
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the NCSG monthly policy call on Monday December 13th at 11:30 UTC. Today's meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the record. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. With that, I'll turn the call over to Tomslin. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Brenda, and thanks, everyone, for joining today for our I believe last policy meeting for 2021. Today, we'll do what we always do. We'll walk through the GNSO Action Decision Radar, then look at the GNSO Council agenda, because we usually have this meeting if there's anyone joining for the first time, during this meeting or this call, we look at what will be the agenda of the GNSO Council, which usually happens the same week as this call. We usually have this call on a Monday before the GNSO Council meeting, so we walk through that agenda so that councilors can take input from members going to that meeting.

And then we will have some policy updates from our three PDPs that are currently in flight. It's a busy one this month because there are quite many change requests. Well, two change requests out of the three PDPs in flight. We don't have any specific Any Other Business today, but in case a Policy Committee member or members in general have something that's come up, they can bring.

I'll quickly present agenda item two, which is update from the GNSO Council Action Decision Radar. Unlike the previous months, and probably similar to last month, there isn't much on the zero to three

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.

months radar of the Council in terms of policy. It's really preoccupied mostly with operational tasks. And fair enough, because again, the new Council is only getting to sort stuff out.

But stuff like ODPs are preoccupying Council in the next three months and we'll look at those ODPs. If you're not sure what ODP stands for, it's the Operational Design Phase which the Board calls for before it implements policy recommendations from the Council. We'll look at those two in the Council agenda, because they are there, so I won't repeat them here.

And the other thing is the EPDP phase one recommendation 12, the Council is working on this response and dialogue with the Board, some questions came, and I think that's also on the agenda, so we'll probably have a quick look at it on the agenda as well.

Lastly, Work Stream 2 implementation for GNSO Council, while this is on the radar, the Council doesn't have a plan yet, hasn't decided which vehicle to use to work on this. This is still sitting in the backlog. So there's no plan yet to discuss on that.

I'll pause there to see if anyone has any comment or questions on that before we proceed to the Council agenda walkthrough. Seeing no hands up, we'll walk through the Council agenda next.

The Council agenda, there are a couple of administrative matters in this meeting. One of them is—sorry, not administrative matters but consent agenda. A couple of ones there. Like I mentioned, the transfer policy review—Rafik, your hand is up.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Tomslin. I was going to wait until you finish going through the consent agenda, but I was going to comment to the comment, the first item there.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay. Well, we actually have a slot to discuss these two project changes as part of the policy update from our members who are represented in these groups. But yes, that's what those two are. There are two motions here for project change request. One, the transfer policy is trying to bring an item that was meant to be discussed in phase two of that review PDP into phase one, apparently because they want to address all security items together. And we'll probably hear more about this from Wisdom. And yes, I don't know if you want to comment now, Rafik, on that item.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, let's go. Okay, so I understand about the project change request, but I have a concern, because usually, the project change request, when it was created in the context of the PDP 3.0 improvements, it was really about project management and to manage the timelines and commitment, because we didn't want the working groups to kind of go forever and they don't really follow what they said as a plan or timeline. So that was really the purpose. But it seems here it's about scope and bringing one item. So I think this should deserve more discussion than being in the consent agenda. I think it needs more clarification why working group thought that should one topic, one item to be covered at

the time. I think there is even maybe a proposal to change the charter if I'm not mistaken. I'm trying to recall, it was a few days ago.

The other question is more procedural here. If the working group thought there is some maybe—not concern but there is maybe required change in the scope and the charter, why this didn't come up to the GNSO Council through the Council liaison? Because working group members can ask the Council and so on ... So I have these concerns. Seems kind of to rush and push the Council to make decisions. So I would like that the Council really make an educated decision on this matter to understand why and what's really the impact. It's not just kind of procedural as for other change requests.

I can tell you for other change requests, even it was about the timeline, but because we wanted the working group to commit to what was planned. I think this deserves more discussion than just trying to pass a motion, the consent agenda. I don't think it's controversial topic, but it's important for GNSO Council as the manager of the process to discuss this in more detail.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Rafik. Wisdom, I might call on you to give a bit of context, but Rafik, I just have a question for you. This is just because you have firsthand knowledge in the development of this work tool of project change request. Are there other guardrails included in that work tool that would prevent a PDP from raising a change other than a timeline change, or is it just because that's how it's been used before?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

I think the change request itself follows a template, so you have to explain the reason, but this was really created and designed as a project management tool. So that was kind of the main goals. Changing of scope can be part of project management. It's possible to see that. I don't recall it was really envisioned. Sorry, my memory is not necessarily reliable here. But in terms of the context when it was discussed, it was really project management tool. So I think it's possible. I'm not saying it's not. But what I'm suggesting here is really to discuss more. Any other PCR—that's a funny acronym—we had to spend more time to discuss, maybe because they were for critical PDP like the EPDP or the RPM, but they had more discussion. That's why I'm asking here why it was not raised before, in particular since it's about the charter, clarification of the scope, why didn't it come up early to the Council? So maybe I missed some discussion, but that's why it's more about clarification. I don't think there is any ill intent with this, I just find it a little bit odd that they are using the PCR for this purpose if it's about bringing a topic.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Okay. Thanks. Wisdom, I wonder if you could add more context for us, since you are in that group, as to why a PCR was preferred. If you're speaking, we can't hear you. All right, maybe we can ask for a bit more context when we get to the update part. We'll have a bit more discussion on this motion. But I get your point. Maybe we do need a bit more discussion than just confirming the motion.

WISDOM DONKOR:

Moving to the next, 3.2, the consent agenda, which is an issue of time, I think. The specific curative rights protection for IGOs is requesting for extra time to complete their work. So according to ... if I go by what you were saying, Rafik, I think this one falls in a traditional use of the tool. But I guess there'll be questions regarding why they need the time. Juan will be able to give us some context on this one as well. Hopefully, he joins before we get to the item. He promised to be here. Hopefully he'll join by then and be able to give us [inaudible]. I'll pause to see if anyone has any comments or questions.

Seeing no hands up, we'll proceed. The Standing Selection Committee is the other item on the consent agenda. They selected their leadership the first meeting, the new refresh, and our own Akinremi Peter and Arinola from the BC will be the chair. So they will be confirmed Thursday.

Finally in the consent agenda is the recommendations report for EPDP phase 2A. So that's all that's on the consent agenda for the Council meeting. Just checking to see if there's any hands before I move to item four. Like I said, we'll come to some of those items on the consent agenda back when we reach the policy update section of our meeting today.

All right, seeing no hands, item four is a Council discussion on one of the ODPs, the standardized system for access and disclosure. Here, I think the Council plans to discuss their January consultation with the Board regarding the cost model of the SSAD and where the SSAD ODP project team would have gone to by that time. So for this, the SSAD ODP GNSO liaison will be presenting, giving the Council an update on where Org's

project team is up to at this point. And if there's any information regarding the cost model which the Council can use to plan their consultation meeting with the Board in January. I'll pause there to see if anyone has a comment on that item.

Seeing none, we'll move to the next agenda item, which is the next ODP, the SubPro ODP. Now, this one, unlike the SSAD one, is just kicking off. I understand that they haven't officially kicked off yet. However, the GNSO liaison to that ODP has had meetings and preliminary questions already. But in addition to the liaison updates and updating the Council on where the project team from Org is up to, there is an important discussion which has come up from this ODP, which is how does the Council—what's the process the Council should use to process questions and feedback to the Board from the Council and how the Council should approve those feedback or responses back to the Board through—sorry, Rafik, I'm just seeing your question now. You're asking why a closed update.

I think this meeting—and this is for SSAD. So permit me, I'll go back to item four to answer Rafik's question. This is a meeting, I believe, organized for Council and the EPDP members if I'm not mistaken, consultation with the Board. Why it's closed, I'm not so sure. I can check that for you, Rafik, why it's a closed session, but I don't have the answer today. But it is a closed session. Thanks. I'll go back then to number five.

So I was saying there has been—Brenda, if you could go to item six, because this relates to that as well. Like I was saying, out of the SubPro ODP has come a question of how does the Council manage the input review into the questions that the liaison comes with from the Board,

because currently, there hasn't been an official process as to how the Council should approve those responses. So that's the intention of item six, for the Council to have a discussion on how the Council would like the process to look like. And I believe the liaison is also interested in knowing that.

So that's really all about that item. It's an open discussion. I think the current proposal is that it would be a nonobjection on the mailing list once the responses would have been drafted by the liaison and the Council leadership and shared with the Council, there'll be a nonobjection process on the mailing list. But the Council will discuss if that is not good enough or if that is fine. Yeah. Are there any questions on item five and six? Yes, Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Tomslin. Not so much comment about the process. The document itself doesn't give too many details, but regarding item five, I think the ODP for SubPro, it's more a question if it's possible to get more details about the timeline why it will take I think over one year almost before the Board will make decision.

So we heard a lot about the ODP as a process to help the Board to make decisions. But one year, that's quite long, and doesn't mean that at the end, the Board will make decision. They can also take more time to go through. So if it's possible to get more details to understand why. And I can acknowledge that the topic is complex, there are many dependencies and they want to be sure about going through all the details, but I'm asking because at the end, many times we talked about

the effectiveness, how to improve the process and so on, but we find out that it's taking too long in terms of PDP and to review even before the approving and then after the implementation. So it's kind of a lifetime before things to be implemented. So to get more details and understand how they reached that outcome.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Rafik. And I believe that also is in line with the concerns the community currently have regarding implementation of policy recommendations that have been approved by the Council, that it takes forever to see it implemented by the Board. So it's a valid question to ask why it's taking long, because the community has shared some concern, including us, but it doesn't help the volunteers' participation when they don't get to see—what they've worked on for many years, doesn't get implemented. So I guess it's a valid question to ask.

If there are no more hands or concerns with item five and six, we'll move on to item seven. Item seven relates to ICANN 73 planning, and this is not just about what meetings or what days meetings which the Council traditionally had should be had, but rather, whether there are other meetings that the Council would like to have other than the usual meeting with ccNSO or the GAC, things like, would the Council love to meet with ALAC for example during ICANN 73? Would they like to meet with RSSAC, SSAC? And also, some meetings which used to be physical meetings before COVID-19 pandemic but haven't been able to transition to virtual. Is there a way that Council can make them virtual? So this is what this Council discussion would be about.

I think I'll be leading this discussion, and there is a Google document that will be shared today which is a simple document, it just has a table of the meetings the Council usually has had in the past physically, and once out of those, which were able to transition to virtual and the ones that have not been. And for the Council members to contribute into the document if they can be and if there are any other meetings that should be added which the Council would like to see held during ICANN 73 as well. I'll pause there to see if anyone has a comment, question on that item.

All right. Seeing no hands, I'll move to item eight. This is regarding the Board's letter. I think we had a discussion about this in the November meeting, but the current status is that the Board's letter to the Council asking if the overlap items on IDN guidelines 4 and IDNs EPDP can be removed from the guidelines so that items which do not overlap or conflict with the policy work that the IDNs EPDP is doing can proceed and IDN guidelines version 4 published. The Registries Stakeholder Group was working on a response to the Board, and that response would be presented by Kurt Pritz on Thursday. So on this item, we'll be hearing from the Registries Stakeholder Group on what the response to the Board would be. I'll pause to see if there are any questions on the item.

Seeing none, we'll move to item nine. This is the one on EPDP phase one recommendation 12. I mentioned that dialogue and a response is expected from the Council back to the Board. But there was a small team created in the Council to address this one, and I understand that the small team has some clarification questions back to Becky Burr, not to the Board in general but just one Board member, before they

officially respond to the Board. So they're planning to have a meeting with Becky to discuss this, and this item is optional pending new information that comes through before Thursday between the small team and Becky I believe. I'll stop there to see if anyone has anything to add. I know that Manju is in that small team and I wonder if you'd like to add anything. If not, that's fine. Yes, Manju, please go ahead.

MANJU CHEN:

I actually didn't have much to add, but we are having this meeting my Wednesday morning, so it's going to be before our Council meeting. So hopefully maybe during the Council meeting, if we have time, we will update the Council about how the meeting with Becky went. That is all. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Manju. So it looks like that item will stay on the agenda then. So for item ten, Any Other Business, I think there are only two items there, one being the additional budget requests, which the councilors have been asked to think about coming from the strategic session, whether there are any new ways of working, or tools or anything whatsoever that they believe the Council can try out, which would require a budget request. That's 10.1, and then 10.2 is the GAC communique and the liaison to the GAC. I believe he had sent some questions to the Council to have a think about. So those are the two items on Any Other Business and that'll be it for the Council meeting.

I'll see now if anyone has anything else to add or comments or questions regarding any part of the Council agenda. All right. I see no

hands. We'll return then to our agenda, which the next agenda item, number four on our agenda, is the policy update, and like I mentioned, two of those policy—EPDPs, PDPs, whether E or not, have a change request. So I don't know if Juan is here now for an update on the IGO. If not, we'll first go to Wisdom for the transfer policy review. The floor is yours.

WISDOM DONKOR:

Thank you very much. I'll give updates on the policy transfer. I believe yesterday, my colleague, Farzaneh, updated the group list. I'll just highlight some of those updates she made on the list. And yes, there has been a lot of discussion. Most of those are operational issues, and several issues were looked at. An example of such is how long should a domain name be locked before one can transfer again. This is a feature that we discussed to be in place to kind of prevent registration abuse. for example, hijacking, domain hiding, [inaudible], etc.

So apart from that, we also have been discussing about how long the lock should be. For some registrars, discussion that we've had, brought to discussion that some registrars believe there should be no lock. Our side on the committee are with the opinion that a lock period is necessary. So that has been tabled, and then we don't have any operational issues. So we think there should be the need for NCSG to look into this and see if possible to do a bit of research about this and see how this'll have with operational matters.

On our side, we are not pushing for a specific number of days, of how long a domain should be locked, but rather, we are looking at how long

enough can prevent abuse and not long enough that it hinders the operations of a domain.

The other aspect that has been discussed before—I think Farzaneh raised this before, a dual factor [inaudible] which we asked to be in place. The other is privacy concerns with notification about domain transfers which should be sent to domain owners. So this has been discussed extensively.

On our side, we have been supporting the minimization of personal data that can be found in this notification, and I think Farzaneh has raised this before. There are many voices in this group about how we don't hear the customers. So there'll be the need for us to do a bit of research into customers to see what they think, especially noncommercial customers, to see what they think about the operations of domain names. That'll be useful to the process.

Then, in a nutshell, two things that we have identified and are keeping our eyes on are the security and the privacy aspect of the domain name transfers [and other.] So we have [inaudible] enhanced security in transfer policy and have asked to remove those processes that could potentially impact the privacy of domain name registrants.

We did also support [inaudible] using the [inaudible] identification when defining various auth codes. So briefly, this is what I would say we have to give today the community. And aside that, there has been a number of recommendations under consideration, and then I will find the time to share some of those recommendations on the list for everyone to look at and see if there are any concerns with those recommendations

that should be raised on the committee level. Thank you. I think this is what I have.

I also heard—I think Rafik was asking about the project change request. I think if he can give a bit of time, maybe Friday, I can go into this and look for some information, if that is okay.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Wisdom. I don't see Rafik putting his hand up to say if it's okay or not.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah. The Council meeting is next week, or this week?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: This week.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Then we should know as soon as possible.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah. Wisdom, if it's possible to have it before Thursday, that'll be helpful in the discussion we're going to have. Well, as it stands right now, it's a consent agenda, it's not a discussion. So it'll be good to have it so that we can make it a discussion.

WISDOM DONKOR: Okay. I'll look into that [inaudible].

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you. Does anyone have any question for Wisdom regarding the update? And I note that Olévié mentioned that he had issues with transferring and I know that that's the sort of information you and Farzaneh have been asking on the mailing list. So I don't know if the challenge Olévié had is relevant to your work. But yeah. I don't see any other hands up and I don't think Juan was able to join us today. So I will move to the IDN EPDP which Farell will help us with that, giving us an update. Thanks. Over to you.

FARELL FOLLY: Hello everyone. Thanks, Tomslin, for giving the floor. After the A4 item that we have discussed last time regarding the IDN on EPDP—the A4 just for a reminder, it was regarding the challenge mechanisms when applying to an IDN, so when an applied for IDN is found to be invalid, what would be the challenge and appeal mechanism in place to help the user go through the process.

After that, A5, A6 and A7 have been discussed, and I would like us to share the outcome of those discussions, and there is not yet some decision but we are still working through the draft of the document, but I believe that any time or sooner, the stakeholder group will be consulted to require their input for the initial report or whenever it's required to have input from the stakeholder group.

So the A5 was actually to discuss about the fact that there could be many variants for an applied for IDN, and there is a recommendation from the SSAC which is SSAC 060, that notes that variant codepoint in an LGR may introduce a permutation issue. So possibly creating a large number of variant domains, and this can present some challenge for the management of variant domains at the registry and registrar level. And therefore, SSAC recommendation 60 advised to [inaudible] down the number of possible variants. But many people or many members of the IDN oppose that proposition because even though there might be a security issue to take into account when having too many variants, but at the same time, it's highly likely that we can know in advance in what circumstances a registry can handle all those things. So there are people suggesting that this suggestion should not be enforced by a policy coming from ICANN but let upon the decision of a registry themselves so that they can find appropriate way to handle this, because it's difficult to find a criteria and mechanism that can ensure that there are not too many variants. Some suggested for instance that when a TLD is malformed, then it should not be allowed to be a valid TLD, but people argue against that, like trademarks and those things are not well formed but are valid TLD domains because some company had been using them for long and we have no right to tell them that that can be a TLD or even an IDN TLD in some cases.

So that's more or less the [inaudible] of A5, and I'm not representing NCSG, I'm a GNSO liaison, so I actually share no view of NCSG, but I think we should be consulted anytime to put input forth. So I will then move to A6. A6 is just a follow-up of the A5. So as such, in the future, a

label generation group should be updated, and the criteria here or the question here is, how to make that update the most efficient possible.

One of the recommendations is to always make sure that after an update or when planning an update, there should be a backward compatibility. That means the new LGR should always remain compatible with all existing variants in the domain, and then who will be responsible for that, how can it be done, etc. Those had been some questions that we have tried during our discussion to find solutions for.

And of course, there is also a recommendation from the SSAC as to how to ensure this kind of backward compatibility, and when there is an exception that occurs, when it's impossible to update an LGR without impacting existing TLDs, then how should this be handled? There are some suggestions to ask the generation panel to flag this issue and then we'll try to find with the working group the entity that needs to work together to handle this kind of exception.

From there, the analysis, there are some triggers that can help launch an update to a root zone label generation rule. For instance, evidence that an additional existing codepoint is needed for one of the languages considered, because a script may be used by many languages, so optimization in IDN can be optimized for the script level but not the language level, and sometimes optimized for particular language but not at the script level. So those are some differences, let's say, issues that need to be taken into account and had been proposed to help the ones who'll be updating an LGR to process through.

Also, additional language can be considered and not considered before the script, because there is a new language or reason why the language should be now considered. For example, a change in the EGIDS value, for instance. So this is just for example.

So I can now move also to A7, and A7 is also a continuity from the previous one, what mechanisms or criteria should be used to identify a script appropriate for a single character. So SSAC has a recommendation that the use of a single character TLD should be avoided at the most extent possible, but of course, in this case too, the registry are free to manage a domain according to what they can handle. So if we are to make such constraint, how can we achieve that and what should be the mechanism in place to maybe reduce the confusability that one character top-level domain name can introduce.

So this is handled in SAC recommendation 052 for those who are interested, and then I think this is where we are now. There is not yet any outcome or decision on that, and we are having our next meeting on Friday. It was Thursday, but due to the Council meeting, it was moved to Friday. We'll continue discussing this issue. And I think if you have any issue, suggestion or question to raise, please share it here or comment on the mailing list, and I can try to share it with the team if it's not an NCSG position. If it is, I think we have appropriate channel to send our comment later on.

Thank you very much. I think that's all I have to say for IDN.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Farell. And being the Council liaison, for those who did not know, that's why he cannot represent NCSG position. Peter and myself are the NCSG representatives. Myself, I'm having a challenge with the meetings because they're 2:00 AM my time, but I get to read the scripts or listen to them after.

I do have a comment which I think on A5, which should be I think in my view, an NCSG position. Peter, if you have a view on this, please chime in. It's that on limiting the variants, it makes in the policy ICANN a sort of content regulator, which is not in its remit. So I think in that sense, we shouldn't be letting ICANN limit the number of variants that can be generated, because I haven't seen the data that shows that if there is a certain number, it'll cause any specific stability or security concerns.

So that's my current point of view. Peter, if you have anything to add there, you can, and I'll let folks comment either on the mailing list or here, you can raise your hand and say. I also appreciate that NCSG doesn't have too many people versed in this topic on IDNs, but I think it's of serious concern to us because there are many of our members who live and use the Internet in those regions and countries where different scripts and languages are used. So that's all I had there and what I think our position should be on that A5.

All right, I don't think we have Juan still, so we might not be able to get an update on the IGO EPDP today. I understand he had a lot to share. So in his absence, I'll speak to him after the meeting and request that he sends his update on the mailing list. Yes, Bruna. Go ahead.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Hi everyone. Just one short AOB. We have been talking a little bit in the past meetings about some sort of prioritization work for NCSG. What I wanted to ask you is whether we could maybe schedule a call—that doesn't have to necessarily be the policy call, but maybe an NCSG call in the beginning of 2022 for us to discuss prioritization of resources, our participation in working groups and all of these spaces, and for us to also check where else we need some extra work or where do we need to gather some more volunteers to, because Tomslin and I and Tatiana and a lot of us have been talking about how complicated some things have been so far and how overstretched we were, so just wanted to see if there is any good ideas about maybe having a call on our work prioritization and also to see how to better structure what we're doing for 2022 given that we might have a little chance of having an on-site meeting for the policy meeting. So yeah, just wanted to see what are your thoughts and ideas about that.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Bruna. Well, before I say whether I take a side, I'll wait to see if other members have a position about whether we should have a meeting or not, or if they think it's something that's important. If I understand, Bruna, I think you expect some sort of feedback today in this meeting, either via chat or raising hands and speaking. Is that correct?

BRUNA SANTOS:

Yeah, well, just to see if that's something that would be nice for everyone and to see if that's something that would interest. We can

obviously do this with leadership and councilors and let it open for anyone else who wants to come in. But I think it would be important for us to have a more frank and open conversation about the amount of initiatives we're all involved now and how can we better work to have more volunteers and everything else, and also the prioritization part. So if anyone doesn't say anything, I'm going to read this as there is no one that's truly against that. But yeah, if anyone would like to speak or even propose anything else, that's more than welcome.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

I like the idea of nonobjection. I think it's an important one to have. We didn't have any sort of planning this year at all in terms of that. So yes, it's a good one to have. So we could initially target, like you said, opening for all but request councilors and leadership, all the committee members to attend and open it for anyone else who'd like to attend. I see Manju's hand up. Please.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Tomslin. I'm just wondering, why does it have to be separate from the policy call? Even on the call, we have pretty low attendance, so I'm not sure if having another one between the policy calls is going to be more people. I think it's a good idea to have this meeting and to talk about the survey, but I don't think [inaudible] time for the policy calls [inaudible]. Maybe we could just [inaudible] we're going to talk about in the strategic session [inaudible] the policy call and then we expect more people to come, and like Tomslin said, we mandate the leadership and councilors to attend this call, because I don't know about you—and I'm

too new maybe to say this, but I'm kind of tired of a lot of meetings every day.

So I'm just thinking if it's not impossible to incorporate those, because I don't see why not. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Manju. Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS: Yeah. The idea—well, I think Tomslin and I can coordinate on how to better make this meeting happen. The only reason why I thought about separating is because I didn't want it to take too much space from the policy calls. And I also think we might be talking about more things than just our policy work, like how to better engage volunteers, how also the leadership team should be working together, and also because I think we are not having any good attendance from any of the [ACs] or the other chairs. So it's kind of limited.

So I was just thinking about making it more like NCSG broad and not just on the policy sense. But I think we can go with your idea, Manju, maybe just making sure that the next NCSG policy call is an expanded one with maybe an extra hour so we can add this prioritization talk and everything else and make sure everyone attends, because I think it would do us really good to have 2022 planned and everything at least mapped in the sense that we should all be working together. And it might be an even harder year because we are all worse in the burnout area.

I know you councilors and some of our volunteers are all in more than just one committee at a time, and I really wanted to see if there's space for us to rearrange and see if there's anyone else that's willing to come in. So that's my idea so far, but I think we can make an expanded policy call. Let's see how we can coordinate this.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. I see Rafik's hand up now.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah. I was not going to comment, but what I heard kind of urged me to speak. Bruna, are you really suggesting that we will have more than two hours call for policy and to talk about prioritization? Because if that's the case, then I'm not sure that will be effective. We're already having trouble to have 90-minute call, so longer, I doubt that would be effective. For example, here, it's almost 10:00 PM on Monday. Not my favorite day to do anything. So personally, I won't be [inaudible] for any long call anymore. I did it enough, no more. But that's just me.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Rafik. Well, I think it's a difficult one. On one hand, it's hard to get people to be here so that we can discuss it, and on the other hand, it's not to use, like Bruna mentioned, time from the policy call. But I think we can plan it and have both on this call. We plan the meeting knowing that we will use maybe 30 minutes for that discussion and get the audience we need to be in attendance to understand that even if they're not interested in the policy call, we'd need them in that call

because we will be having that conversation. But maybe it also might be a bit confusing for them if the policy call is used for that conversation. So maybe that's where the suggestion Bruna has to separate the call to have a different meeting.

Hopefully, January is not so bad to have another meeting, Manju. But yeah, Bruna—

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you, Tomslin. I was just going to ask Brenda and Andrea when are their holiday breaks, because maybe that's something we can schedule either before the next policy call or do something together. But I agree with you. I was going with the separate meetings because I think there is more than just the policy work, and it would be good—at least to me—to have a broader NCSG call that's talking about more things. We haven't had that in a while, and I was avoiding also calling for them because I know we are all very much tired and stressed with a lot of other things. So that's what I was thinking.

But I will send an e-mail to the mailing list just proposing this and saying that this planning/prioritization call was something that was discussed at the policy committee and asking members whether they would prefer it to be a separate one or some section of the policy call, because I also think that 30 minutes doesn't really do for what we want and what we maybe need.

So yeah, I'll send an e-mail and probably coordinate this with you, Tomslin. I know you don't need more work, but I'm sharing the load with you on this. But that's what I'll do then.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. I think I can take one more. So yeah, there seems to be support for a separate meeting. And I think I agree that a more general NCSG conversation which is also good which is not policy specific as well. So let's go for—I think your suggestion of sending it on the mailing list asking for it is a good idea for a separate one.

All right. That is all we had. Unless someone else had another AOB. Manju, please go ahead.

MANJU CHEN: Thanks, Tomslin. I understand we had this casual meeting with some of the Board members a few weeks ago. I just want to ask Bruna if there's any—[oh, you] didn't attend, because the time zone wasn't really friendly for us. So I just wanted to ask if anyone who attended it, do you have any takeaways from that meeting? If it's okay to share with us here. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Manju. Bruna, I'll have to look to you for this one.

BRUNA SANTOS: No worries. It was a good call and part of these more informal exchanges we try to have each time. I guess this one was focused on meeting strategy also and some of the things we've been trying to hear more from our Board members and everything else.

So Manju, I will take a look at my notes because I still have them somewhere, and I can share them on the list just so everyone is aware of that. I should have done that before but I lost track of time in these past weeks and also with the IGF: But [inaudible] I'll make this as a personal compromise to have this in a more feasible time for you guys from APAC, just so we also have you on the call and because that's also relevant.

So yeah, I'll share with you the notes as soon as I find them. That's it.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Bruna. Is there Any Other Business anyone would like to raise? Okay, if not, that is all we had today. I want to thank you all very much for the meeting today and for the participation. Have a good holiday. If I don't see you at the Council meeting call, then see you next year. Season's greetings. Thank you. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]