ANDREA GLANDON:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the NCSG Policy Committee call being held on Monday, the 5th of August, 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 so much, Andrea, and welcome again everyone to our August policy call. It does feel like we had the other one only last week, the July one, and that's because the August council meeting is a very early one. And I'm sure you'll miss the meeting because the time in between until the September meeting will be quite long since we'll go back to the middle of the month for that one.

However, let's start with today's agenda to quickly review the council agenda. I think there are a couple of items on the council agenda that we'll probably spend some time looking at them to have an update because there's quite a number of votes on discussion items. So they might not be on this main agenda, but we might discuss those items on the agenda. I don't know if, Peter, you're happy to lead us on that one?

EN

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Hi, everyone. So let's look at the council agenda. So I'll start from the item number three, which is the consent agenda. So this will be the GAC communique presented for consent. So just to take note of that. So on the item number four, which is the GNSO liaison to the GAC replacement. So council actually has found this a useful mechanism to liaise with the GAC to stay updated concerning the PDP activities. So here, there will be a voting with regards to who will replace the current role s. And Sebastien Ducos actually has been nominated by the standing selection committee. So here, the council will actually be voting to confirm Sebastien Ducos to be the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

Item number four is the adoption of SPIRT charter. So here, the council will be voting on SPIRT charter. There has been a lot of back and forth on this, but the council will be listening and also will be voting with regards to this charter. I'm sure that the community are so interested in this, especially the non-commercial folks, and how things, how SPIRT, the regards to the function of SPIRT. So I don't know if the non-commercials want to touch on this before I move to the next item, because this now will be voting with regards to the charter and [inaudible] is the GNSO council liaison, so we'll be presenting that. So I don't know if there's any reservation or concern with that.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Peter. I think I was also keen to know from NCSG, especially councilors who've been following, I haven't followed much, but whether there are any concerns on our end on the SPIRT charter or not. I was keen to also hear if people have any concerns.

EN

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, just to touch on that, because in Kigali, [inaudible] made the presentations [inaudible] had a side chat with her that made her to be copying me and made her to be copying me in different email concerning the SPIRT charter, and how they wanted to deviate from the initial recommendation. But she was able to converse and make sure that the SPIRT [inaudible] and they are not going out of the scope and they remain in line with the SubPro recommendation. So good to see that the community should be the go-to and the function of SPIRT team should be coordinating with the community when any changes and something is noticed or observed or any implementation of the program. So that's what I could say on that. But I'm waiting for our presentation as well, so we can look at different ways on maybe how the decisions was made concerning the SPIRT team here. The charter rather.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. And it doesn't look like there are any other hands.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Okay, great. So on item number six, which is the accuracy scoping team. So here also council, we vote to reject the scoping team's recommendations because we've been following this and there are not enough data to make sure that this can go on and to be able to, I guess I saw that on the agenda, so we'll be discussing that at length. But here the council will be voting to reject the scoping recommendation because there are no data to ensure that the work to carry on. Okay, so

EN

I don't know if there are hands that want to contribute or say something on that.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think let's take the conversation [inaudible] agenda item.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Okay. So then the item number seven, still talking about the accuracy of registration data. So here, on the last call, since it's not [inaudible] to like carry on this text, then the GNSO councilor is looking at all other alternatives to see how to get this done. And they are seeking feedback from the councilors group, the [inaudible] community, each of the councilor community, or stakeholder group to see how this can be done, whether to restart the scoping team or not, [inaudible] feasible or whether there are additional ways to go about that. This is one of the interesting things that the NCSG might need to look into. Okay.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I see Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, hi. Honestly, this accuracy of data issue, I do understand that it is an issue we need to focus on, but this smells to me like forum swapping. The scoping team on accuracy of data ran into a number of brick walls. Possibly not assisted by our chair who, you know ... I think we didn't follow our leadership particularly well. But now we're going to have to look at it in another forum. We are coming up with some real problems

that won't go away and I just wanted to remind everybody that when you make comparisons to the ccTLDs, governments are in charge of ccTLDs. However, it is managed in your jurisdiction. It's a country code, and it is the prerogative of the country, i.e. the government to figure out how they're going to manage. Many of them have identity requirements that only a government can demand, such as in Canada, I did the first CIRA privacy policy, having just worked on our law, and they demand a lot of identity data that we do not want the private sector to be running around asking for. So, this notion that we're going to follow the same procedures that a ccTLD does, they have different accountability and different responsibilities in terms of citizenship. So, really drives me nuts. So, thank you for listening to me rant. I think we have to be careful that we don't kick the accuracy scoping team down the road and have all the issues sneak back in in another way, because we're not dealing with these. If ICANN will not take on the accountability for data quality, which is what we're looking at here, and they won't take it on because they won't take a controllership role, then that's where it ends. We're talking about common, widely understood in government data quality issues. Thank you for listening. I'll shut up now.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. I had mentioned earlier that we'll take it to the agenda that we have on this, but I think this is the right place to, right time, now that input has come in to just have that conversation. So, the council, obviously, as we've seen in item number six, is voting to reject those recommendations because it's not feasible to get the data as recommended. Now, item number seven, the council is recognizing that we've hit the brick wall, like you said, Stephanie. And now, in May, in

the contracted party summit held in Paris, the contracted party house released a statement or document emphasizing the importance of registration data accuracy. And they actually made an affirmation that they will continue their effort relating to registration data accuracy. And I have no idea what those efforts are. However, the council doesn't know what to do with, well, doesn't have a direction on this, right? And so, council leadership has asked every stakeholder group or constituency to see if they have any other way, any other ideas to advance this topic of accuracy. And if I understand correctly, Stephanie, you're saying we should kill it now that we've hit this wall and ICANN will not take any ownership of controllership of the data. So, I'm guessing, I intended to ask the question during that discussion, if we have any other ideas or as a stakeholder group, we'd rather just let it die. So, that was the question I intended to ask. So, I guess now you say, your input, one of the input now is clearly suggesting that we should let it die.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Basically, these are issues that have been haunting us on this. When I arrived at ICANN in 2013, as a so-called privacy expert, I mean, the first meeting I was at, I was in with a guy from China. They were looking at installing facial recognition systems so that you couldn't get a domain name without an iris scan, facial recognition, some kind of experimenting with different things. I was shocked. And, of course, there were those in the intellectual property community who thought this might be a great idea. Private sector has no right to be gathering this data. Now, I realize in the intervening years that the private sector and the platforms have continued to gather all kinds of data. I think

Google Glasses were still in the lab at that point. But it doesn't make it right. We don't foist onto the private sector identity systems. And there are no easy ways, short of gathering all kinds of very sensitive personal data that a government has forced a citizen to contribute. There's no other way around that in terms of secure, remote identification of individuals. So that's brick wall number one.

Brick wall number two is that private sector organizations have no way to confirm any of this identity data that could be coming from the dark web that people are coughing up. We might actually contribute to rising cybercrime. And what's annoying is guys like Steve Crocker know this, you know. Thirdly, who, if ICANN won't take on the responsibility of accuracy, they are foisting it onto the registrars and the registries for purposes that are tied to law enforcement. So all the registrars and registries care about is whether they get paid. They do not need data about an individual in order to prosecute a crime. That's what we're talking about here. So we skirt around this. If governments won't do it, then don't ask the private sector to do it when it is, you know, constitutionally outside of all due process mechanisms. That's basically the core of my rant. And I'm not a lawyer, so I would welcome a lawyer having a similar rant. Thomas Rickert is really good on this stuff, by the way. But at the time, ICANN was already doing all kinds of accuracy studies. I have slides from Margie Millam. Margie Millam was in charge of some of those accuracy efforts back then. We had masses of things going on where people would lose their domain names because they didn't correct their address data on time. This also wouldn't stand up, in my opinion, as proper procedure, but I'm not a lawyer. Anyway, yeah,

EN

this is grasping the nettle. It's time. Don't waste our time on more committees when you can't actually do what you're trying to do.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: In the early days when we were seeking the IP address, a lot of information was called in by the corresponding registry. All people who wanted an IP address were submitting a lot of data. So, there is no concern on what is getting submitted. So, some mandated data should be shared with ICANN, is what is my first submission. It is true. Even today, a big form has to be filled, lot of data should go in and if it is with the registry, a good chunk of it can be with ICANN. The second one, we are experimenting with this data registry system of collecting some automatic data in conformance with all the data collection regimes or whatever it is. Since it is a relative exercise which is being noted and we are only talking about relational databases most of the time, I suppose some schema should be viable across all requirements. If only we ask that schema to come out, then should be fine. Others, we are not interested. We do not want a ton of data to happen on our [inaudible] as well.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. So, if I understand correctly, you are suggesting a technical solution to the problem of creating a type of database that could collect the data that you think is available. Did I get that correctly?

EN

GOPAL TADEPALLI:	Yes. Lot of data is available with the registrar, registries, which we submit, and a schema of which should be available, shareable. That should be easy.
TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:	Thank you. Adebunmi.
ADEBUNMI AKINBO:	Okay, so to the best of my knowledge, I know we had a discussion on the WHOIS and the reduction of some information. And we should not forget that registries or registrar always have an agreement that is most of the time signed by the end user without [inaudible] which actually gives room for us to [inaudible]. I think we should also be looking apart from the technical aspect, looking at how [inaudible] information by the private sector is kept safe when it comes to cybersecurity. These are concerns that over the past few years, like the previous [inaudible] discussion. We should not also forget that the [inaudible] proper information is still up and running for most registrars. And if you still do not respond to that, you may end up getting locked out of whatever domain you have registered. [inaudible] It hasn't stopped for you to modify it in such a way and manner that your data [inaudible]
TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:	Thanks, Akinbo. Sorry, it was a bit noisy. I didn't quite get everything you said. If I understand correctly, you're saying that you're in support of us using data that exists with the registrars and registries ready for accuracy. Is that correct? Okay. All right. I just want to say that when

EN

we've had this conversation in the council as well with the registrars and registries, the legal way to get whatever data that can be used for this purpose, and I think ICANN Legal said they couldn't come up with a legal purpose to collect or use any additional data than is publicly available today. I don't believe legally there is a way to access any other data set, whether that the registrars or registries in some form, which we may or may not know about.

The other thing was, I think there were some other ideas floated by ICANN Legal of using historical compliance data, but even that data set will not address accuracy or cannot validate the accuracy of a registrant, basically, because that is just really compliance data. It's with those challenges that we find ourselves in this position, asking for whether there are any other creative ideas on how to go about this. There are real legal challenges that both the contracted parties, ICANN Legal, have faced in doing any sort of accuracy validation on registrant data. That's a bit of the background for those who've been saying that there is some data that I'm saying we should use. ICANN couldn't find a way legally to use any other data. I thought I would just add that context as well. But I do not see any other hand up. And I think the time that was allocated for that conversation has been used so we can move to the next item. Thanks, everyone, for contributing to that.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Thanks so much, Tomslin. Good conversation. Maybe we can take it to the group on the mailing list. On the singular and plural, this has been a topic that has received a wider interest. Council will be receiving an update from the small team plus in the [April meeting, unable] to

discuss that because of some of the issues that we received. There was a strawperson proposal developed by ICANN. It looks promising. The council actually asked the small team plus to look at it. An update will be discussed in the next meeting on the singular and plural. I will leave it open if someone wants to jump in.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I'll just quickly add on the singulars and plurals that the hope of the small team leadership was that we would vote on this item this week. I did make a request that we keep it as a discussion item rather than a voting item. Mostly because I understand that topic is quite a heated one within the small team. Correctly so, I understand they thought they had a stable draft of the supplemental recommendation. And right now, they've gone back to the discussion again, end of last week. So, as of this time, they do not have a stable draft to present to council. So, I think that we will again just have an update rather than—I guess it depends on how their meeting today goes. They have a last meeting today before the council meeting. I would say unless somehow they manage to get to consensus, they will not have a draft, a stable draft to present to the council on Thursday.

I just wanted to remind NCSG councilors that the small team assignment form does require that the small team should inform us, well, they should bring only draft recommendations that they enjoy full consensus. And if not, they should let us know what sort of level of consensus they had. So we should demand to understand what level of consensus those recommendations. We haven't asked for those in the

EN

past, but I think we should, as a matter of procedure, we should start asking for those as well. Thanks, Peter.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, thanks, Tomslin, for elaborating on that. Okay, great. So we can move to the next agenda, that is a transfer policy and review. So here, so they're seeking for public comment and the council will be receiving an update on the format that the PDP, actually the PDP working group made for the policy recommendations and to be more digestible. So the council will be receiving an update on this effort. And I'm sure that we also, we should be getting that comment ready on this one. Okay, I don't know if Tomslin, do you want to add anything on that or anyone?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Well, I see Ken's hand up, but I just wanted to say something that we are not noticing on this item is that the transfer policy review team is actually intending to change, and I believe they already have, they're changing the format in which these recommendations are put and they're working hard to make it more readable or digestible to average readers. So it might be something that's really good for an average registrant out there to be able to read and digest the document. Apparently, if it's successful, it might be adopted as a new template to write recommendations. So I don't believe it's been published yet, but keep an eye on the format that the chair is going to come talk about. And now over to you, Ken, sorry.

KEN HERMAN: Hi, Tomslin. Hi, Peter. It's Ken Herman for the record. Thanks for the introduction. Yeah, just a couple of minutes on it. The report, first of all, has been circulated, so it's available. I think, [Danielle,] I think you're putting up the link for it. So I was gonna emphasize that the discussion at the council will be on the format, it's not on the content of the report. And the working group, you know, spent some time, mostly this was an innovation of staff, to try to make the report exactly, Tomslin, as you described, digestible. I don't have a lot of experience in reading a lot of these reports, being relatively new in the business, but it just seemed to make a lot of sense to me to review how these things are. The reports, and this one is no different, there are many hundreds of pages. It's a lot of material. And some of the innovations that the team sort of are introducing are things like structuring the recommendations in a way that take the reader kind of through what the change is recommended, what is the recommendation, why did the recommendation emerge the way it does, what sort of guidance was available to it, and then links in the report to other parts of the report in annexes that explore the charter question that drove that particular issue, as well as a summary of the deliberations that the working group took. So if you're interested in that sort of depth, it's there to get to with a handy link. But if it's not something, then it's not going to take up a lot of space in the report so you can get easily onto the next recommendation. And there are many recommendations. There's some 40-something recommendations that change the way small and large things are done when it comes to transfer policy.

The other innovation that is quite interesting is something called a policy impact assessment. So this is a new feature. Now, it's a lot of

EN

discussion about what this was all about. And it's simply a matter that the staff took to try and sort of gauge whether a particular recommendation is kind of a major change for somebody, for one stakeholder group or another, just kind of a major change to the way things are done. Some of them are low impact, such as simply changing some wording to make things clear, the definitional changes, for example. Others really have a higher impact and it would change the way some things are done or change the way timing is when it comes to the transfer policy. So that's just briefly. It's described in the report itself at the prologue as to what those changes are. And I'd be interested to hear more about it. Once I have a chance to confer with my other working group partners from the NCSG, we'll prepare to circulate this report for comment. The comment period will be 60 days. This was, I guess, in recognition of the fact that, well, August is kind of a slow time for people and they may not get a chance to get to it. So it's the end of September. So probably we're not going to jump on this immediately, but we will be circulating a call for volunteers to help with the drafting of the public comment. That's all for me. Thanks, Tomslin. Thanks, Peter.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Thanks, Ken. That sounds so interesting and promising. So I hope that they consider all the necessary stakeholders with our format. And the format actually doesn't really change the content of the recommendations. So thanks, Ken, for that.

So on the 10th item, that's on IPC request for ICANN Board reconsideration on the auction proceeds. So there are a group of

volunteers that are actually drafting the letter to the board for reconsideration. So the council will be getting an update on the draft letter on the next step of the council, what the council should do. And I'm sure that we've been following the IPC request and asking the ICANN board for reconsidering some of the decisions with regards to the new gTLD auction proceed. Okay, so are there any comments on that? If not, then I'm off to the next one. And any other business. So we have a number of public comments. And so we need to get our teams ready. We've seen a lot of people volunteered already on this. So to comment on that. So these are council, we just look at them and just maybe remind each of the council to remind their constituencies to make input in the comment. Okay, that's all from my end. I'll give the mic back to Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Peter. We will get back to our agenda and we've already covered the data accuracy scoping discussion. So we'll move on to the current open public comments. I guess that is somewhat like the continuation of that AOB on the council agenda. There are quite a number of open public comments that are running right now. And you would have seen a couple of emails from me. Folks have volunteered for some but not all. There are some that might have not in the past been of top of our priority, but there are some like the Han script single character IDN generic top level domain that has 12 days left. There is the proposed language for the next round applicant support program and registry service provider evaluation program terms and conditions. I don't know why these things are so long. But we do have someone. I

think we have a single volunteer for that one. If anyone has time, please jump on that as well.

The Registry Stakeholder Group charter amendment. We do not have anyone on that one volunteering. Then we have the preliminary issue report on Latin script diacritics. I think that's something we also had looked at as NCSG before. We do have a single volunteer for that one. Three days left. And then there is the data processing specifications for ICANN accredited registries and registrars which has [36] days left.

To your question, Stephanie, if we had members for the, if you could just scroll up a bit, Andrea, please. Something like the diacritic, that was a staff produced document because that's a preliminary issue report. So, no, we do not have anyone there. Then for the proposed language for next round applicant support program. I think that will be coming out of the IRT and [inaudible] our member who is attending a lot of the SubPro IRT. For the SubPro-related items coming out of the IRT, [inaudible] will be the best person to speak to. Adebunmi.

ADEBUNMI AKINBO: Thank you. Apologies for the noise the other time. Could you please share the link to this so that some of us can look at it and see [inaudible]?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. I believe Andrea shared on chat, but I'm sure she'll gladly share it again. Thank you, Andrea. So we do also have the gTLD IDN tables review process when reference LGR is not available. That has 39 days

left. And then there's the IRP IOT proposal updates to the IRP supplementary procedures as well. That has 43 days left. And the draft ICANN strategic plan and operating plan framework. I think this is the one that there are a lot of people who volunteered for this. I think about four people. This one is getting some traction already. And then of course, this was just the initial report on transfer policy review, I believe was posted just today, if I'm not mistaken, or yesterday or Friday. Sometime this weekend. If anyone has time and is keen on joining this, one of these, please let me know. And I'll hook you up with the folks that are already working on it so that you can join them in the drafting. Thank you.

And Peter, during the last meeting, you and the team had some concerns and questions related to the EPDP IDNs from your meeting in the IDN EPDP. And you went away to have a conversation. So I had put this item for the team or for us here to get an update on how your conversation went and whether you got answers to the questions related to the EPDP IDN that the EPDP group was asking NCSG about.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, yeah, thanks, Tomslin. Yes, it was just irrational, irrational behind our comment, which that was actually like submitted and we discussed that and the group understand. They were really taken into consideration and we're happy that some of our comments are given time to discuss and make resolutions where necessary, especially in the area of RDDS, expansions to that and adding some reference to SubPro like in the glossary and just on the general comments that we made. And because we don't want an expansion to RDDS and we want things

EN

to be and some of the wordings, the ways the word edit and we suggested some, you know, wordings and rephrase so that that will not impact registrant or the use of RDDS and different things. However, last meeting, I wasn't able to be there. So I'm sure that Emmanuel was able to make it to the meeting, but I don't know. So, but that's the basis of it. And we're happy that our comment was taken into consideration. And there were discussion going on on different comment receives and how that will impact the IDN [policy] recommendation.

And just to touch on that, that the group also received a request from the ICANN org on harmonization of IDN table. So that is being discussed and I'm sure that the team is also referring back to GNSO council to get some update on that and how they need to proceed on that. So that's just what I can say with regards to that. Back to you, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. That clarifies it. I don't know if anyone had any comments or questions about that. But if not, since I don't see any hands up, I'll move to ICANN 81 planning. Julf, if you're there.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thanks Tomslin. This is going to be reasonably brief. We had one call planning call and there is a preliminary agenda, but there's still lots of moving parts in it. There is going to be the second call on Thursday. And for that, the most important thing is a decision on the community session and there's four proposals. I put them on the mailing list and we basically need to vote on which one or which ones we do support. I have proposed that we combine two of the soft items, but there hasn't

EN

been any response to that. And I think procedurally that's a bit tricky because there's a different drafters of the proposals. But if I can ask you guys to have a look at some of the different proposals on the mailing list and give you a feedback before Thursday, that would be really helpful. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: If I understand correctly, we should sort of send in what we vote for amongst the four proposals.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Correct.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay. Great. I don't know if anyone on the call have anything to say regarding that. Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: You mentioned that you had second several suggestions for merging sessions. And are we voting on that too? And which do you suggest merging?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yeah, sorry. Yes, the suggestion to merge was the ALAC and the ccNSO proposals. But the problem is that that would require drafters of those proposals to agree on a common one. So I don't see that happening. And we can't vote for that because it's not a formal proposal. So

EN

basically, as we go in for a Thursday meeting, I see us voting from the four ones that are on the table.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks for the question, Judith. Any other questions? I think if not, we'll go on the AOB section today. We haven't received any specific request for AOB items today. So I'll just leave the floor open for anyone who has any specific items they'd like to bring up. Bolutiofe.

BOLUTIFE ADISA: Yes, hi Tomslin and hi everyone. I wanted to use this opportunity to bring to your notice especially some updates regarding the SPIRT charter drafting team. So, as you know, I'm one of the representatives for the constituency on that one. And we have finally come to a conclusion of the final draft. And I think it's going to go on to the council, probably in the next meeting.

One of the concerns I raised was regarding the membership of the SPIRT drafting team. However, I think they made an argument of why it was important that the drafting team remains open to everyone. And then there is also no conflict of interest situation that would deprive anyone from being able to apply or be a part of the SPIRT team, basically. So that was my issue because I also wanted to get some sort of accountability for us to make sure that we don't just have a bunch of commercials in this SPIRT team. But we also have representation of non-profit or non-commercial interests as well on the team. So I sent an email. I actually put you in copy, Tomslin, and I don't know if you saw it. But yeah, I think it was not taken into account for the moment. And I'm

EN

hoping that if the council probably raised something similar, it would be something that we keep in mind for the next review. So at the moment, there was a rough consensus, obviously. But I think if it's also something that we point out from the council, I think we can also make a point for it because it could just be a statement that says that ICANN's procedure for selecting members should also include some form of diversity of interest. And that was actually my proposal. And yeah, hopefully we can also chip in so that the concern of the community is not just about the diversity of interest. We can also chip in so that the concern of having just commercials on that working group, I mean the SPIRT membership, would be addressed.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bolutife. I think I missed your email because I can't find it. And we're actually voting on this charter on Thursday. So you joined late, but I was asking earlier if there were any concerns on the charter because it's up for voting on Thursday. And what I hear you say is there are concerns, but the group had a rough consensus that they were happy with the charter. And so it's coming to the council for adoption. And you want us to, as NCSG, to put in some sort of on the record that concern and proposal. Is that correct?

BOLUTIFE ADISA: Yes. That's exactly what I'm trying to propose because I feel there would be further opportunities to have a review. And I think if it's on record that we actually pointed out that it's important to consider some level of diversity in membership, not just commercial interests only being

supported. No matter how little that is, I think it will be helpful for NCSG community.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right. And you have to forgive me. I haven't read the charter in detail yet. Currently, as it is written, how does the charter favor commercial interest?

BOLUTIFE ADISA: Okay, so as it is currently drafted, first of all, it's open to anyone, meaning anyone can apply. And I think the second thing also is that there is no consideration for existing conflict of interest, which means if someone is representing an organization that has something to gain, this would not be considered a criteria for selecting them to be a part of the SPIRT. So my concern really was that if this is going to be based on just merit, we mostly find that large organizations that are able to sponsor big names usually take up spaces like this. So if there's clearly no criteria that ensures that we consider non-profit membership on the SPIRT team, it's likely that we don't have any and all we have on the membership are commercial people. As much as they say it's not a big deal, it's also not a good look and it also means that noncommercial interests are not represented in the working group. So that was really my concern.

I'm not saying that we have to change the entire charter, but I think something as little as making it such that the application process considers merit, obviously, and interest, but also it looks at the background of whoever is applying to ensure that we have a balance, at

EN

least to some extent. And not just a couple of people that all have the same interest in the same SPIRT membership.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: So, you mentioned it's open. The SPIRT is open. Is there a limit on how many members?

BOLUTIFE ADISA: Okay, I don't know the exact numbers at the moment, but when I say open, I mean like there is no restriction to certain community. It's not based on community, like probably GNSO—it's not representative. And also it doesn't consider conflict of interest, meaning that there are literally no restrictions. People can just decide to send their representative, their big lawyers and just take up all the space. And yeah, I think it's important that we also push for noncommercial representation on this as well.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks so much, because that clarifies the issue for me in my head. Considering that Thursday is just a couple of days, are you able to help write that statement you would like for us to read so that we can quickly have a look at the PC? And then once we are happy with it, we can read it out on Thursday during the vote. And like you said, you're recommending that we should vote yes, but read out that clause. Is that correct?

EN

BOLUTIFE ADISA: Yes. I think that would actually be sufficient. Yes. So I will do that email and try to send before the end of today. Yeah, that would work then. Perfect.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Awesome. Thank you so much. I guess the PC will take a look then. And we can certainly read it out. I don't know if there are any comments. I don't see anyone's hand up or any other AOB. Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I just wanted to say thank you for raising that issue because it's really important. But the problem is we don't really have decent declaration of conflict of interest anywhere having failed in the CCOICI where you tried to get the SOI improved. So it's probably important to really raise this issue and make a big deal of it. Be good to have someone do that when the discussion comes. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. Yeah, we certainly can raise that. We'll decide amongst ourselves who will take the lead on it. Seeing no other hand and no other AOB, I suppose I can give back everyone a lot of minutes of their lives back. Thank you all so much for sticking with us today and for joining the call. And see you on Thursday if you join in the meeting. Otherwise, see you online.

EN

ANDREA GLANDON: Thanks, everyone. This concludes today's conference. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]