
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the NCSG PC call being held on Monday, the 16th of September, 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 who's made it today for coming. So, good turnout, but not as we hoped. But nonetheless, we do have a light agenda, so I wanted to ask if anyone has an AOB they would like to discuss today before we start so that we put it on the agenda. All right, seeing no hands, we will go right to the Council agenda then. Ken, there you are.

KEN HERMAN: Hey there, everybody. Hey, Tomslin. This is Ken Herman for the record. Yeah, I can say a few words about the transfer policy review. We'll be starting comments pretty soon, so I can talk about that.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thought so. Thank you. All right. Is Pete still there to help us walk through the Council agenda?

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.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Hi, Tomslin, I'm here.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Awesome. Thanks. Over to you then.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Okay, great. So, hi, everyone. This is Peter for the record. So, I'll be walking you through the Council agenda. So, the first on the list is the consent agenda. The Council, there will be a motion to approve proposed modifications to GNSO operating procedure relating to Board Seat 13. I'm sure that we've had back and forth on these.

And I don't know, maybe I shouldn't, because I'm not part of those people there, but I've heard the group going back and forth. I don't know if some stakeholders, maybe people that are part of that conversation want to jump in to give a brief update on that. I'm sure that Tomslin might have some things on that. But here, so I'll be reviewing the Council will be approving the modifications to the GNSO operating procedure relating to Board Seat 13. So, Tomslin, please go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah, I just want to say I believe that's related only to the Board Seat 13 specifically, and that's the Contracted Party House seat. So, I don't think that includes the conversations that NCSG has been having within the

non-contracted party house. I don't believe we have a change of procedure yet. Anyway, I think that's the conversation that's going on.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI:

Okay. Yeah. Thanks for the clarification. So, the second item on the agenda is customer standing committee. So, these are the names. The Council has received names for them to be approved. And so, Council will be looking at them to see if they will be approved and move forward. So, we have those names on our screen. Okay. So, we can move to the next agenda. I don't know if there is any concern from our group.

Okay, great. So, the item number four is also a Council vote on Supplemental Recommendation on the singular and plural. So, we've been having discussion about this. So, the Council, we vote on the supplemental recommendation on singular and plural. I will also defer this to Tomslin to chip in something here also, because we are big on this and there has been conversation around this. Over to you, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Peter. And I must apologize that I forgot to forward to NCSG what the draft recommendation that came out of the small team. I completely forgot to forward that to the team. So, I will do that while we are having this conversation. But if everyone remembers, we did have a meeting that was shared on the mailing list with Kathy, one of our SMEs to this small team. And she gave us an update and I promised during that to pass some of her update during our meeting today.

So, essentially, the small team has been debating on whether to allow, I should be positive, whether to allow singulars and plurals to coexist in the top-level domain for the next round, within the same language, of course. And the Board had some thoughts about it as well. Since they were participating in that small team, they had thoughts. Staff also had thoughts. And what came out of those thoughts was a straw man, which we've discussed this, I think, to death. Even in the last ICANN meeting in Kigali, we discussed this.

Long story short, there was a proposal for an exception, but that exception heavily favored the .brands when put on a contention set because non-commercial-- Or I should say, they couldn't accept a way to evaluate non-commercial groups without having to look into the content. So, that is what that group has been discussing for a while. And we've brought these updates to these monthly meetings frequently, every single month about it. I admit it has been confusing as well for anyone who has not been following because it's really confusing.

But because of the fact that the .brands were going to be heavily favored if there were an exception to the rule that plurals and singulars should not coexist during an application, our subject matter experts decided to support a total ban of plurals and singulars coexisting if the team cannot be convinced to also allow it in a fair manner to non-commercials. So, that is really the outcome of that small team which will be adopted and being sent to the Board is that singulars and plurals will not be allowed in the next round. Again, long story short.

And yeah, there are some statements. I think there was a plurality statement. There was a minority statement from some members in the small team. And so, one of the things that us or I should say myself especially was advocating for is to make sure that unlike in the past where minority and whatever statements that come out of a recommendation are not forwarded to the Board, I was advocating for those statements to also be passed to the Board as a whole is aware of, has better insight into the conversations that took place in the small team. So, that is the short of the story. I don't know if there are any questions. I'll try to answer. I don't see any hand.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Okay. Yeah, thanks so much. Oh, Stephanie.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Stephanie's hand is up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I continue to apologize for being really obtuse on this topic. However, the one good thing that I see coming out of it is this insistence that the differing views be forwarded on to the Board. And I think we all know our concerns about small teams. Is there any way that we can insist that this not just be a one-off that the minority views on small teams be forwarded on? That would be a lovely precedent to set in place and keep.

Because there is this tendency at ICANN to want to create the illusion that there is consensus on things. And usually, our objections have

been ignored and you'd never know that we had fought and fought and fought unless you went to the recordings. So, I think we should try and insist that this become procedure on small teams. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. If I can quickly give my thoughts on that. I think it's possible in this way. The next small teams' assignment form, we certainly should advocate that since the previous one we did send minority statements to the Board, we should put it in as part of the assignment form that those statements will be forwarded when they bring the final recommendation to the Council. That way it sticks.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: That sounds great.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Awesome. Back to you, Peter.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Okay. So, we move to the Registration Data Accuracy. So, here, this has been on the Council agenda for long and the Council will vote to divert the scope into recommendations. And here we've been talking that there is no actually data for evaluating accuracy, Registration Data Accuracy. So, Councils also will discuss that and also vote to defer that. So, that's basically on Registration Data Accuracy. I don't know if any Council or any member wants to have any reservations on this or any

thought. This has been quite a lot on our agenda and we've been discussing that and bringing it back and forth. Okay, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I believe Stephanie might have something to add, but I just wanted to say that there is a reason why we have two of these on the agenda. One is to vote to defer that implementation or resurrecting the accuracy scoping team, which I believe NCSG's position has been sort of that we should kill this thing if there is no good data coming out of a source that we can use.

But the second discussion, which is on the same topic, is there are some questions that will be sent to the stakeholder groups and constituencies by the councillors for us to discuss with our groups and take it back to the Council. Now, I think we've discussed this about three months ago, in theory, those questions, because the questions have been rejigged, so to speak, but I think it boils down to the question of whether there are alternative ways to go about this. So that is the discussion that will come up, and I think the outcome of that will be those set of questions that will be given to us to come discuss with our stakeholder groups. So, yeah, that's why there are two items on the same topic.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thanks, Tomslin. But here, since there is no data for this, I don't know why we keep resurrecting it. I looked at the questions, which is good for us to look at it, but it's still going to boil down to the same thing. I'm not an expert in Registration Data Accuracy. I actually don't want to put Stephanie's on the spot, because she is the one following

that conversation and has a lot to say in that. Stephanie, I can see your hands up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thank you. Stephanie Perrin for the record. We have an expression in Canada where you're playing out the game in hockey. It's called ragging the puck. You're just basically playing out of time, and I suspect that that's what's going on with these questions. They can't just bury this darn thing. They won't let it go. So, I'm resigned to the fact that it's going to be kept alive when it should be buried.

I realize that's kind of a cryptic way of answering your call for comment on this, but the parties that want greater accuracy are not going to let it go. They haven't got a way to regulate this, because ICANN is not a regulatory body. So, what can I say? It's a contractual matter at the moment. Anyway, I hope that answers any questions. We're just going to have to put up with it. I don't even want to fight about whether it's kept alive any longer. We'll just take it down the road another six months or a year or whatever. Thanks.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI:

Thank you so much, Stephanie, for jumping in. I apologize for that. I have to call your name. Thanks for that. The next on the agenda is the policy status report. I've actually not been following this up. I'm sure that the reason why this is on the agenda is for the Council to receive updates from the ICANN staff. I don't know if Tomslin can give the background on this.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Background, yes. Yes. Maybe I can give the background, but I haven't read the report. This is related to a status report on the policy implementation working group recommendations that brought about some of those things we'll use for the first time this year. I think, I believe, or late last year, the GGP, for example. And EPDP was also used earlier, my bad. And also, the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework and the IRT.

I think we do have Rafik today who knows way more about these recommendations, but this policy status report is looking at whether these have served their purpose or not. And staff usually puts this together based on research they do. So, they will be presenting that to us physically.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah. Thanks so much, Tomslin. I'm still trying to compute. Okay. So, Item 8 is the Council is going to discuss about the SPS meetings. I'm sure that planning, the ICANN org, the leadership are currently planning for the SPS meeting. And also, we're going to receive an update on the ICANN81 planning schedules. And also, I'm sure that on the Latin diacritics are probably coming, so we're going to hear an update on that also. I don't know who has been following these, if there's any concern from our end, but we're going to receive an update from that.

And the same thing on the information with GNSO appointed Board member and GNSO Council. So, that meeting will take place on 25th of September. There will also be an update from the PPSAI R team, which

we have Stephanie on Board. Also, on the contention set for the new gTLD. So, that has been back and forth, and I'm sure that we're going to get an update from that. If time permits, I'm sure that the Council will discuss about that. I'm sure that's all from my end, and before I give the mic back to-- Okay, so I can let that be in the AOB on the IDN discussion and the meetings that we had the last time. And I also see Emmanuel on the call, so he might be able to give an update on that. So, over to you, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Sorry, I was trying to get my mic off. Okay, thank you so much. So, you would like to add an update on the IDNs under the AOB. Is that correct?

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yes.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay, we'll have that added then. So, proceeding about public comments, out of the four public comments that we requested for volunteers last month, two of them had volunteers. The IRP-IOT, which was discussed on the mailing list, and the team received edits and comments, that has been submitted now. The one that we have volunteers for and that's still open for your input is the draft ICANN Strategic Plan and Operating Plan Framework for FY 26-30. The team working on that also shared their draft to the mailing list, so if you have some time, please take a look. Many people have already provided

comments on that as well. Then Ken is going to speak to the transfer review comment as well, so I'll pass it over to you, Ken.

KEN HERMAN:

Okay. Thanks, Tomslin. Ken Herman for the record. Yeah, I wasn't prepared to give much today, but opportunity presents itself, so I'm going to grab it. As you see that there is a Transfer Policy Review public comments coming up by the end of this month. There have been two briefings by the transfer policy review team over the past couple of weeks. I sent a message about that prior to them, where they reviewed the changes to the transfer policy and the rationales behind it, opportunity for people to ask them any questions.

Now, the ambition for us, Juan and I have been working on this. I'm afraid I got busy this week. Greetings from Kathmandu. I'm in Nepal at the moment. I'm on a mission for the rest of this week, so perhaps either late this week or early next week, we would like to offer an opportunity, so we'll try to plan something for people from the non-commercial community to ask any questions. So, look out for that, and it'll be a tight to kind of get some comments together.

But let me just say that from my perspective, I'm not seeing a lot of contention in the changes that have been made to the transfer policy during the discussion. I was interested to see that during the first session that the transfer policy team had on September, not sure, I don't remember the date, the first of the two. There was some pushback from at least one registrar about the time between changes

you make and changes you can transfer, so there's a restriction, transfer restriction imposed at various points in the transfer policy.

So, registering a domain or moving a domain from one registrar to another imposes a mandatory 30-day restriction. That used to be a voluntary 60-day by some registrars, and it was inconsistent, and the working group agreed that some restriction would be necessary in order to minimize the opportunity for domain hijacking or domain theft, but there was at least one registrar who was coming on very strongly about why there was any restriction. I feel that personally, from the perspective of non-commercial users, that a restriction of some time frame is necessary.

My perception is that many, particularly non-commercial entities, but also the commercial, I would surprise that there wouldn't be some alignment on this, would also feel that they're not exactly monitoring their domain name registration all that closely, and so the missing emails or probably not on top of emails and notifications of things might not be noticed right away, and a transfer restriction for a certain period of time should be necessary. So, there's that.

I didn't get the sense that any of the registrars that were participating in the working group had any appetite for eliminating restrictions altogether, but I think it would, in our comments, would be good to emphasize that we feel that some level of transfer restrictions are valuable, even if there isn't a tremendous amount of evidence to support the fact that there is any risk involved, and this is what that one registrar was going on about, the fact that looking for evidence to suggest that there was an element of risk.

The fact is that since the beginning of time, there have been restrictions on transfers after certain actions were taken in order to mitigate any risk of domain malfeasance, and so there wouldn't be any evidence to say that there was a risk at all, so short of eliminating the restriction, you wouldn't really know. So, I thought that was a bit ingenuous. Beyond those kinds of issues, I'm reasonably satisfied that there aren't any substantial or really almost any concerns that we would have. They did reduce the transfer restrictions from 60 days. Some people might have some concern about that, but I didn't really see any issues with it.

There is now no longer a change of registrant. It is now a change of registrant data, and that might be of interest to people, and there was some rationale behind that. I found that discussion quite interesting. There is notifications for many things and preservation of notifications to registered nameholders about any changes, but they did take away confirmations, seeing that for many of the stakeholders, feeling that confirmations merely slow the process down.

I'm on the fence about that, whether it's necessary to have a confirmation. Registrars pointed out that the biggest thing that registrars can do and registrants can do is protect their accounts at their registrars and to encourage registrars to implement two-factor authentication in order to protect registrar accounts, which is really almost the greatest risk associated with registrars. That's kind of off the top of my head note about this.

Once again, to summarize, I'm not seeing really a lot of things, but I encourage people to at least have a glance at this report. As we spoke about the last time, it's a new format, so it's fairly easy to get through

the substance where a lot of the narrative that supports the recommendations are contained in annexes that you don't have to page through in order to get to this next recommendation. I think that was a useful innovation and it allows for a fairly rapid review. There are a lot of recommendations, so it can take some time.

One, there are a couple of things there that people may notice about they want to remove some parts of it from the transfer policy and situated in other policies. This is not policy development. I was reassured about that. That's simply they didn't feel that it belonged in the transfer policy itself. That might be something to think about. Once again, we'll try to have a session. Juan, I see you're on the call. Let's try and get together next day or so to try to plan something about when we can do this.

If people have some questions and if anybody wants to participate in collecting the comments, they're, of course, welcome to do so. I'm open to questions here. Thanks, Andrea, for posting the links to the transfer policy discussions. That's all for me. Over.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Over. Thanks, Ken. I do not see any hands up, so it's probably, indeed, over. There are two other public comments that are open I forgot to mention. One is a second round of proposed language for the draft sections of the Next Round Applicant Guidebook. If anyone is keen to comment on those, please shoot me an email. And then there is the additional reference level generation rules and related updates as well

that is open for comment. Andrea is going to put the link, I hope, in the chat where you can take a look if you're interested. Thanks.

All right. So, going back to the agenda, I have two AOBs. The first is I've just put Next-Gen, but I intended to write a bit more. It's regarding the Next-Gen Mentorship Program. I've heard some members in our community ask about this. There is a call for nominations for the Next-Gen mentors. Now, while the call says community members should nominate, this is not at the stakeholder group level. It's at the supporting organization level. So, this will be GNSO. The whole of GNSO, all the stakeholder groups and constituencies have to nominate a single person.

I do not currently know how GNSO intends to do this, but the way I believe it's done in the past is those nominations will be sent to the GNSO Council Standing Selection Committee, and they will select a single person to represent GNSO as a mentor from GNSO. The program only allows for three mentors. Currently, there is one mentor from GNSO, but from the Business Constituency. There is one from the advisory committee, ALAC, and another from the Root Server System Advisory Committee. So, there are three currently.

Just thought I would make that clear. I know some folks in our community are interested. You send that request to the PC. The PC will forward the names to GNSO, and basically, that's all we can do. The GNSO Standing Selection Committee will do the selection there. All right. I think the next item is the IDN EPDP update. Peter, if you can take that away.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thank you so much, Tomslin. I don't know if Emmanuel wants to jump in.

EMMANUEL VITUS: Good morning, everyone, depending on your location. Emmanuel for the record. So, yes, Last week, the IDN team finished the review of the public comments, and I'm happy that our feedbacks that we actually discussed during the public comment period were taken into account. So, I think I sent an email to the team regarding those comments, and my recommendation, because they asked every representative to go back to the SGs to get comments regarding the new languages.

So, I actually sent the email explaining to the entire community that the proposed changes reflect our feedback and address the concern that we actually raised during that public comment period. So, we actually recommend to accept the updated language for the recommendations 13, 14 and 15.

So, moving forward with the work plan in general, we discussed it last week. So, there may be some little adjustments based on the feedback from the other groups. So, it was left with the GAC and the registries. This morning, I saw their emails. So, I think we are reaching a full consensus agreement on this, and I think the deadline was today, the 16th. So, I think after that, we'll be able to have a call during the next few days to close that chapter.

So, as you can see, I don't know if you usually visit the wiki page, we are working on a very tight schedule, so that I think from today going, that consensus period that will last for at least 10 days, we should be able to finish everything by September 26th. And until the end of the month, which will be around September 30th, to resolve any challenge that will arise so that we stabilize the final reports and circulate it for the team review by October 1st. So, I think I will share that with you when we all agree at the working group. And we'll have the possibility to review that until October 7th before the draft is submitted to the GNSO Council.

So, it will actually give us some time to brief before we go for the ICANN meeting. So, if everything goes well as I think, and everything is completed, I think by November 1st, everything, I mean, the final report 2 will be sent to the Council for consideration. So, I think the Council is expected to take action on this phase 2 final reports on November 30th during the ICANN meeting in Istanbul. So, I think that is it so far. I think we clear everything so far. So, nothing much to report on from now going, but I will share the draft final document for everyone to see whether it will reflect or if there's any red flag to raise before this is sent to the Council for consideration.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI:

Thank you so much, Emmanuel. I just wanted to add that this will give us an opportunity because this is a technical environment, and we contribute from our own understandings and there are a lot of technical jargons and stuff like that. So, the period for us to, when Emmanuel shared with us, I will encourage the group to look at it and see if there

are any language that might need us to look at. So, yeah. Thank you. Over to you, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you. Thank you, Peter. And unless there is any other AOB, that's the last thing that was on the agenda. So, if nothing else comes up, then we get to finish early today. So, I'll give a few seconds to see if there is any other AOB and if not, we call it there and give back some time to everyone. Thanks then. See you all online and perhaps during the Council call later in the week. Thanks everyone.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]