be both the registry and own all the domain names for dot book, ditto for Google with dot search, and both of them for dot cloud, I think. And so, closed generics were barred in the first round, but lots and lots of people want them.

It's very lucrative to control the generic word of your industry. It's also somewhat illegal. And so, a small team, a small group was put together with the GNSO appointing, we appointed people and were part of the structure. Tomslin and Manju were amazing, and Stephanie in creating the structure. So, it was GNSO, GAC, and ALAC in a small group, unprecedented, just like the small team we just talked about, the separate small team, was unprecedented. The closed generic small group was unprecedented. And we met for a year, and a compromise, we put out a compromise, but the community did not like it. That's what Washington, D. C. was.

It's very, very difficult to have an easy way to prove that you're going to have a closed generic, but not misuse it. And the community was not happy that we had put in enough guardrails. And so, the GAC and ALAC asked the Board not to allow closed generics in the next round, and they have. So, I just wanted to let you know. So, just in case there's a question about procedures in the GNSO Council, I wanted to tell you that as a participant in this, I thought it went very well. I thought staff did a great job, and this idea of kind of taking a hard problem offline to work on it was very interesting. At least, I'm not saying it would work on everything, but it worked pretty well on this one. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Kathy. And I think the Council, when that report came out, the Council did discuss and there was agreement that it was, from a procedure perspective, that was very, very good. So, good work. Thank you. Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks, Stephanie Perrin, for the record. I just wanted to ask Kathy, when I read the letter, it sounded to me like, I mean, I was very heartened. It appeared to put the thing down for now, but I didn't see the wooden stake through the heart. Is this thing going to zombie back up again in a year? Because there was, I can't remember the precise wording, but until such time as we agree on a policy, this thing's dead. Then somebody's going to rip off and try and agree on a policy, right?

KATHY KLEIMAN: May I respond, Townsend?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, please.

KATHY KLEIMAN: So, it is a zombie. It will rise again in 10 to 12 years, just as it did before. And, yes, we may have to fight it all over again. But now, having had two rounds where huge objections were raised to the antitrust implications, the monopolizing implications, the speech implications, the competition implications of closed generics, I think it will be harder. Just so you know, the GNSO Council still doesn't accept this recommendation, but basically, Council agreed that Council did not ask, although GAC and ALAC asked the Board to not allow closed generics in the next round.

What Council said, and their letter was very, very carefully phrased, was we had agreed that if the small team could not come to a compromise, then this issue was in the hands of the Board. So, there's an acceptance that the Board has the power. But not necessarily agreement. So, yes, Stephanie, it will rise again. But hopefully with enough history that people will know this time what's going on. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Hopefully. All right. Let's get back to our agenda. Oh, Manju, see your hand up.

MANJU CHEN: Yeah, sorry. Can we, because we skipped the last item of the Council agenda, and I'd like to get it over with, because I'm still on holiday, and I wish I can.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right, cool. Please.

MANJU CHEN: This CCOICI, as you guys know, we did this statement of interest thing, and it was killed. And now CCOICI, it's a continuous improvement of Council kind of thing. I am not sure if you guys know, but there is a continuous improvement kind of cross-community working group right now going on also within ICANN. I think all of the SOAC and NCSG have a representative on it. I'm also representing Council on it. So, I'm not representing NCSG.

I think the NCSG representative, I'm not sure, but I think it is Wisdom. Anyway, so this continuous improvement thing of Council, there was actually a pilot. And now, as we've finished several of the assignments Council gave us, we are actually sending out surveys to all of the stakeholder groups and constituencies within the GNSO Council, well, within the GNSO, and asking them if they see the CCOICI as an effecton mechanism to carry out the continuous improvement of Council. I believe you must have received the survey consulting letter on the mailing list from Julf. I'm just copying, pasting the link also so I can check it out.

I wish we could all just look at the questions and have a full discussion and send one, because it would be important. The answer is kind of will decide whether CCOICI should continue or not, or we should find another mechanism to improve Council in general in the future, because that's a theme now for not only the cross-community group, but also the WS2 recommendations.

So, I also asked Julf to put this on the agenda for our San Juan meeting, so we can discuss more then, but I just wanted to remind everybody that this is going on, and if you have any opinion on this, please feel free to express them either in the mailing list or prepare them to discuss in San Juan. So, I'm going to do the same reminder during our Council meeting too, so that's about it. Thank you very much, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Manju. So, we'll take that survey and give you feedback. Benjamin?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you, Manju, for bringing this up, the continuous improvement cross-committee working group. Yeah, I think that's, I don't know if it's working group or working party. I'm also representing NCUC with another alternate member participating, and one of the things that just lays more credence to what Manju has said is trying to find mechanism of continuous improvement in our constituency, and I've been asking about different leaders if they know of any continuous improvement process that we have.

So, I'm also just reiterating that if there's anybody who knows of any process that we've been doing, or if there's any working group that currently existing that is solely working on continuous improvement, or any mechanism that is improving the way we do things in our constituency, they should please share, and I hope to also share some of the deliberations in our group.

I mean, the work so far, the work is just about starting, so there is not much that's happened yet, but it's just been constituted, and the initial task right now is to ask the community what is happening. Is there any continuous improvement process that we have within our groups? So, if anybody knows any, please, I'm trying to find what we have been doing to improve our processes, either selecting people representing us, or if there are mechanism that we use to address things that we find out that is not working well in our constituencies, please share, or if you know any. Thank you. I just wanted to take this opportunity to reinforce what Manju said. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Benjamin. I hope you've sent that on the email list as well, or that request for input. Bruna?

BRUNA MARTINS: Thanks, Tom. Hi, everyone. Now, just, I wanted to highlight what Manju wrote in the chat, right, that it's an NCSG submission, I guess, so it would be important for us to discuss it jointly on once and when we have a list of said improvements, but also, I was the NCSG chair at the time of the beginning, some related discussions around this committee and so on, and I think back then, we made a point that although it was a very welcome attempt of allowing for the community to better improve its own process and so on, we try to highlight some things such as mandatory slots in each and every single policy-related efforts, and that sometimes, it was very hard for us to fulfill these slots due to the lower number of volunteers.

We've also highlighted the repeated deadlines and creation of new committees, the need for us to avoid the duplication of work and the duplication of groups, and I think the community has moved a little bit in a rather different direction recently, and one example would be the said smelting.

So perhaps regardless of having one or two examples to bring up and just say that NCUC or NCSG have been improving its own processes and how we deal with our members, we can just highlight the way we do things and the way we organize ourselves through an NCSG policy committees and that a lot of our contributions and so on have to come

from the SG perspective and so on and so forth, and then reinstate those things. Because in my perspective at least or in my own ideas, I don't think we have done anything recently to improve this structural, said lack of civil society volunteers or even the availability of civil society volunteers on ICANN.

And obviously, I'm not here talking about ALAC, I'm talking about our own problems and how NCSG has been working recently, and without things such as more capacity building, more travel support, or even some other resources available to us, we don't get to improve our own process, so just maybe offering this point of criticism here because obviously we can come up with ideas and examples, but using this consultation to also reinforce that we still face a lack of resource and support for civil society might be important as well, that's all.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Fair point, thanks Bruna, and I think we have to meet in Puerto Rico and get that at least get it drafted out I suppose and share with the community so that everyone fills in, maybe a Google Doc or something, and then Julf can submit on our behalf. All right, Andrea, could we please go back to our agenda? Thanks. I would like for, if Reema is still there, to give us an update on the small team plus. I know she was planning to leave early.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yeah, I'm here.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right, thanks. Could you give us an update on the small team plus, please?

REEMA MOUSA: Sure. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. I think this is my first-time sharing an update with this group on small team plus stuff. I usually, am on the west coast and this meeting is very early, but I'm on the east coast today, so I'm happy to be here with everyone. I'm going to try to go pretty quickly and focus on the most important thing of the moment, but just to give an update on things that have happened since the last policy meeting, which I'm making the assumption that either Namra or maybe Stephanie gave an update at that point, because I think I remember seeing an email chain that that would happen. But I'm going to focus mostly on what actually has been happening for the past two weeks and what will continue through today.

So, in the past couple of weeks, the pending recommendations that have been discussed are 9.2, 18.1, and 18.3. So, 9.2 is the single registrant exemption that was taken to the Board caucus by Becky Burr, and now where that discussion lies is that the text is stable there but might end up getting rejected by the Board again, potentially, and will just have to be fleshed out later. And then on 18.1, that's rejection of applications. 18.3 is the covenant not to sue.

Those are both stable, and we've moved on from those. And I'm moving quickly past those because from an NCSG perspective, we didn't have much to contribute on those. But moving on to what the current

discussion is, we are on 32.1, 32.2, and 32.10. And those are all recommendations related to limited challenge/appeal mechanism.

So, where that kind of stands and where the discussion has been there is that the Board rejected the initial recommendation on this because they were concerned that, and I'm heavily paraphrasing here, and I'll also footnote here that, Kathy, please feel free to jump in and amend or correct or add to anything I'm saying. But the Board's rejection really came from a notion that although the Board is interested in having this limited challenge/appeal mechanism, or some sort of intermediary thing like that, they are concerned in the potential for excessive, unnecessary costs or delays in the application process if appeals or challenges or objections are able to come up sort of willy-nilly.

And so, where the discussion is right now, at least from what we're advocating for from the NCSG perspective, is to really add some more specificity into the draft language to sharpen the focus of what this recommendation would do and limit the broadness that the language allows for now in the ability for really anyone at any time to bring challenges. And then the concern from the NCSG perspective would be that applicants, maybe applicants from smaller organizations or from civil society or whatnot, would have to respond to those appeals, maybe from big players. And that that would be an expensive and lengthy process for those small players and perhaps be unfair.

So, I'll pause there. I'm happy to take any questions. I do have to jump within the next like five or ten minutes. But yeah, and I'll also pause and check in with Kathy to see if there's anything I missed there.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Oh, I think you got it. Thanks so much, Reema.

REEMA MOUSA: Great.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Reema. You and Namra are covering us with that small team plus. And I know that you're meeting every Monday. So, I'll open it up to see if there are any questions for Reema. All right. Seeing none. All right. Just to confirm, Reema, is it correct to assume that the small team plans to really wrap up their work and shut down in Puerto Rico? Is that correct?

REEMA MOUSA: That's my understanding that, that's the goal. We were supposed to finish even earlier. I think originally, actually, we were supposed to finish before the wrap of 2023 or maybe very early on 2024. But as I'm sure you all know things sometimes continue on. But I think that's the goal. So, yeah, we'll see and we'll keep you posted if it continues on past that.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay. Thanks. Thanks a lot. And I think there are a couple of outreach sessions too from the small team as a whole to the community. Just for everyone's information. I think there is one during Prep Week and then

there is another during ICANN79 as well. So, if you want to lean in to get some more updates, please look out for those sessions. Especially since the schedule is out as published by Andrea and Chad. All right. Thanks again, Reema. Let's move on now to the RDRS briefing from Ken and or Wisdom.

KEN HERMAN:

Hi, Tomslin. This is Ken Herman for the record. Thank you very much. Let Wisdom and or our behind-the-scenes support mechanism, otherwise known as Kathy, jump in should there be any need for additional information. But we're talking about the event that we're planning on RDRS. I know what you're thinking. It's not yet another vaccine we need to get in order to attend a meeting, but it is something important that we need to be, I guess, kind of vaccinated against. Registration data on system.

This is what ICANN is putting into place for God knows who to get God knows what when it comes to data. And I want to emphasize that this speaks to the heart of pretty much a lot of things we do in the Non-Commercial community. It's about protection of data for registration information and who is going to get it. This is private data I'm talking about. Who is going to get it? How do we know that they've gotten it? What's the mechanism that they're going to use for it? Now lots of other things.

I don't have any of the answers for that, and I'm not sure how many of us really do, and that's why we have arranged this briefing which will take place on 21st of February. Sorry that it's in the middle of the pre-

meeting for San Juan, but that couldn't really be helped. So, what we're going to do on the 21st is we have invited some speakers. There's an ICANN speaker who's going to come and give a presentation on what is the RDRS, how does it work, and anything else I can think of that's important to tell us.

We have also invited, and we're grateful that they have agreed to have two representatives from Tucows as a registrar to come and talk to us about their experience with the system from their perspective. So, I think it's really helpful that we'll get a perspective of the main recipients of requests for data. What are they going to do with it, and how are they going to work with?

So, the way we have structured this event is to have, well, probably a little over an hour, an hour and a quarter. So, we budgeted an hour and a half for the 21st just to hear about what's happening with RDRS and ask a lot of questions about what RDRS is doing, how it works, who's getting what, what do we see. And then we've scheduled, as you might have seen from the notice, a follow-up session on 26th of February. That's a Monday. So, it's not a week later. It's the next Monday. Both of them at 15:00 UTC. Hopefully people can make it. We tried to find time that was good for everybody, especially our speakers for the first session. But at that second session is an opportunity for us as a community to discuss anything we want to say about it or do about this, complaints, comments. Approach is basically a strategic approach to what we're doing with RDRS.

So, we've broken it into two sessions. First session to hear about it and ask any questions you have from the people who made it and the

people who are using it, and then a second session for us to come together and decide what we want to do about it. I think that's all I can say about this. I see, Stephanie, you have a hand up, but I'll let Kathy or Wisdom have an opportunity to, Tomslin, if you don't mind, have an opportunity for them to correct any mistakes I made or add any additional information. Go ahead. Tomslin, back to you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. So, we'll go with the queue unless, Kathy, you wanted to add information like Ken suggested.

KATHRYN KLEIMAN: Yes. If I might. First, thank you to Ken and Wisdom for picking this up and doing this. This arose from the last meeting in Hamburg where we were talking about law enforcement issues and kind of a question that some of us had about, well, how does the system really work. And it turns out ICANN staff has been presenting. I think they presented publicly, but they've also been going to stakeholder groups and constituencies to share what this new RDRS system looks like. And so, Ken's bringing them in. Ken and Wisdom are bringing them in so they can tell us, so that we can get the facts first and then plan our strategy. So, again, thanks to both of them. Thanks, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. All right. To the queue now. Steph then Bruna.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. And I echo Kathy's thanks to Ken and Wisdom for getting this set up. It's very, very helpful. If I'm reading the budget documents correctly, it says there were two FTEs assigned to this task for two years, and they are sunsetting out. I'm not sure where they're going, and that's a question we might want to ask, but the fact that their sun setting out seems to indicate that they think this thing is final.

Oh, FTE. Sorry. I'm not speaking clearly. Full time equivalent to staff full time on this job. And that's a lot of resources to put on what, in my view, is not a very useful product. This is what the SSAD turned into this thing. I'll find out at the presentation, see how people are feeling about it. But I'm wondering if there isn't going to be a demand for updates and improvements to this. And if so, who's going to do it, and where's the money going to come from? Because ICANN absorbed the costs of this and agreed that the users would not have to pay to use it. And so, that's an obstacle right there. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Good questions. Bruna?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, Tomslin. It's more like a question with regards to the organizations of both meetings. I know this was an issue that was possibly brought up in previous calls. But in any case, I think it would have been important to have had a discussion on the policy committee meeting list, Paris committee list mailing list about the organization of both meetings because although a briefing might be okay, the second meeting, as Ken just explained, will go through some sort of a position

making for NCSG. And I don't really understand why there isn't a kind of an internal debate on the PC about it, and we'll also be keen on engaging with that.

So, it's more like a request, that if we organize said meetings in other situations or in the future, we use the policy committee list to discuss the details and even suggestions for invitations or people we can reach out to. And I understand you have Wisdom involved as a counselor, but it would also be nice to have the full group of counselors involved in such initiative. So, that's more like a request/question, Tomslin. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you. Kathy or Ken, do you want to take that?

KATHRYN KLEIMAN: Ken, I'll defer to you if you want to take it.

KEN HERMAN: No, no. Please.

KATHRYN KLEIMAN: Okay. Bruna, it's a very fair thing. Actually, we thought we got the marching orders or the direction, the guidance from the policy committee since this came out of the PC meeting in Hamburg. There was a real desire to talk, Farzi, Stephanie, me, others to talk about or concerns about anonymous law enforcement requests. And the sense

was, well, this is a brand-new system. Are there anonymous law enforcement requests? Which is why the registrars are coming in to tell us whether they actually is it anonymous to us, to the public? Is it anonymous to the registrant? Is it anonymous to the registrar? That could cause some really interesting legal issues.

The question did come up in the policy committee meeting. And so, the idea was laying the framework, getting the facts, and then having the discussion. But you're absolutely right. This should go through the policy committee as well. Ken, Wisdom, am I misspeaking when I say we've certainly got time before the second strategy meeting? Maybe you could coordinate with the policy committee. Thanks.

KEN HERMAN: Tomslin, if I may?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah, please.

KEN HERMAN: Yes. Thanks so much, Kathy and Bruno. Yes. This came up. We did think that maybe we had gone through the proper approaches, but apparently, we might have missed a few steps. So, I think we have some time. I'm not really sure on what the policy committee process really is, frankly. But we can certainly discuss that offline. My understanding was that we wanted to get some better ideas to what the system was, how it worked, and then talk amongst ourselves. But I think we can certainly adjust the process. And so, what we can do is I'd

rather try to avoid rescheduling the session on the 26th if we can't. So, I'll work with the policy committee to see what we can do and where Wisdom and I will do that. Thanks so much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Ken. Well, I guess, yeah, the issue of the planning is the bid which, in my opinion, was a bit missed, but it certainly came out of the conversations we were having in Hamburg. I think at the time when you were planning to, as we were speaking, I just realized that it might not be at the same time, but the Council on the 26th will also have another meeting, but I haven't -- I think it's much later in the day, but it's definitely something that we can look at, especially that pretty safe meeting where we have to discuss as NCSG without the external parties. It could be something we look at, the timing with the policy committee a little bit. I don't know what the time the members will prefer, but we will certainly look into it since, as Kathy mentioned, we have time. I see bed first, Bruna, is your hand still up, or is that an old hand?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: It is, Tomslin. Thank you. Bruna, again, for the record. Just to clarify some things. I didn't say it didn't come from the policy committee meetings or anything of the sort. I just think that we have the mailing list as a good point of communication for exchanging the planning of such sessions. And perhaps there was even some extra perspective someone would like to bring to the organization of these two meetings or even comments on the time zone as you were saying, Tomslin, or even on how 26th might be not a really good day, since it's previous to

ICANN. Folks might be already starting or prepping up their traveling issues and things like that. Or even that is rather short notice, right, to schedule a meeting for these coming weeks.

But in any case, I also think that what's more important maybe is that, obviously, we can collect and should collect perspectives, comments, and ideas from the community. But when it comes to shaping or finalizing or forming a policy position, I think the policy committee is key here. So, that's why I'm pointing to the lack of communications with the policy committee as it's relevant, and it's part of the core structure of whenever we need to decide or form positions in a lot of the policy discussions and so on, and especially this one as it's been something that people like Stephanie, Farzaneh have both used a lot of their times and concerns and even got exhausted from.

So just perhaps, yeah, I guess it's more like a request for us to be more careful about those things. And if and when we move forward in that, let's please, loop the PC in instead of just a few members of that. That's all. Thanks, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right. Thank you. Benjamin?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Yeah. Thank you. I just wanted to ask that the policy committee have a schedule of beyond the NCSG policy meetings where we have brigades for some kind of capacity building or informational so that if they have a schedule. Because I know that I run into the same kind of where you're

trying to get a session to inform members who have been asking what this whole topic is about. So, my take is I would not have any of the opportunity to have those sessions even now as we are heading to another meeting.

So, I was wondering if the policy committee has maybe a roster of occasionally picking subjects and updating members, just educating them over time so that we who are supposed to be handling admin part of our constituencies don't have to do this work of trying to put together sessions that policy committees would really want to take lead on. So, I'm wondering if there's a plan for that that would always educate the members even as we go into different meetings over time.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Benjamin, for the question. So, the question has a couple of angles to answer. From a perspective of does the policy committee have a shadow or something in that regards? It doesn't officially have one. However, the way it commonly does it is based on hot topics, it would interact with the community and have that conversation on those topics, especially ones where positions need to be formed.

In terms of updates, I think we've had the conversation many times as well in these meetings where the councilors alone are not, or counselors are often busy, and therefore, they cannot be the only ones to send the updates back to the general membership. Now the point I wanted to make there is that the constituencies obviously appoint policy committee members as well. Not only councilors are part of it. So, we are trying to work with the members that the constituencies

have appointed to become just as active as the councilors as well, because I was looking at the charter earlier today, and it actually anticipates that those members will also be giving feedback to NCSG and the constituencies, not only councilors.

So, I think, we're working on getting the members you appoint to the PC to also be as active with bringing feedback to the general membership as well. So, hopefully, that works out that way. And if you can encourage the members you appointed from NCSG and from NPOC to become as engaged as we hope, that would help all of us as well. I see Stephanie's hand up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes. Hi. Stephanie for the record. And I'm sorry to be a broken record all the time asking questions, but I think this is really important. We discussed this matter in the Washington meeting, and I think I tagged Julf to consider the idea of having NCSG meetings other than policy meetings periodically where we could answer some of Benjamin's legitimate concerns about updating the members and having discussions about things. Because the policy committee meetings, we're trying to clear through things and take decisions, and sometimes we leave people behind if you're not immersed in the work.

So, Julf, unfortunately, wasn't able to attend today's call, but I'll nag him again because I do think we need this. Personally, I'm really grateful that you guys have organized this RDRS meeting. I agree with Bruna that any policy decisions should come back to policy committee, and it's unfortunate that both Tomslin and Manju won't be able to attend these

meetings because of the time zone issue. I mean, this is just the way we work.

But I also raised my hand to raise the point that there's nothing stopping us having discussions of key policy issues on the NCSG list. I mean, obviously, we don't want to air our dirty linen if we're having trouble reaching consensus on a particular point, maybe the list is not the place to go to. But we don't have to have a meeting to ask questions about issues. We're supposed to use the list. If you read the charter, we're supposed to use that NCSG list, and frankly, it's a wee bit dead. I haven't got time to post to it. I'm too busy doing plenty of other things. But members who are curious should ask questions on the list, and somebody will answer. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Fair point, Steph. Yes. The list is a good place to also have that interaction as well, especially with the time zone differences, of course. Bruna?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, Tomslin. Stephanie addressed one of the points I really wanted to because, yes, the mailing list has always been the core space for us to raise questions, let others know what's happening in form of initiatives, in form of some of the developments and so on. And recently, let's say, perhaps ever since the pandemic, we have stopped sharing as many relevant things in there as we should. Right? That could be a place where any member would have access on what folks are doing on RDRS or what folks are doing on the CCOICI or things like that. Right? And it

was always kind of perceived as first, the mailing list and then the calls as the mailing list is the one where folks have more access to, is the one that's stable regardless of time zones and so on and so forth. So, again, it's really important that we take back that position of sharing more developments there and so on.

And going back to the meeting, I must say it upsets me a little bit that some folks are framing this as being thankful or not for the organization of a said meeting, but it's not really that. It's just like we've always done things in consultation with both the community and the groups, the committees, and so on and so forth. And right now, I'm not seeing something that was done like that. I'm seeing something that was more like a germinating idea on one of the PC meetings, and then we developed things, and then now we are letting everyone know.

So please don't read that as me being not thankful because it's not that. And it's kind of a wrong take on a very simple thing that I'm asking that it's more transparency. And I'm asking that from myself, from all councilors, for all constituencies and just so that we go back to the way we were before in which we exchanged a lot of things on the mailing list and things worked because of that including. So, it's more like that because once we start sharing them, then perhaps Ben's request of us doing more capacity building ceases to exist because we have more information available than just in the people that are joining the policy work minds. Right? So, it's more like that. That's all, Tomslin. Sorry.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. Sorry. I have to draw a line on this one so that we can cover the rest of the items on our agenda. We can continue the conversation as well on the mailing list like we've suggested. I'll move to a quick update from Ken on the transfer policy review. What are the developments there, Ken?

KEN HERMAN: Hi. Thanks. I'll be really quick on this. After weeks of discussions having to do with a lot of internal registry register stuff like bulk transfers, etcetera, the committee has come to an issue, which I think we might find interesting and have something to comment, and I'll try to put together materials to circulate on mailing list. That's the topic of change of registrant information. So, the issue is when somebody wants to change anything regarding the information about the name of the registrant, the owner of the name. What happens? Right now, number of things happen, notifications, locks, etcetera. And as part of the scoping arrangement, I guess, for the working group, this was added to it.

So, what's being discussed is what constitutes a change. There's been a lot of discussion about a material change versus any kind of spelling updates, and why we're talking about that has to do with things like notifications. Many of the registrars on the list have suggested that they really don't need any notifications either to the prior registrant or the new registrant. This is not transferring between domains, mind you, between registrants, by the way. This is talking about just within, so anybody wants a domain name and changes information about it. What triggers a notification? The working group is discussing. Basically, just

the change of the name of the owner, organization of the owner or the email address of the owner, and they would be whether or not there would be notifications to the prior and the new owners that change has happened.

And probably the most substantial change that'll come in a recommendation is domain name lock. Currently, there is a 60-day lock on any sort of movement of that domain name, if there's a change of any information for the domain. Evidently, this has caused a lot of confusion. The registrar's report that the domain name owners find this inhibiting and confusing, and it's a source of consternation that if you change your name or just update your email address and contact information on your domain name, that it locks the domain for 60 days. You can't move it to another registrar if you want to.

Some communities such as the registrars are eager to remove that lock. They find it not very useful for security or any other purpose. Other communities are really saying, well, 60-day locks may be too much, but they don't want to remove the lock altogether. They'd like to retain at least, maybe even a 30-day lock.

So, that's a long and short of what's happening. In the interest of time, I'll leave it there. I'll make an effort to put together a short briefing to circulate on the mailing list. But if anybody has any questions, they're welcome to ask. Or any comments or any preferences, please, send me an email or let me know. Thanks so much, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks so much, Ken. Quick question you can answer in less than a minute. What is NCSG's position on the lock thing? The notification, I can assume we want the notification, but on the lock thing, what's our position?

KEN HERMAN: I'm not aware that NCSG has a position per se on this. Certainly, it hasn't been discussed, and we're only just now looking at this in the working group. My opinion is that we should retain a lock. Other constituencies that represent the domain name owners are advocating, such as the Business Contingency, etcetera, continue to advocate for a continuation of the lock and full notifications of that. And I personally support that, and I would encourage the community to support notifications for both new and old information. It doesn't have to say what the change was. It just has to say that something happened. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Ken. We'll look forward to the detailed update on the mailing list. Thank you. All right. We had the update from Manju already, so I'll move on to Kathy to tell us about a bit of a background on SPIRT and why we should care.

KATHRYN KLEIMAN: Okay. And I will make this fast. But the reason we're talking about this is because we're looking for volunteers for this group. Now I just want you to note that that it looks like spurt, but we pronounce it SPIRT

because that sounds better. And this goes back to the SubPro working group making up the rules, reviewing the rules for the new gTLDs in the applicant guidebook. So, SPIRT stands for Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team. And this is another new idea. We keep coming up with some new ones. So, this is a new idea from the SubPro working group.

Many of us know what an implementation review team is. A working group, Policy Development Process working group makes the recommendations, but those recommendations are pretty high level. And so, they used to just be passed off many years ago to ICANN staff, but it's really hard to create the implementation details unless you're kind of in the heads of the people who created the rules. What's the legislative intent in some ways? So, we created Implementation Review Teams. While the Policy Development Process working groups are run by GNSO members, the Implementation Review Teams are run by staff, ICANN staff with people on them who are from the GNSO. And I think GAC and ALAC can also be on them, but I'm not sure.

And so, the Implementation Review Teams create the details, but they the Implementation Review Teams go away when that policy is implemented. But we found out in the first round of new gTLDs when you're processing 2,000, almost 2,000 applications, probably a lot more this time, that questions come up. And it's not clear. The recommendation isn't clear on that particular question. The implementation isn't clear on that particular question. And so, the idea of SubPro, particularly its chair, Jeff Newman, was to create a SPIRT team, a standing implementation review team, for lack of a better word.

So, when these special questions come up, they come back to the SPIRT group. The SPIRT group makes the tweak they think is necessary, reports it to Council. If the question is a really broad question, policy question, then that's absolutely supposed to go back to Council. We wrote special guardrails in. But this is a brand-new thing. It's going to be standing for a while. It's very important.

And again, processing the details of the new gTLD applications. If anyone wants to add, Avri probably knows a lot more. Stephanie, Tomslin, anybody wants to add to this, but we're looking for volunteers. It's a really, really important job. Somebody from NCSG, multiple people from NCSG should really be watching this closely. And anyone who's interested in the new gTLD process, this is a great time to really dive in. Thanks, Tomslin. Back to you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Kathy. Yes, we need multiple people, definitely, so that we can always have someone available for this. Let me know if you can and we'll make sure that they get signed up. Obviously, the preference will be someone who understands and is interested in the new gTLD program. All right. I'll pass it back to you, Kathy, to talk about the RPM IRT as well before we go ahead.

KATHRYN KLEIMAN:

Again, this is short, but let me just add something to the SPIRT, which is for those of us who went through four years of the subsequent procedures working group, it's time to pass this off. And so, we're happy to be advisers, but someone else should be, someone new should

be or someone who's been following this but maybe not on the working group, should be on the SPIRT team because that's going to be going forward. That's the new world, the new gTLDs. It's really kind of the opening up of a new stage of ICANN. So please volunteer.

So now we go back to the old world, which is the Rights Protection Mechanism working group number 8. Rights Protection mechanism working group, which I co-chaired, was talking about a small part of the overall new gTLD rules, but a really important part, the ones the lawyers care about, which is what are the rules for trademarks, and what are the rules for free speech and free expression and privacy, and how do those go together. So, I think that this is the group that reviews the trademark Clearing House and the Uniform Rapid Suspension. A future group will be looking at the UDRP.

So, we came up with our recommendations over four years, and now the Implementation Review Team is supposed to be looking at it. We submitted a comment that was like 8 to 10 pages on this. Pedro led that, and I went to the Implementation Review Team to make sure, see if they had any questions about our comments, to make sure they had incorporated them. There were only six comments. And it turns out they had ignored our comments completely, just completely overlooked them.

And so, at a certain point, they were reviewing edits and changes to the implementation rules of the recommendations, and they said, "Well, WIPO has a change." And I said, "NCSG has a change too. Where is it?" And they'd get to another area. "WIPO has a change." And I'm like, "Where's NCSG's change?" So, I've got to tell you, we need to be on

these implementation review teams. They, of course, stopped. They are going back. They are incorporating NCSG's comment, but there was no explanation of how they could ignore it, how they could ignore so many very, very specific comments. And it's dangerous, guys. We've got to be there. Back to you, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I have a quick question. And I should know this, but do we have any member in that Implementation Review Team?

KATHRYN KLEIMAN: I think you've got me now.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right. I'll dig it out. No worries.

KATHRYN KLEIMAN: But we're also not getting any reports from whoever's on the SubPro Implementation Review Team. And really important things, that's like two-- So, RPMs may be a quarter, if that, of the new gTLD issues, but SubPro is three-quarters of it. And we really need updates coming out of that implementation review team. I think we do have people there, but I'd love to know more about what's happening.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I'll follow up on that one. All right. I want to quickly go to the AOB before we close, and the ICANN planning AOB. Unfortunately, Julf is not

here, so I'll skip that. But Stephanie requested for me to add an AOB on the ICANN planning comment, public comments. I see your hand Farzi. Did you want to add another AOB?

FARZANEH BADII:

Yeah. Just two short ones. I have some questions about the ICANN planning I want to ask Andrea. And there is another thing about the ICANN fellows.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Okay. So, I'll go to Kathy. Sorry. Not Kathy. Stephanie. I just wanted to mention that I did request for an extension on that public comment, Stephanie, but I haven't yet heard back from staff. But over to you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I apologize. I did not engage on the budget thing. It's a lot of work. For those of you who've never looked at these planning documents and budget documents, you have to read all the background documents. A lot of the stuff is in summary, and you can't really tell where the money is going. It's very important where the money is going. You have to look back year on year so that you can notice trends and changes, expansion of budgets in one direction closed down in the other.

So, I was not engaged on this. You've heard me complaining about how overstretched I am. However, we had Judith come forward and drafted a document. It was basically, largely, she'd done the same thing for ALAC and brought it over for us, which I think we've been trying to work

more closely with ALAC and have a more congenial relationship for several years. So, nothing inherently wrong in that, except that there should be more transparency if we're going to basically take an ALAC document and plunk it into make it an NCSG document. I don't mean to be critical here, but just this is the procedure. If you're going to do that, everybody has to know that this is where the core of the dot came from.

And Judith was unaware of the process. A budget document, particularly, we have got rid of the additional budget requests. And if you wanted money for projects, it was to have been included in your comments on the budget. I certainly didn't realize this. I haven't been following the disappearance of the ABR process. Not my bailiwick. So quite frankly, I think we should have been looking for some project money here, and we didn't. We missed the boat. Unless somebody wants to whip up a project proposal very quickly and wedge it into this document.

Now, to be honest, I haven't had time to go through all the work that Judith has done. I started editing, then I immersed myself in the documents, and I'm not out of the documents yet, so I need more time. We did put out repeated calls for people to comment and help, and the only person that's come forward is Remi. But gang, we should care about the budget a lot more than the lack of volunteers is indicating here. So, I think if we don't get the extension, we should not put the existing comment in because if there's things we're missing, putting a comment in implies that that was a finished document.

And I don't think it does completely represent NCSG's interest yet. And maybe we can pull it together so that it does, but not without more

time. Unfortunately, Tomslin has to put it in, and Tomslin is in a bad time zone for the timing of the deadline because it's dead opposite of me, and I'm not going to get done till midnight with that. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. And, yeah, this is where we would have needed help from the financial committee, certainly. But yes, I think midnight will be early morning my time, so I'll be awake at midnight 12th of February. Nevertheless. But like I said, I have requested for an extension from ICANN. I send them an email Sunday, American time. I'm still waiting for feedback. I see Judith's hand up.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi. Am I being called on?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, please, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. It's Judith Hellstein for the record. Yeah. Stumped I responded. For the ALAC response, I was not the penholder of it, and their response has significantly changed since what people looked on earlier. So, it is not correct 100% correct. Maybe to say that it mirrors the ALAC. The ALAC is now a lot different than it used to be. In the early stages, the earlier people contributed, and I contributed earlier, and so that's why it was similar. And since I was the penholder, I brought my comments over. They were not ALAC comments until they're voted on later on.

So, it's a much-changed document. So, it's not really 100% saying to say that it's an ALAC document. Some of my stuff was taken out. Some of them was not.

I asked other people. I don't know as many of the comments, and I was a little shocked that there wasn't as many comments in some of the strategic priorities, and there wasn't any comments on the budget, what you want. And I thought, well, maybe NCSG has a different way of doing it. And so, it's just the way it is. I wish we could have had more comments, and I thank Remi and Stephanie for all the work they've done. It just shows that we need to be more prepared on certain issues at our budget. We focus a lot on policy issues in the NCSG and not as much governance issues. And that is one of the problems. And that's why the governance issues falls through. And so, maybe we could, next time, rectify that.

I'm not sure if they're going to give us our extension, but I think maybe what we could do is you could put in a comment and say, here's our preliminary comment. We will be adding to it, but we wanted to make sure we got something in before the deadline. You could try it out of close if they don't give you the extension. Because then that at least you get a door. And I think if you don't put a comment in, that's even worse. That seems like, oh, you don't really care. But I think if you're saying, well, we haven't had time to focus on it. We're going to get to a few more days, but here, we want to put our foot in the ground to make sure that we are commenting. But that's what I have to say. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Judith. Yes, we definitely needed help from the committee that we have as helping with those governance issues, especially with the budget, but we didn't get anyone from there. Unlike Stephanie said, when we requested for review many times, that was what we're hoping for but nothing came through. So, we definitely need better planning, like you suggested on budget issues. Let's see what comes through as Andrea has promised to keep an eye for us on the request. They have extended before when we've requested, so let's see how it goes, and we'll probably take the approach you mentioned there. Farzi?

FARZANEH BADI: Yeah. I just wanted talk about the AOBs. Can I talk about them now or?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, please.

FARZANEH BADI: Okay. Yeah. So, first of all, on the budget thing. And I have seen the leadership do this all the time. If you want comment, then you've got to tell us on what parts you need comments, what you need our opinion on because frankly, people don't know what is going on. And then suddenly, they see this forwarded email from the space that just hits them, and they're like, oh, what is this? What's this budget about? And we need to have a strategy before coming up with a budget, with a budget kind of come comments. Frankly, what are we going to use this budget for? For travel? To send more people to travel to ICANN

meetings and not contribute to policy? No. I think we need to have a strategy first before we actually work on a budget.

So, anyway, there are two more things that I wanted to say. One is that we have been trying to organize a meeting during the NCSG meeting in Puerto Rico with the Contracted Party House and with SSAC. So, I don't know. We tried to do one with GAC as well. GAC is very eager to meet with us. They didn't have the time. But these are the two that Julf is trying to organize. Andrea, I haven't followed up on the SSAC meeting. If you can tell us what the status of those meetings are. And we need to talk to SSAC about what NCSG is about and what we stand for and how their comments on different matters, what we think about their comments, especially about access to personal information of domain name registrants. And so, there was one thing.

Another thing that I think we need to address, I mean, it's not a big deal, but I went to the fellowship list the other day. And then I saw that some of the fellows had put in intellectual property, civil society, and like academia security as their stakeholder group. I don't think that's a stakeholder group designation, but I think we should be very, very clear with the fellows that if you're civil society and you want to join a Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, you cannot be a part of Intellectual Property Constituency and generally have commercial interest in mind. Thank you. Sorry. I took time some time.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you. I think Andrea already responded to your question as well on the chat. She hasn't heard back from them. But I agree that we

need to correct the fellows. I guess we need to have that better interaction with the fellowship as well, as we used to. We've gone overtime, and thankfully, I haven't seen Andrea ask me to shut down right now. But thanks, everyone, for staying and letting us go 11 minutes overtime. And yeah. I'll see you in Puerto Rico if you're there. Otherwise, see you online.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you, everyone. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]