

---

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the NCSG Policy Committee meeting being held on Monday, the 15th of July 2024 at 11:30 UTC. 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 multi-stakeholder 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 thanks everyone for joining. We will go straight into our agenda because we do have a packed one. I did get requests from our community to have someone give us an update on the African domain name system, the DNS Africa study. And today we have with us Yaovi to give us an update on that. And hopefully we can ask him any questions that we have after that update. So I'll hand it over to Yaovi. Thank you so much for coming.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you very much. Thank you for inviting me, Yaovi speaking. I'll try to share my screen. And then I'll also try to take like just seven minutes, something like that, to share the key, the key from the report. Again, this report is a request from, is a solution or an answer to a request from the community. In the Africa region, we do have a regional plan, which is ending this fiscal year, fiscal year 25. So one of the recommendations or the action in this regional plan was to have

---

*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.*

---

another study on the domain name industry in Africa. So one, the previous one was published in 2017. So this company, Power South Africa, is the one who was commissioned for this study. And then what I want to share with you is briefly some of the recommendations, mainly the recommendations. But before that, this study was supposed to, is taken into account 54 countries. So it is taken into account 54 countries. And also another outcome was a trial observatory that was proposed, is proposed by Power South Africa, a trial observatory. So I'll talk briefly about that one too. So the study covered 54 countries. And what I want to mention is that the way they did the study is that there is an online survey in many languages, in English, in French, in Portuguese, Arabic, Spanish, and Swahili. And the questionnaire, the participants were registry, registrant, registrar, reseller, regulator, ISP manager, and data center operators. [So the record metrics for each study and] generic top level domain. So the study looked at the website location, where is the website. So we have the, like on the continent, where people are hosting the website using these domain names. Besides the language, does this website support IPv6, is DNSSEC implemented? So also how many websites are hosted in country, in Africa, overseas, and by region, by language?

Okay, what I want to just summarize on this screen is that the company mentioned that it was hard for them to get data. It was very hard for them. So they mentioned that only data from ccTLD up to, from 4 to 11 countries, while we are talking about 54 countries. So they mentioned that only a maximum of 11 countries were able to provide data. We have also a diverse region, as they mentioned, the income, language, we don't have the same language. We have some countries speaking

---

the official languages, some of them in English, some of them French, some of them Portuguese. So we have this one. And then also the internet access, we have 43% for Africa, the access, when we are talking about internet access, while we have 68 for the rest of the world. And for the penetration, it varies between 7% and 85%. So the general finding is that there is a low demand for domain names. When you consider countries or Africa, there is a very low demand for domain names.

So this is why when I show you some of the data from the results, before that also the company mentioned that there are some factors that are very important for the success of the domain name industry. They mentioned the infrastructure aspect, and people should have affordable access. They mentioned the digital awareness, the price, the ease of registration. So they mentioned some factors which they look at in various countries.

So I want to come to the key element of the conclusion. I already mentioned that the continent is highly diverse. So that is something we have to consider. And they mentioned that there are two countries, mainly when we consider Kenya and South Africa. So Kenya and South Africa, I mentioned that the two most successful countries in Africa in terms of domain. So if you look at the full report, you should be able to see the number of domain names in these countries. You can also see Morocco, Nigeria. So we have seen some changes in other countries, also in the region.

So if we take also these two countries, Kenya and South Africa. We see like EPP, that protocol, they have more than 100 accredited registrar.

---

Like in some countries, you have just the country code, ccTLD registry, who used to register domain, who is registering domain. So if someone wants to have a domain name under the ccTLD, in most of the country, you don't have the 3R, what they call the 3R model, where you have the registry plane visible. You have the registrars. And then you have also the registrant going to the registrar for domain registration. So we have a few countries, not all of them, using the 3R model. So the report mentioned that we have Kenya and South Africa. We have a good progress in these two countries.

So there is a company also called Freenom. In the past, this company has contracted with some countries. You can see Gabon, Central Africa, and Mali. Freenom was in these countries. And this country had about more than 400,000 domain name registrations. So I know that most of these ccTLDs, or they have already done already, there's no more contract between these ccTLDs and Freenom. So Gabon, Mali, Central Africa Republic, I need to check. But I know that Gabon and Mali, there's no more contract between Freenom and these ccTLDs.

What I want to mention also is that between this period from 2017 and 2023, we see a small growth in the domain name registry. But this is very, very, very small when you see the growth for domain registration. And again, I have just two minutes left. What I want to mention also is that the study is also recommending that the 3R model is something that can help to have the domain name industry growth. And we see also this as a recommendation most of the time, the discussion happening during the Africa domain name system.

So what I want also to mention is a trial observatory that PowerSoft Africa proposed. So I know that it is very difficult for them to have many countries participating in this. So in this screen, you can see, for example, they have so far Cameroon participating. They have Central African Republic, they have Congo, and you can see there are some data also they are making available through this observatory. So when people go there, people can see the number of domain names that are registered. People can see the website in the country where they are registered.

I think I will stop there. So the element I want to mention is that from the findings also, the second aspect is the trial observatory. So it is not ICANN pushing 14 countries to go to that observatory, but it is something they are proposing to many countries. And as the region, our department, we are thinking about how to these tools can be used by the various community, especially the Africa top level domain name or the domain name business industry.

So I just want to stop there. And then we have our email address that I can post in the chat. As I mentioned during the presentation, if you can write to [gsesafrica@icann.org](mailto:gsesafrica@icann.org), we should be able to please respond to your question. So thank you so much for your understanding. So the study is available online. Now it's fully published. And then you can go there and take your time and look at the full report. So thank you so much. I don't know. We still have more than 10 minutes. Thank you so much.

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Yaovi. Thank you so much for the presentation. We do have questions. And I see Farzaneh's hand is up, so we'll go to Farzaneh. And there are some questions in the chat as well. I'll probably speak them out.

FARZANEH BADI: Yeah, thank you, Tomslin. And thank you for the presentation, Yaovi. What I wanted to ask, so as the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, we care about privacy in domain name, privacy of the domain name registrants. And also the freedom of expression and a host of human rights issues. One of the things that I noticed in the report, and I apologize if I don't frame it correctly, I saw there was some mention of privacy of the domain name registrants in the report. But the report did not go in depth on exactly what is going on. So my question is, do you see an area of further research for privacy of domain name registrants in Africa?

And the other thing that you mentioned was that you surveyed registrants for this study. And I wanted to know if you also did a distinction between commercial registrants and non-commercial registrants. And that is also important for the non-commercial stakeholder group because we care about access to knowledge and other issues that could affect non-commercial domain name registrants.

And my third question, I'm sorry, I will go back down after this. My third question is about surveying the internet users and their access to the domain names. And whether their access to the domain names have been measured, whether their access to the domain name was affected

---

at some point. And if so, which domain names and what were the reasons?

Usually, what we do in our stakeholder group is to look at how different laws and regulations that have transnational effect could have an effect on access to domain names as well. So I just wanted to know if you consider those in this study or if you came upon some of these issues that was not within the scope, but you think that they are areas for further research. Thank you.

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Thank you very much. So I will start by the last one. Some of the recommendations, for example, they were recommended from the PowerSoft company. In some countries currently, if you don't have a focal point in the country, you cannot register a domain name. So one of the recommendation is, for example, to the ccTLD especially to allow people, even if they are not in the country, to register domain name. I know some years ago, there was an agreement between the ccTLD in Kenya and the one in Nigeria. But I didn't know so far how far they went in the discussion between these two ccTLDs. So this is something I don't see too much personally, but I didn't look at that in the report.

When you mentioned also the registrants that were part of the report, I didn't clearly see the mention about if they are not commercial or not commercial. So the report mentioned the registrants. So probably something I can look at later and let you know. Let my colleague look at this and then check also with PowerSoft and go back to you.

---

When you talk about the privacy of domain names, so this one generally, the ccTLDs, they have the rules from country to country. So we have just a few gTLD as part of this report, like .Africa and a few generic top-level domain in Africa. So this one, they are following the general rule. But if you mention the ccTLDs, I think the rules vary from one country to the other. So these are the answers I can provide to your questions so far. So those I could not respond, what I can do is to go back to PowerSoft and maybe get back to you by email. Please feel free to mail me for a specific question and I'll be happy to offer my colleague and come back to you on that one. Thank you so much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Yaovi. We do have two more questions. But I just wanted to note that it was interesting that in the DLDs that were in Africa, most of the gTLDs are really city names or regional names. That's interesting. So mostly the ccTLDs that influence the report. Benjamin, then Stephanie.

BENJIMIN AKINMOYEJE: Yeah. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Yaovi, for such an insightful presentation. I've also read the report and also I was at the launch. Congratulations. I just have a question. And my question is, if maybe a country, I don't know, has some issues with the content or the conclusions of the report and probably have sent for some amendments or things like that, is there room for adjustment or this report will continue to share the same content or there's a possibility of, oh, we've seen now that the report is out or new data is up, is there a chance for adjustment or updating of the report? Thank you.



YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Benjamin, I think that is a very good point you raised. After the session in Kigali, we had the same question because some countries or some participants, they mentioned that what they have in the report is not accurate. They mentioned that one. But we told them that, unfortunately, before the publication, we called the community to make comments to the report. We receive a lot of input, comment, very, very important comment that help us to maybe have a better document, if I can say that. But to answer your question, I think there should be a room to improve the report, if necessary. We cannot say that the report is. If I take the example, we had one report in 2017. And then the community see that, okay, we should have another report. So what I can take from your question is that we as ICANN staff supporting the region, we should think seriously about that one because it's not just for you alone. So other people mentioned that there is a need to make some correction to the content. So definitely, I see probably something we can do in the next regional plan we want to develop. So it's something we can look and take into consideration to work on that. If not this fiscal year, it's something we can look at. It may not be necessarily a world study, but the community can help. And we can see the way to do that. So your comment is very welcome. And then it's noted, I'll reply back to my colleague. And definitely, we have some upcoming regional meeting so we can discuss that again. And definitely, we should address what you mentioned. Thank you so much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Yaovi. Stephanie, last.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks very much. Very, very interesting report. And I regret to say that I haven't read it yet. So I'll probably have lots more questions after I read it. But great presentation. I'll try to be quick. I had typed my three questions in the chat. So maybe we can push those out and send them to you. But the first one is basically, I'm concerned about the widespread access to the internet through social media. That doesn't usually spell good privacy. And I'm wondering if there's any further information you have on that. Because there wouldn't be any enforcement action with once you're using social media.

Secondly, did you look at the two leading countries, Kenya and South Africa? Is that because English is dominant? And clearly, having to translate and operate in the wide number of languages is an expense and is not well facilitated by existing systems as yet. I mean, we're working on it.

And then thirdly, and this pertains more to economic activity, I'm wondering if the postal union and the post offices in all these countries have a role to play in internet access and if they have expressed any interest. Because that could be very helpful in terms of economic development, and in particular, serving in financial transfers. Thank you.

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Thank you so much. So I'll start by the post office. We do have some contact from the postal union. And through the project or the program we call the Coalition for Digital Africa. So we had some discussion about the idea from this organization where the postal offices at the country

---

---

level, they can be points to help country code top level domain names to grow. So I can confirm that you have this idea. But this idea didn't move too far, but it is something that countries can explore.

You see most of the postal organization in many countries, they have shift or not shift. They are not doing just traditional services. So they really think that moving to that area of supporting the country, ccTLD, is an area they are thinking about in many countries, but I could not see concrete example yet.

Now, Kenya and South Africa is not just because of the language. If you see South Africa, if you see even the domain name, the total number from Africa, around the 4 million, you have more than a million only from South Africa. This is also, I can say, is linked to the development of the ICT in general when you take this country. So the language [inaudible] the aspect, but is the business environment in these two countries that are making the influence.

And then when you mentioned social media and the privacy, there are many countries in Africa now. I'm not referring to the report. I didn't check that. So now we have many countries where the law, the ICT law, and the various law, they are seriously considering these impacts. So I know that in many countries, they are taking seriously the impact of social media and privacy. And then they are really taking action. And there are some law that are trying to help to keep in mind the privacy of our users. So these are the questions I can provide. And then feel free, again, to please send the additional mail to [gseafrika@icann.org](mailto:gseafrika@icann.org). And we will really be happy to make a follow-up. Thank you so much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Yaovi, for that presentation and for helping answer some of the questions we have. Thank you. We will move on now to the third item on our agenda, which will be to review the council agenda for the upcoming meeting later this week. And for that, Peter will be helping us. So I'll pass on to you, Peter.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Thank you so much, Tomslin. And that was a good session to just put input from everyone. So I'm going to walk you through the council agenda. So I will start from the item three on the consent agenda. So the council will have two items to discuss, just to consent about. The first one is the GNSO PRO officer roles and responsibility. So these came up from the report that we got from the communication team to enhance the GNSO communication within the ICANN environment and also to better communicate what GNSO is all about. So we've received a volunteer, I'll say, Lawrence actually volunteered for that role. So here, the council will be consenting on that. And the second one talks about the pilot holistic review, so the council will be consenting on those people that are willing to step forward for those that have their names submitted already.

So item number four talks about the EPDP on temporary specifications as talking about the urgent request. And I'm sure that we've had discussion about this. So the council will be considering the guidelines that I was saying when it comes to the recommendation item of the EPDP phase one about urgent request whether there's rationale behind

---

that proposition, that policy that was developed against the EPDP did not really specify the rationale behind the urgent request from law enforcement and left it to implementation teams. And I guess that's where the issue is. That is the way the community are now speaking up about that. And I'm sure that we have our own reservation concerned. I don't know if there is any further input that we need to discuss about that. Let me see if there are any comments.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think Kathy is wondering whether Stephanie has any additional input on that item. But I just wanted to say that I think the hope is that the council will agree on next steps on how to proceed on this item from the board. So that is really the desired outcome for that one.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Okay, great. Thank you so much, Tomslin. I want to see, are there any other comments? I saw that. Kathy, put something on the chat.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: And I also see, sorry, Peter, I see a question from Rafik, which is directed to me. Maybe I'll quickly answer, whether leadership discussed some proposals. And I think they did indeed discuss some proposals. I would say discuss possible outcomes rather than proposals. And one of those outcomes is that the council either will agree to what the board might agree to what the board rationale is. And then if that's the case, we'll choose to consider the fact that the way the policy was written, it will, while to agree with the rationale, but it won't agree with the fact that

---

the policy is not implementable because the way it was written is that a timeline will be considered. And therefore, the council could make that argument that the policy was written, that it will be considered. And the IRT did indeed consider it and found that it couldn't come up with a specific implementation or feasible implementation for urgent requests. So that's one possible outcome. And the other is maybe if the council does choose to go for a specific EPDP, maybe just for this specific item, that could be another possibility. But yeah, the leadership is really hoping to see what the council in general thinks about this. I do know that when it was discussed in Kigali, there were some people in the room that didn't think that or rather suggested that council should push back on the board's rationale that there is no way to handle this moving forward. That one way to handle it is the board should ask the council to start a PDP. That is already documented as a way to move forward with such an item. So it will be an interesting conversation on those things. And I see Stephanie's hand up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes, thank you, Stephanie Perrin, for the record. I'm just responding to Kathy's request for my comments. I think we have to remember we cannot be working on attempting to promote access to the DNS through the growth of small registrars—and for instance, we just heard from the African report—and push for permit faster access. One of the arguments that the registrars advanced during all of our work on this, and both in the—I'm struggling over the EDPB on this and the PDP, was through Volker Greimann. And he also advanced it in the WHOIS review group that I was on almost simultaneously. If you're a small registrar, you cannot staff a 24-hour desk over the weekend that will have a legal

---

team that will investigate the validity of an urgent request from law enforcement. And you can't release the data unless you know who you're releasing it to. So this is the kind of a structural impediment to saying yes to any of these urgent requests. It's just not possible. We in NCSG have to balance respect for urgent requests with respect for growth of internet access and DNS access in developing countries. And that really also means in different languages. I mean, language is always an issue if you're dealing with foreign law enforcement. So just putting that out there. So yes, it'll be an interesting discussion. We had a lot of conflicts with the schedule during the Kigali meeting. So frankly, I don't have notes from that meeting. But I'll check back. Thanks.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO:

Okay, thanks so much, Stephanie. And I can see a comment. Farzaneh. Okay, great. I guess we know where we stand on the urgent request. Okay, so we move to item number five, which is accuracy checking. So we've been discussing this also. And we know both the problem is because there is no data to actually assess the, to carry on the accuracy efforts, the recommendations in assessing the accuracy of the registration data. And here, the council, in follow up with the questions that was raised by the council chair, the GNSO council chair. So during the meetings, they will be looking at, is there any alternative ways of carrying out this? So there are three questions that the council will be discussing. And just looking out and see how to determine next step. What are the propositions of the alternative way of carrying this effort if there are no data? And also, is this actually visible? So how do we need to do this? So this will be a big discussion as well. I'm sure that Stephanie is on the call. And also, if she wants to chip in on these, or any

---

other persons that want to jump. Maybe you have been following this. Sorry. I'm dialing it. I'm joining from my phone, so having a hard time to navigate. Oh, okay. Kathy is proposing something for AOB. Okay, great. We can move to the next item.

So on GAC communique. So I'm sure that every ICANN meeting, so GAC actually released their communique on what they perceive, what they think is relevant. So here, we'll be receiving updates on the content, the analysis of the content of the GAC communique, because it's something that they can actually follow up. And to be able to respond to different issues that is raised by the GAC, that we need to update the board as well. So here, we'll be just getting an update on that and discussing that, the review of our content. So next item. Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Thank you, Peter. Thank you for this detailed briefing. It's great. I was wondering whether we have any people who are on the small group of GNSO councilors reviewing the GAC communique?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Okay, Tomslin, do you want? Okay, I can see yes. Manju say yes.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Okay, I just wanted to point out, in case we didn't, but I'm glad we do, that there is a long section, fairly long for a GAC communique on applicant support, on the applicant support program. And that that's worth taking a look at. But there are also a lot of issues we are concerned about and interested in in this communique, from registry



---

voluntary commitments, to DNS abuse, to registration data request service, and registration data accuracy. So I would urge everybody to ask this small group of councilors a lot of questions about the GAC communique, because I think, if I remember correctly, the council now responds to the GAC communique. So if we have questions, they should go into that response. Thanks. Questions or support, if we really support what they're saying about the applicant support program. Thanks.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Okay, thanks for raising that. Manju's hand is up as well. Please.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. I just wanted to note, it's a common misunderstanding. I came into this with this misunderstanding, too. The GNSO response to GAC communique is not a response to the GAC. The GNSO review of GAC communique is actually a supplemental information for the board when they're considering the GAC communique. So within this GNSO review, we're only going to provide factual information that has been done by council. It's not going to be any response to any of the GAC advice in terms of not any substantial response to whether we agree or not agree or whatever council's position is on it. It's only a reiteration of what has been discussed within council and what has been done by the council. So it's not going to be any response. Thanks.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, thanks so much, Manju. That's a good one. This is not about responding to the GAC. It's just for the GNSO to just be updated about

GAC works and also to be able to facilitate their communication with the board and what they're currently working on. And it's just like a kind of a way to get an understanding of what is going on and be effective in their communication with the board and also to stay up to date on what they're doing. Okay, great.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Peter, can I interrupt? That's not what I heard Manju saying, though. What I heard Manju saying was that the council doesn't respond to the GAC, which is a really important reminder. But the council is informing the board. And the board has to respond to the GAC. And the board has unique powers in that it can say yes to a GAC—the GAC communicates are sometimes informative and sometimes directive where they're directing ICANN to do something and change something. Here, I haven't had the chance to analyze it because I've been working on the singulars and plurals. But sometimes the GAC tells the board to change things. And in that case, the GNSO council has the opportunity to tell the board why it shouldn't or what the process was behind the PDP or the decision. I'm not trying to create a conflict where it doesn't exist. But I think GNSO council input to the board on a GAC communicate could be very, very, very timely and important.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO:

Yes, I completely agree. So yeah, in that case, then it's the council that they have the responsibility to tell them, oh, this is what we're working on, this is what [inaudible]. Yeah. And that's why it is important to actually discuss that. And that's why this is coming to, is on the agenda

---

---

to discuss that. Thanks. Okay, great. Also, I'm just thinking, if possible also, I know that we have a lot of work. I'm sure that we also need to stay up to date, maybe like if we have not been reading GAC communique. So we need to start reading that also. As NCSG, not GNSO council. Okay, great.

Next item, which is on the singular and plurals. So here, the council will be receiving from the small team plus on singular and plural. I'm sure that this has been one of the long conversations that we've been having in NCSG. And also, I'm sure that we have some experts working on this as well. Okay, so council will be receiving an update in the work of small team plus on singular and plural. So are there any comments on this? Comments? I'm not seeing. Okay, great. So we'll move on.

So here, the council will discuss any further action on item number eight. That's SubPro small team's supplemental recommendations and the recommendations that were not adopted. So the council will discuss any further action. Or any further action should be pursued of any non-adopted recommendations. Also, the small team, we will be updating. And we give introduction on this topic in the next coming GNSO council meeting. So I don't know if anyone wants to jump in and look at these. Because these are some of the things that Kathy actually talked about, like applicant support and the non-adopted supplemental recommendation, registry voluntary commitment, public interest commitment. Tomslin?

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. And I think applicant support was adopted. So I think I just wanted to point out to members of NCSG of the two items that were not adopted. Because the conversation on Thursday is to map out a way forward on these two items, whether we should drop them altogether, or there is any benefit working on them. So your input, actually, is quite key on these two, going into that conversation for NCSG councilors.

And the two items are the registry voluntary commitment and the PICs, and the second is terms and conditions. And top of my head, I'm trying to remember why those two were not adopted. I believe for the registry voluntary commitments and PICs, it was because of the exception that was given to the dot brands regarding DNS abuse specifically. And then I think I can't remember the rationale that the board gave for the second one, which is the terms and conditions. But going into that conversation, I think we need some input from our community, whether you think this is something worth fighting for. Because the council has the option to go into that section 16 to modify this non-adopted until it is either adopted or rejected. It could, another small team plus could be spun up here. So yes, your input is necessary.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Thanks. Okay, next on the queue. Kathy, please.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yeah, could whoever is running the slides move down so we can see all of topic nine? Thank you. So this is a supplemental recommendation that I haven't seen for a long time. Every time we get to brands, they try to create an exception. So I'd have to go back and take a look at this.

Because I haven't seen this in a long time. Can we see the supplemental recommendation below, the other ones that are being discussed? Applicant support, we certainly support. Because we worked very hard on that. That was [inaudible]and me. No, we didn't kill RVCs, Farzaneh. What we said was that we did not want RVCs that required monitoring of content. That ICANN's remit does not include content. But that an RVC could do other things, such as review who the registrants are. We do that in old gTLDs, like .edu and .gov. Who is the registrant coming in? But we did, strangely and surprisingly, win on the fact that RVCs will not involve any content. And lots and lots of people had been very concerned that they would.

I can take a close look at this. Again, this is old news. We're still working on supplemental recommendations now, singulars and plurals, a lot of times being spent on that. So I'm happy to take a close look and see what we're talking about here. But I share the concern that we've created a lot of exceptions for the .brands. But I can't tell you that probably everything here was agreed to by the small team. Thanks.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO:

Thank you so much, Kathy, for the comment. Anybody else? Okay. Then we can move to item number nine. We talked about the IPC request ICANN board for the reconsideration of their action and inaction. And the new gTLD auction proceed. Which involved the implementation of the ICANN grant-giving program. So I've not really been following this. So if you've been following it, I would appreciate it to come.

---

But what led to this? Why is this on the council agenda? So in Kigali, there were discussion about that. And some council actually volunteered to drive it right to the board on that request for the consideration. So we'll be having an update on these. [inaudible] council meeting. So I don't know if Tomslin can jump in to give some background details.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think you already gave the background. A small team is working on a draft letter from the GNSO. So not to necessarily support IPC, but as a response to the general concern about issues being dismissed without proper analysis by the board. And I haven't seen that draft yet. So I guess we'll be seeing the draft presented to us on Thursday.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Thanks so much, Tomslin. Okay. Move to item number 10, which is any other business. So we'll be looking at aspirational statement. I'm sure that we know what this is all about. So we've been having these discussions. And we also have voted it. But we've seen a lot of back and forth on that. So that will also just be discussed. And the second one is the SPS action follow up. So strategic planning session for the council. So they're currently planning on that, where councilor comes together to plan for [inaudible] coming years. And recommendation report, we'll be looking at those recommendation report, public comment reviews and how to enhance council deliberations as well as involvement in making policy better. And also how we meet. Also, this is a critical one that we need to discuss. And also touch on how we meet, how ICANN

---

meeting is held every year. So what do we need to do? Do we need to improve that? So our comment and our input on this is very important. I guess maybe there's no time now to discuss that, or maybe we can discuss that. Maybe I don't know if Tomslin, do you have it on agenda?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: It's probably a good segue to that item and the next item on the agenda.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Okay, great, great. And any other business that we need to discuss will be the IDN input, because I was on a call the last time. And there were based on the NCSG comment on the IDN input. It was too wordy and it was difficult to actually get a point out. And our expert group was not available on the call because of another meeting that was being held, the West African IGF. So I'm sure that we need to have that discussed, or maybe during the AOB, not on the council agenda. Okay, just wanted to point out how. So there is no other item on the agenda, so I will give the floor back to Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, and thanks for promoting the AOB on IDN. It's already on the agenda at the AOB. Hopefully, we'll get to it in time. But let's quickly jump to the how we meet dialogue. I don't know, Andrea, if you have my email on hand to project it. But basically, like I mentioned in the email, Sally met with the support organizations and advisory council leadership in Kigali. And she mentioned to us that she will be sending

---

our way a proposal for us to start discussing how we meet and how we work.

Now, what we have so far and what I've shared is only on how we meet. So how we work is still to come. And based on what was shared, we do have some ideas to guide us in the conversation. But one thing, I think I will share that link on chat so that people might be able to go there again as I'm talking.

Two foundational questions that were asked in that proposal were if you or your group could change one thing about how we meet that will facilitate efficiency in how we deliver our mission while remaining sustainable into the future, what would that be? And the second was, what are the key changes do we need to make to continue to ensure we can meet these goals?

Now, this is all in the backdrop of costs, of course. Reducing the number of people who can attend meetings, reducing the number of physical meetings themselves, possibly reducing the number of sessions in meetings. So that's all what this is about. And we meant to have that conversation about that.

So because of the very tight timeline that is available to us, I think we are meant to provide our input to the GNSI leadership by the 24th of July. So I'll bring this for discussion today. At least we have a discussion, and then we can continue having that on or putting our comments on the document. So with that, I'll open the conversation up for input. And the first on the queue is Rafik.



---

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, this is Rafik speaking. Thanks, Tomlin, for sharing this. So just a few comments to start after reviewing the document. I think the first point to have in mind, it's I don't believe it's just about how we meet. Because I think the whole focus or the purpose is on regarding that cost reduction, knowing what's going on for ICANN situation. And I think that's what drives the whole thing.

But however, I would say we should be open-minded here and see if there are anything useful. I believe there are some points that can be interesting to discuss. And I think we have maybe to really explore them. Personally, I don't have so much reservation about them. There are other points I guess that will create more tension and issues, and I don't see how they'd be really resolved, like regarding the current allocation of funded travel, and particularly for the community, anything that will open a can of worms that's not really good for us.

So there are I think some points we can really explore and discuss. For example, reducing the number of sessions and so on. I don't think it's something that should not happen. I do believe that we should explore that more. Because the issue that we should have in mind that for many years, ICANN just added things. So at some level, and it's good to practice, you need to think what you need to reduce or subtract. And we have a problem with that, so we just added more session and the prep week and after it. So at the end, it's also create more work and overload for us. So why not reducing the session to really focus on some of the topic?

And the other point I want to highlight by reading all this is that I think in the particular point number three, if I'm not mistaken, or number

---

two, is regarding that we will have to think about the meeting by an annual basis. And that will push us as a group here to think in terms of planning. And not just kind of struggling just before every ICANN meeting to figure out what kind of topics or session we want. And we spend our time, it's kind of an ad hoc approach. But what is suggested here will push us to really think as a stakeholder group to plan for the year what will be our priority, what will be our goals, and how we will use the kind of opportunities here in the meetings. Because it's also that once something is proposed, maybe if we can reduce one ICANN meeting and replace it by a virtual meeting and so on. And also maybe, again, by reducing the session.

So it's not just about meeting. And this is kind of maybe the part kind of how we work. It's for us not just to build our work and planning just before every ICANN meeting, try to figure out, but really to plan for the whole year. And that will be kind of a change for us and also for the other groups.

Other than that, yeah, I think like I don't know, for example, like the proposal number five, reducing informational and training session also to be discussed. But I think also what is important that it's not just about ICANN meeting, but all kind of meetings, including like for the GNSO Council that the SPS or the board meeting and so on. So I guess here is really to think again how we can review what's going on because we added many things and try to optimize and streamline.

I think it can have some benefit at the end because adding just more meetings, it puts some pressure on us. We don't work for ICANN. And most of us, our work is not related to ICANN. So having more meetings,

---

it's kind of, I think, put the pressure on us. So if we can review and to think how we can optimize and really to have the meetings that can bring benefit and to achieve our goals is something we also should discuss. So I advise everyone to go through this and to share the comments, but this is my initial thoughts and I will try later on to put them in the document. So thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Rafik. That's really helpful. Stephanie, then Benjamin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. I haven't read the report that these questions are based on, so I'd like to read the report before I tear it apart. But I think costs are very real. Anybody who's been planning travel for their work knows that costs are way up. Did we get a full analysis of costs with this discussion on how we meet is a question.

I think we need to separately evaluate what we get from face-to-face meetings. I had commented that in my view face-to-face meetings are very useful for breaking logjams in PDPs. And we've had a lot of PDPs where we actually made progress when we got together face-to-face. Finding a budget to get like two dozen people on a PDP together is hard work. We know it. We can't even get to meet the other side of the house because usually they turn us down. So I think we have to stick to our guns and ask for a qualitative evaluation of what we get from face-to-face meetings.

---

Now, having said that, I do think that one of the benefits of face-to-face meetings, the big, sprawling, long, overlong, I would say, meetings that we're likely to have at the annual meeting, for instance, they're useful in that we meet the other sides of the community. And the ICANN stakeholder groups can get remarkably myopic. And as people who really believe in the multi-stakeholder vision, we have to remember however cynical we get, and I get as cynical as anybody these days. I think I should get the award. However cynical we get, it is useful to go and see what the Aaron people are doing, to go and crash the SSAC meetings, to have a coffee with some of the SSAC people, to actually rub shoulders with some of the people. And that's important, but I'm not sure that we actually maximize those opportunities in our meeting planning these days. If we're just going to advance work on PDPs or do a fluff show and tell of what's going on with a PDP, then we might as well do that virtually. So much of the meetings nowadays are canned presentations that we could easily have listened to on Zoom, rather than drag everybody into a room. What really helps is when we actually get to talk to the different stakeholder groups in real meetings, not fluff pieces. So that's enough out of me. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. Benjamin, Kathy, then last, Peter, and we'll move on.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Yeah, thank you. I've read the document and in all honesty, I think if an analysis is done, we already have the bare bones. It's not like the meetings we have a large, I mean, I'm talking from NCUC perspective,

---

we just get a little portion of the meeting and very little representation as well. So I would say if there are meetings or sessions that are not as valuable, they can be tossed out of the window. What I'm saying for us, I think it shouldn't be done across board. It should be done, people should be evaluated and I mean, groups should be evaluated, sessions should be evaluated at the service of the purpose. Because if you take away some of the few sessions we have or the little time or few representatives we have, then you practically just almost, is an existential threat for us. Like our participation would really be diminished. So for me, in as much as I like some of the ideas, if it's applied or implemented across board without looking at it subjectively, it would affect us badly. That's what I feel. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Benjamin. Kathy?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yeah, and I appreciate Benjamin sharing his thoughts on the list as well to help kind of stimulate discussion and thinking before we came into this meeting. So that was great. I agree with what everyone else is saying. Let me say that doing it at this moment in time to me is mind boggling. I know we have to, I know ICANN feels it has to, because we're going into the new gTLDs. The last time we went into a round of new gTLDs, it was a London meeting. It was 6,000 people. It was the biggest meeting ICANN had ever, ever hosted because there was massive interest, concern, questions about the new gTLD program. If we cut back now, we will lose the very thing that we are trying to do, which is

get many more people involved in interested in new gTLDs. Newcomers through the applicant support program, through the outreach and marketing are going to come in and they will have a million questions about ICANN just as we did when we came in. So we need those education and outreach sessions and we need them sometimes face to face so people can actually ask the dumb question in the hallway, the question they would never raise their hand to ask in an online session. We need to come together. We need to be working on, we're going to have comments and concerns about new gTLDs, about the program, but also when they come out, we need opportunities to bring this together. It's much easier to raise concerns in person. And so I'm concerned about all these reductions.

Even reducing the common areas of gathering, of activity. Let me take you back to the old days of ICANN where everything was sponsored by Network Solutions and a lot of people weren't invited. And then it was sponsored by a few large parties and most of us were not invited. By creating the common areas of gathering and reception, ICANN created a place for all of us to mingle kind of equally in the evenings. Take that out and we're not going to like the results. A lot of deals will be cut behind closed doors. ICANN is a 501(c)(3). Let it go out and get grants like the rest of us. ICANN can raise money through grants. It should, thanks. Sorry for talking so long.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you. Peter.

---

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Thank you. Yeah, so I align with what everyone has said. And another thing that we just need to look at is just to know the intent of the letter, whether it might not be fully feasible, like what they are trying to do. But my concern is if we really want to evaluate ICANN meetings and productivity and effectiveness, we should do it right. We should get an independent reviewer to do this and to be able to advise on what is the next phase of what we need to do because if you're doing it, we're getting a lot of emotion out there because it's going to affect a lot of community stakeholders and we will see a lot of [inaudible] what we're proposing. So this should be done by an independent reviewer to be able to say this is what ICANN needs to do to save costs, to be effective and to do whatever they want to do. But going this way is not going to solve anything and is going to even add to the problem. So I guess we need to look beyond responding to this letter and look at how do they need to get this done. So that's just what I want to say, thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Peter. Looking forward to see all those comments in the document so that we can compile them and send them through. All right, we will move on to the next agenda item which is a quick one on an update from Benjamin on Continuous Improvement Program community Coordination Group. Benjamin.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you everybody. I just brought this continuous improvements working group work to you again. The last time I spoke with you, I discussed the principles of continuous improvements that they want to

---

consider, the five principles. And I just want to dig your brain to try and recall the conversations we had. It's in your email boxes and you could quickly run there and just look at it. So this is the principles, but what am I talking about today? Next slide, please.

So based on the principles, I mean, there are a few things that need to be done that we need input from everybody. And I really mean it when we say we need input from you. Please look at this because you are going to see it in the future that is going to be applied to us one way or the other. Is things like, so the principles have to have criteria. I will share that shortly. And then also smart indicators. Next slide, please.

I don't have a lot of time, so I'm going to rush through it. So this, in case you want to understand what the criteria of the principles mean. Remember I said, the principle one was the SOACs or NOMCOM is fulfilling its purpose. Now, the example that I want to use here is principle number three, which is the operations of the SOs, which is related to us, are efficient. So I will check if our operations are efficient, if we want to apply these principles. So each structure or constituency has a process for planning and setting priorities. We must have that. Do we have a structure that helps us to do that? Each structure efficiently assesses input related to their scope of responsibility. Each structure efficiently develops and recommends output relevant to their purpose, development, support policies, and leadership placement. So at least an example of our criteria should be applied to this principle.

So there are a lot of them that has been recommended that we could use, but it's not enough for us to say, okay, this principle number three, these are the few criteria we want to use. And we've been encouraged



---

to at least have five criteria, or minimum, if we can get up to five, we should at least get three. And I need everybody to help create this criteria. It's me and [inaudible] that is representing NCUC. I just hope that a few other persons will show interest and maybe we'll have a call or two to discuss this and come up with this criteria for all these five principles. So we need three criteria for each principle.

So we need to create criteria for each principle to guide our principles of continuous improvement as non-commercial stakeholder group, or in this case, I'm talking for non-commercial user constituency. But this also applies to all of our constituency and our stakeholder group. So I need, if it's possible, even the three of us representing the, or six of us representing the NPOC, NCUC, and NCSG could come together and really develop this criteria if community members are not giving input.

So today, that's what I just want to share with you that we need to do this. I'm moving forward because I don't have a lot of time, but I just brought it to you so that I can stimulate your interest and it can get you to participate. Andrea, I need to drop off now, can you just move? So I want to show them after the criteria, there's also indicators that we need to develop.

Yes, so this, I move from criteria now. When we come to indicators, so we could either have indicators or not have indicators, as it has been shown here that if for a particular criteria we choose for a particular principle, it might have indicator, it might have smart indicator or not, because every stakeholder group or constituency is different. So the way we measure things or evaluate things might be different from the

---

way other stakeholder group do it, so that's why it's [inaudible] that our voice is clear and loud in this conversation.

So at this point, we could have a more detailed presentation but I just want to call your attention to it, that this level of work is going on and it requires our influence. Thank you very much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you Benjamin, thank you so much. Unfortunately, Caleb, I cannot take that question on that item so that we are able to cover the remaining items on the agenda, but if there is time, I'll come back to you. I don't know if Julf is present to give us a quick update on the day zero event.

[ANDREA GLANDON:] Julf was not able to make it today. I can give you a brief update. There's not a lot of updates yet. The request was sent to Sally and I am currently waiting for some of the cost information from our meetings team so that I can send that on to Sally for her to review.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right, thanks. Thanks so much. We will go to the AOB now with the time that we have left. And the first is the DNS abuse and the human rights impact assessment. So I'll hand it over to Farzaneh.

---

FARZANEH BADI:

Yeah, thank you so much. And I'm sorry, I have to drop off at the top of the hour but I can stay for a couple of more minutes. So if you remember, we suggested to the contracted party house to do a human rights impact assessment on DNS abuse mitigation. And one reason that we actually suggested that was and because they kept saying that what are the measures for success and stuff like that, we argued that the measures for success should be also like qualitative indicators rather other than the quantitative indicator. So how many domain names you take down or delete or suspend, it should not be the sole measure for the success. It should be also, we should look at the processes and in order to do that, it would be good to do a human rights impact assessment.

So we suggested that with the hopes that we can actually make that like a standard practice for the CPH, for the registries and registrars in the future when they are doing a mitigation of DNS abuse. And so we presented that during their outreach in Kigali and then they said that, okay, so what are the next steps? And I told you about it and we suggested that we should do a tabletop exercise. What is the goal of this tabletop exercise? The goal is to show how in real life human rights impact assessment of DNS abuse mitigation can take place and involve the community, involve the stakeholders.

And so they got back to us and I raised this with the policy committee. They got back to us and it seems that they are very non-committal. They think that this is an NCSG-proposed thing and they don't want to fund anything. But they did say that they are going to be involved with the design of the process and we really need them to be involved in designing it because they are the ones who do this like on daily basis.

So one of the things that we can do, one solution to this is that pool our resources, get all the people and the organizations that work on human rights related issues and our members like the Global Partner Digital and Article 19 and Ephraim who has been working on that to design the tabletop exercise. And we are gonna say that this is the first iteration and we are not gonna do more than this until we actually get some funding or we can hire an expert advisor, like outside expert advisor who can help us.

And then also the other solution is that, like we tell them, no, we are not gonna do this for you, which I don't think is the best route to take. I suggest that we do the first iteration for Istanbul, in Istanbul, and we show them how tabletop exercise is going to work, do some pro bono work for this tabletop exercise and then for the iterations after that, like we push for standardizing this and asking the CPH to consider doing HRIA consistently. Okay, we're not going to do more until you get funding possible. Okay, great. So Avri agrees with me, Kathy agrees with me.

We need to also think about how we are gonna, like in the future, make this more systemic and a part of their process, which we have to do it in a gentle way, step by step. But okay. Okay, great. Thank you very much. I thought I'd just update you on that. And if there are any comments—I have raised this with the policy committee and they can discuss it for a few days. And then I come back to the general mailing list and I'm gonna raise it and we take it from there. Thank you.

---

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. We received it and we'll begin discussing it. Thank you. I will move on to the last one. Peter, I don't know if you were the one to take this quick five-minute discussion on the comments on our questions on our comments on the phase two initial report on the IDNs EPDP. Or Kathy. Please.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, so thank you so much, Tomslin. So I just want to hear from Kathy and everyone that actually made that comment. So to know the rationale behind that comment, because that comment is too wordy and the meaning is not really clear. And I want a way to get back to the group and say this is the meaning of the rationale behind why we made this comment. So I don't know if Kathy or anyone's there, Pedro.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, please, Kathy, go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay, first two things. First to Peter, thank you for asking. To everyone, I think we have a lesson to learn here that we should always hold a meeting between the people who draft a comment and the people who take it into a working group or in this case an implementation review team, an IRT, and have to then take our comments and try to implement them and put them into the writing that's taking place.

Peter, you're not going to like the answer. I think we still have to take this offline. I just reviewed our four-and-a-half-page comment and some of them, this is, it's in, we put it into the AOB. This is phase two initial

---

report of the EPDP on internationalized domain names and we need to talk about some of the privacy issues, some of the concerns about the RDRS system. We have lots and lots of questions, not necessarily concerns, but lots of questions because things were so vague in the original report.

So I'm going to recommend, and I want to know in chat if I'm missing anybody, we need a meeting with Emmanuel, Peter, Pedro, me, Daniel Gluck was, Daniel, if you want to join us, you were so helpful in the research. Is there anyone else who wants to be part of this discussion? But sorry, Peter, I do think we have to take it into a separate meeting because you've raised immensely important issues.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, thanks, Kathy, because the next meeting will, I guess it will be next week, right? If I can remember at the top of my head. So we need a kind of, while we're discussing, I guess I will encourage you using the mailing list for us to discuss this matter before we really get into it.

KATHY KLEIMAN: No mailing list. Nobody has time [inaudible].

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Can we do that this week? Can we find the time?

KATHY KLEIMAN: According to Daniel, we have to do it tomorrow.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Okay, that's fine by me.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Fine by me. If you'll send some times around, we'll schedule. Thanks for the extra time, everybody.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, great. Yeah, thanks so much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Awesome, thank you everyone. You got an outcome there, Peter. Thanks everyone for joining us today. Sorry we went four minutes over, but I really appreciate you guys hanging in there. See you, if not in the council meeting on Thursday, SEE you online. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**