

---

BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the NCSG Monthly Policy Call on 11 April 2022 at 11:30 UTC. Today's call is recorded. Kindly state your name before speaking and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. And with that, I will turn the meeting over to Tomslin. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Brenda. Thanks, everyone, for coming today. It's a small crowd today. However, we do have a very, very packed interesting agenda to go through, considering that all the items that we have listed as updates are actually on the Council agenda.

So my approach today ... Hoping that folks who are supposed to give updates are all on the call. So my approach for today will be that as I go through the Council agenda, the items where an update is required, I'll call on our representative who is on that—either the small team or working group—to give us an update so that we discuss the item. Because I think most of the items, too, on the Council agenda will be updates as well. So I thought that would be a better approach today.

So we'll start with agenda item number two. And as Brenda brings that up for us, again, most of those items will be ... We will have infused them during the agenda walkthrough for the Council meeting. So there will be no consent agenda. Sorry. It's getting late here. My brain's getting sleepy.

---

*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.*

---

But moving right on to item four on the Council agenda. The small team for SSAD will be presenting their preliminary draft report—preliminary report on the assessment on the ODA. And we’ve just been talking with Stephanie before the call began. But on this, the team will present what they have so far decided to do. They’ll be presenting that to the Council. And I think it requires a Council action as well. But I will pass it on to Stephanie to please give us an update on the team because I understand their meetings have been very heated. So it’s best to hear it from the source itself. So, Stephanie, over to you, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks very much. Stephanie for the record. And Manju, please don’t hesitate to jump in and correct the record here if I’m getting a little too ranty. This has not been a very small team. It started out small but we’ve had other people join. Basically, it was formed because we were in a position where the Board was concerned about the feasibility of doing the SSAD because of the results of the Operational Design Phase assessment.

The business community does not want to pay for this thing. They never have. And basically, they’re not happy with the recommendations, or all of the recommendations, of the EPDP Phase 1 and 2, really. So these are hardy perennials. They don’t think that the business community will use it. This view has been plainly expressed. They won’t use it if it’s going to cost them money or if it’s going to not yield the results that they want, like the old WHOIS.

---

And the Contracted Parties are standing firm that, of course, it is they who will decide on what gets released. They have met in the middle to agree that possibly a simpler design of an SSAD might be easier to pay for yet still useful. So they're about to do, or propose, or have agreed on a simplified SSAD and it is coming to Council for discussion.

The small team has been ably chaired by Sebastien Ducos from GoDaddy. And really, he has represented that there are so few people from Council on this small team that we're just basically forwarding the results of the discussion to the Council for a decision. Forgive me but I'm not exactly sure what kind of decision this is according to the rulebook.

But I have continued to register what I think are some of our key complaints about this. They have basically said that the business community won't bother participating in this if they don't get something out of it. Why should they go to the bother and expense of filing a request for information if they don't get anything? Why, indeed? And secondly, don't ask them to pay for any of this, which means, of course, that ICANN will have to absorb the costs of this trial.

We've had numerous lengthy discussions on whether this is a trial or a proof of concept. On this particular matter, Steve Crocker is very eloquent. And he's talking about the phases of building a system, when of course, what we're actually debating here is whether, from a policy perspective, this thing works at all. So I can live with proof of concept. That's fine.

Anyway, there is a Google Document, which I have marked up. I trust that's going to be brought to the Council for discussion on Thursday. I

---

may sound a little whiny in my comments or they may just prune them out as usual. But I do think that a fundamental sticking point for the NCSG is we cannot participate in building a system where the costs get downloaded to the RNH for providing their personal information to whoever the heck is asking.

Unfortunately, it remains the case that while the industry is dominated by key responsible players who tend to be around the ICANN table, there's still a lot of Contracted Parties, and third parties, and you name it, resellers, that don't understand data protection law and may just toss the data over. Possibly, that's what they're counting on. I don't know. But that's one issue, problem that we are not going to uncover with this thing.

The second thing—and I realize this may be a debatable point at NCSG. Some members don't think that an authentication at the front end, verifying who the requestor is, would be useful. So they've dumped that. They're not going to bother. The streamlined, simplified SSAD proof of concept will not bother with authentication. They will leave that to the Contracted Parties.

In my experience—and I actually do have experience—working in jobs where you have to screen requestors who are asking for personal information, that is one thing that is a hard job and that not every data holder or data controller will be able to do on their own. So I think that's enough out of me. I think this has been a frustrating Groundhog Day kind of experience arguing this on the small team. Thanks.

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Stephanie. With regards to the procedural request that you had, which you mentioned you didn't know what the Council is supposed to do here, I think it's meant to advise the Board to ask Org to start or implement such a system. But my understanding is that's only if there is general agreement in the Council that we would like to go the proof of concept way.

If there are objections, then a vote or ... What do they call it, again? It needs to be submitted into the consent agenda in May for a vote or something. If there are some councilors who are not keen on going proof of concept way. So I think there are two paths there once it comes to Council on Thursday—two possible paths. I'll see if there's anyone who would like to ask a question or make a comment.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yeah. This is Kathy Kleiman on the phone. I'd like to join the queue.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: You are the first, Kathy. Please proceed.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thanks, Tomslin. Stephanie, I apologize. I came in the middle of what you were saying. But I always thought ... And maybe I'm misunderstanding. I always thought that accreditation—that trying to understand who the requestor of the data is—was a key function that ICANN was going to take on, on behalf of everyone. If I missed all this already this morning, let's move on. But it sounds like all of that's being

---

shifted. That was always supposed to be a key function. That was a key understanding as we moved into the GDPR.

What you're saying, as I understand it, is that all of this is being shifted to the Contracted Parties. And that doesn't seem to make any sense or be fair. That was always something ICANN was supposed to take on and could do—could scale it up—could do it on a much larger basis because the requestor of one registered party is likely to be the requestor to other registered parties as well. So coming up with a common set of standards for that requesting, I always thought was going to be an ICANN function and a consensus community function.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

That is precisely the case, Kathy. Thank you for putting it much more eloquently than I did. That is the front end. And it's a difficult problem, particularly if you would be, for instance, a small third-party reseller in a jurisdiction that pays very little attention to the GDPR. Knowing who the requestor is is a key, key component of whether or not you're going to give the data.

Then, of course, there is the matter of whether you can streamline the request itself to insure that the request contains all of the proper rationales. And we have wasted hours, and hours, and hours debating whether this should be dropdown box, or a form, or whatever. That's kind of a fundamental thing. You come up with ... And this, I have no quibble with any of the techies, such as Steve Crocker, who have proposed various ways of getting those key things that you're looking

---

for in the request—namely the purpose why they need it, whether they’re legitimate, etc.

But if you don’t know who you’re talking to or you’re unable to detect a misrepresentation by such a creature, body, law firm, whatever, then you’re just throwing an unknowledgeable Contracted Party right back into the soup. And in my view ... And this goes way back to 2013 when I was on the EWG. In my view, this is a function that could be centralized and would provide greater certitude in terms of who’s asking and who the bad parties are because you want to isolate the bad parties.

Now also, since the EWG, this has been a hot potato that nobody has wanted to touch. And I think this is—nine years down the road we have reached the point where nobody wants to pay for this, take the liability, take the heat, deal with the governments. Whatever it is, they don’t want to do it. So that’s why it’s being dumped, I’m sure. Now, I should say that—

KATHY KLEIMAN:

ICANN’s backing out completely from the accreditation review, and we’re being asked to accept this? And that’s what the proof of concept is, is to see how Contracted Parties do in trying to field all of these requests without any centralized processing?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Strategically, I’m not sure why the Contracted Parties are agreeing to this. They may just be consolidating their hold on control of this process, which would be logical. ICANN has also ... And we’ve argued about this

---

and I do bring it up. ICANN is still very untransparent about their role as a controller. Clearly, if they did the authentication, they would have a key role as a controller. They may just be simply dumping their liability by not touching it. And it's back in the hands of the Contracted Parties, which is fine as long as it works.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Wow. Okay. Thank you. I'm worried.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Me too.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Because it's our data that's going to be disclosed.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, yeah. Me too. And some of our members have said, "Well, we can't possibly have ICANN taking on this role." Well, they will anyway. I'm looking at it from the perspective of what role would ...? How would a privacy commissioner investigate a future complaint? Now, that is something I respectfully think I understand.

One of the key questions is going to be, of course, who's in control and what's the nature of the agreement that you have between the co-controllers and the processors? We haven't talked about resellers in all of this. But the resellers are clearly processors on behalf of the



---

Contracted Parties and they're not within the scope of any of the policy debates we've had but that's a really, really, really weak link there.

Then, of course, what role does ICANN play? There's strong pressure from the business community on ICANN to maintain its role in GDD to investigate failure to comply with these kinds of requests. They can't do that if they're not a controller. They've got no business. And then the other issue that I've—

KATHY KLEIMAN:

So it sounds like we should be doing something at the Council meeting. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Well, the question is, if it comes to a vote, I gather the vote won't come until May. But if it comes to a vote, should we discuss voting against it, just to put a spanner in the works? Or is there a strategic reason for spending the money on this test? I think you and I are probably of the mind that continuing down this road, particularly without the useful central verification and authentication, and with the issue of who's going to pay for it still in the clouds, I think it's dangerous to allow yet another proof of concept.

I say "yet another" because don't forget. We had Goran strike that committee under Ram Mohan that tested the RDAP, which we weren't involved in, that was supposedly a technical test. We really didn't need that committee because whosits—Elliot—Tucows had already tested it. It was already up and running when this thing ran—RDAP that is.

---

Anyway, probably I'm going to slow down the agenda if I keep going on, and on, and on.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thank you. I support our putting a flag in the sand and saying there's a problem during the Council meeting.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Great. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. Thanks, Stephanie. I was going to ask what is the strategy for Thursday, which it seems Kathy has summarized it that we put the flag down, which means that letter to the Board would not happen until a vote—a motion is sent for the May meeting and then a vote happens for a proof of concept—unless we'll put the flag and say, "We just want to call that out but we're happy to go ahead with it." I suppose that's the question that's going to come up in the Council meeting on Thursday.

But I have another question for you, Stephanie. I understand ICANN Org had ... The team on this had a presentation about how the proof of concept would work. I was wondering whether they made any mention about how they will finance it or anything like that.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Well, basically, the business community has said nobody is going to pay or contribute to the funding of this proof of concept. Now bear in mind, we're only doing this so third parties can get access to our personal information. Why on earth should either of the Contracted Parties or the end users ...? And of course, if the Contracted Parties pay, it is the end users because any fees will ultimately come from the RNHs. But it's charging ahead. The business community won't pay.

This is a bit like—I actually think that the fight with Steve Metalitz, when we were doing the PPSAI, the privacy proxy. He was trying to get the registrars to pay for the costs of serving documents on folks that the IPC were trying to sue for trademark and copyright violation. Now, there is no situation where you provide a proxy for your customer and you have to pay to ship documents to serve. This is nuts. And obviously, I'm not a lawyer so if there are any lawyers who know better and say, "Oh, yeah. It happens all the time," please tell me. Because as far as I know, if you want to serve documents, you have to pay for it.

This is the same kind of scenario only spread out globally here. We are looking at the costs being absorbed in the ICANN ecosystem, which means the RNH base.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

So it sounds to me like, on Thursday, we should be asking for who is paying before we even have the conversation.

---

STEPHANIE PERRIN: This is what I'm worried about. If we do a proof of concept where it's free, it's going to stay free. It's just going to flow downstream.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Tomslin, if I might. Let me confirm, as a lawyer, that everything Stephanie just said is true. When you serve papers, the person serving the papers pays. Let's say you're trying to find somebody in a chatroom who's operating under a pseudonym—under another name—and you want to break that privacy. You have to bring it to court. You have to pay the fees. You have to show the magistrate that there is a non-frivolous reason and a legal reason for needing to know the actual identity.

It is always the person bringing the complaint, the concern, that has to pay in the current legal system. So the idea of shoving all of that so that we pay for the privilege of having our privacy violated is crazy. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. I'll just pause quickly to see if there are any other comments. Then we'll move on to our next agenda item.

EPHRAIM PERCY KENYANITO: Tomslin, hi. No extra comments. Just echoing that we really need to draw the line regarding the payment, that it should be the requestor that should pay. Costs should not be passed on to the end users who would be essentially having their privacy violated during the process.

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Ephraim. All right. I think there are no more hands that I can see. So we'll move on to item five, which is the presentation of the final report of the EPDP on specific curative rights protection for IGOs. And I gather that every recommendation, they had full consensus. And apparently, it wasn't expected. So I'm keen to hear from Juan what happened there and why it was such an excellent consensus. So I'll pass it on to Juan to please give us an update on IGO.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Hello, everyone. I don't know where to start. But for just a quick review, remember that this EPDP started as a work track. It was derived from the Review of Rights Protection Mechanisms the working group we refer always as RPM. The work track, their work was deferred for recommendations from the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights.

Those recommendations were that an NGO may enjoy jurisdictional immunity in certain circumstances. Do not affect the right and the ability of registrants to file the judicial proceedings. Another one—the third—was preserve registrants' rights to judicial review of UDRP. And finally, recognize the existence and scope of IGO jurisdictional immunity as a legal issue to be determined by that court.

The process is this working group—now it's an EPDP—in this EPDP group was start with what is the definition or what is an IGO complainant? And then we were discussing about this too much. Even in the comments, in the public comments opened, this was one of the most concerns from the community.

---

But because not the term itself. It was because the exemption—the next one. It was about the exemption from submission this mutual jurisdiction because we needed to identify what is an IGO complainant. Then we had to separate what is a complainant and what is a jurisdiction.

This have a lot of discussion, of course. And finally, we decided—the group decided—to do this public because at the first discussions, it was about that complaint should be apart—should be done by another process that is not public and that was the difference.

About the full consensus, it's right because there were no groups opposing to these recommendations because we were always discussing until all questions or hesitates were clear—something like that. So of course, according to consensus designation, it's a full consensus. But the reality is that most of the group were agreed with these topics in the way that we were discussing it. So that's the way that it works.

For the next step, it was that they discuss about the mutual jurisdiction. And in the comments, we have a lot of comments of that—about what is a jurisdiction, what kind of jurisdiction applies, and things like that. And of course, we are talking about IGOs and we have to have in mind inside the discussion, or we put in the discussion, that all the IGOs hasn't the same financial muscle go to an arbitrational jurisdiction and should be that's why the jurisdictional is a thing—is decided inside the law in every territory or according to [applied].

---

The next, it was about the definition of about the proceedings of following a review of UDRP and the URS. And then we discussed about this in a flowchart that you can find in the final report to know what is the process to apply one role or another.

And then, finally, to this, the working group works on metrics for that—for this impact analysis to review the things that always the people say that, “Okay. How we can measure? How we can measure this?” So in this, we can find some things like, “Okay. What is the number of UDRP complaints filed by IGOs and what is the decisions in favor of IGOs and those decisions involving IGO complainants? That can be a review in the final report.

Finally, the principles for arbitral rules can be found, also, in the final report. I am sorry I am not a legal advisor here. But we were working and we have to—I have to study to study too much on this to understand better this topic, this issue. And I think that it was a good discussion. I think that’s it for now. I don’t know if you maybe have any question. And I hope to be able to answer it.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Juan. Thank you very much for the work you did there. I know at some point, if I’m not mistaken, some of the members left the work party or work team. So thanks. I just had one question.

KATHY KLEIMAN: And I have a question, too.

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: My question was whether ... From an NCSG perspective, I haven't followed this very closely. So I was wondering whether, from an NCSG perspective, if you had any concerns and whether they were addressed during the discussions. Thanks.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Our concerns were mainly ... It was in the first part of the meeting when we were discussing about what is a complainant, what is an IGO, and what is mutual jurisdiction. It was a very supportive. It was very discussed about this. But the topic, it was, of course, about the difference between IGOs, and what is a complaint, and the steps of these complaints, and about the jurisdiction because the jurisdiction is different according to territories—to the court of the laws applied there. I think that was the question, yes?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. Kathy, please.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you for so much time on this special committee. Can we make this a little more concrete? Can you help me understand? I'm going to give you a situation and maybe you can help me understand where you came out on mutual jurisdiction—where the group came out.

I have a nonprofit group called the Domain Name Rights Coalition. It exists in the United States. I exist in the United States. Let's say an IGO, in intergovernmental organization, comes after me. They want my



---

domain name, which is based on the initials, DNRC, which is used by lots of different groups, DNRC.

So there's proceeding. I'm sorry. There's an echo. There's a domain name dispute and I lose. Now I have 10 days. I want to appeal. That is my right under the UDRP processes to be able to take this to a court. And it's actually really not an appeal. It's called a de novo review. It's actually reviewed by the court, which courts in the US do. Am I allowed to do that? What is the mutual jurisdiction? Does it change where, literally, in the world I have to bring that appeal? Do I still have my same rights as a registrant to protect my domain name? Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Juan, do you want to take that?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: I don't know if I understood very good the question. But this working group tries, I think, to balance the rights of the registrants and the IGOs to these requirements.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Right. But where can I bring my appeal? I do not have standing. I will not be able to bring my appeal of this domain name action anywhere else in the world because no other court will listen to me. I have no standing in any court other than the United States. Can I bring that appeal in the United States? Because that's where I actually can do it. Where is my mutual jurisdiction? Again, one, it could be Brazil—wherever the

---

registrant is. Can they bring that action? Otherwise we may have stripped them of their rights.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: I don't know how to answer that question for you. I'm sorry.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Did you guys every talk about actualities, like a real example of how it would work in the real world?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Yeah. I don't remember that we would talk about the appealing process because we were talking only about the arbitration—what to do about this part, taking in account the URS and UDRP and what happens if the arbitrations follow the steps or no response. I know that appeal is a process after the court says something and I don't know how to apply this. But I think that, in this case, it's no response, then we can start another process again, I think.

KATHY KLEIMAN: If there's no response in a UDRP or a URS, you don't automatically lose. It goes to the panelist or the examiner to review the process. But you still have 10 days. Even you lose, even if you haven't responded, you still have 10 days to take it to court if you're the registrant. Interesting. I'll go back and take a look at this. Thanks so much, Juan. Appreciate it.

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Kathy. Thanks, Juan. I don't know if there are any other questions or comments on this. I see none.

All right. We'll move to the next item, then. And that's DNS abuse small team. I hope Wisdom has joined us now. But just to introduce it, like we discussed in earlier policy calls, actually in ICANN 73, the small team which the Council put together was reaching out to specific—had an outreach to, I think, four communities. But in addition to that, they were also expecting each SG and C to also respond to those questions. I only learned about that recently or understood that very recently.

So many of those, I believe, have responded already and the team is meant to go through that as see if there are any inputs that require—which suggest that policy work be done on DNS abuse, and then secondly, go through them and see if there is indeed merit in the GNSO for policy work on those, and if there is, whether it's something which the Council can do or not, I believe. But I will hand it to Wisdom to give us an update of the small team. Wisdom, over to you.

WISDOM DONKOR: Thank you very much, Tomslin. Good afternoon to you all. I apologize for joining late. I was in another meeting. Yes. The DNS abuse team first met on February 9<sup>th</sup> and they took that opportunity to discuss the team's assignment. The small team discussed and completely agreed on it—central questions that should be considered issues and how best those issues could be able to get [inaudible] policy development.

A number of points were raised. We agreed on three questions that should be answered by the community. Initially, we had responses from

---

ALAC, GAC, SSAC, and then DNS Institute. Then that was further expanded to eco's topDNS initiative and the Internet & Jurisdiction program.

But also, there were some concerns that all the community should be involved in the discussion. So the team was asked to reach out to the various communities. So on the 16<sup>th</sup> of March, I made a post on the list elaborating on those various questions that should be answered. The [endorsed] answers will be provided and then they will be factored into the document that will be produced.

I discussed that with Tomslin. I think, yesterday, Tomslin also elaborated on those questions on the list. So I will just be glad if everyone can just look at those questions and see how we can give response to those questions quickly for us to provide feedback into the document before it's been finalized. So as of now, that is what has happened so far. Tomslin, if you want me to go through the questions, I can read them out for everyone to hear.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes. The questions are three and they're short. So it would be good to quickly read them, just so that if someone hasn't read the email, they quickly know what it's about.

WISDOM DONKOR: Thank you very much. The first question was what specific problems will policy development in particular be expected to address and why do you believe that the policy development is the right mechanism to solve

---

those problems? That was the first one. Then the second one was what do you believe are the expected outcomes if policy development would be undertaken, taking into account the remit of ICANN, and more specifically, GNSO policy development in this context? Then the last one was do you or your community have any expectations with regards to possible next steps? So these are the three question areas that we, as a community, need to provide feedback into for us to submit. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Wisdom. I've just shared a link where yesterday, considering that there were no responses on the mailing list, I put together a quick draft Google Doc and shared on the DNS list and the policy list as well for any input so that Wisdom can have a response back to the small team on Thursday.

So if anyone would like to comment, please do put in your responses in there. That would help, especially because I attended—I went to observe the small team's meeting last week and notice that most of the other SGs are actually responding, have responded, or are planning to respond to the question. So I thought we'd better do as well to make sure that we correct any ideas that are going outside what we don't think is correct.

I think I might also share some of those responses. I don't know if they're already on the Council list. I'm not sure. But I think input from the DNS Abuse Institute, I think there was some suggestions there that I didn't like at all. So it's worth sharing. I don't know. Wisdom, you could share it. I don't know. You could share it, yes, so that folks can have a

---

look and see what the communities are responding on this issue. I'll pause there to see if there are any comments and questions. All right. Seeing no hands, we'll move to the next item then.

All right. And the last big one, closed generics small team. I don't think there's much to introduce about this one. We discussed it a lot during ICANN73. So just as a quick introduction, it's that the small team that was put together to decide whether we should or should not meet with the GAC actually met. And I'll pass it to Manju to Please give us an update on this.

MANJU CHEN:

Hi, everyone. I already sent a letter to the list where I updated—I think, the policy community list—about what happened during the small group/small team meeting. First of all, I know NCSG was against this facilitated dialog when we were talking about this in ICANN74. So of course, I put forward our position on that.

But first of all, maybe I should just introduce who were on the small team of this closed generic Council small team. It was Jeff Neuman, who was the SubPro Working Group chair. And it was Kurt Pritz, the Registrar and Registry group. And then it was Paul from ... Well, he's not representing IPC on the Council now. He's now Non-Commercial House nonvoting member on Council. And then there is Justine Chew, who was ALAC liaison. Yeah. Sorry. Paul is selected for the Non-Contracted Party House. Justine Chew is ALAC liaison on the GNSO Council.

I believe they were all very actively participating in the SubPro Working Group. So I was the only one who was not on the SubPro Working

---

Group. So they were all like, “Oh my god. This is a no brainer. We should just say yes and move forward with this dialog.”

And then I was like, “But we don’t think so. NCSG didn’t want this.” And I was like, “This group was too small and we didn’t even have enough Council members on this small team.” We basically only had two voting members in the Council on this small team. And Jeff wasn’t even a Council member. He’s the GSNO Council liaison to the GAC.

But they weren’t happy about my opposition, of course, but they respected it. They think my opposition and my rationale of we lack representativeness in this small team was a red herring. But I stuck to it. And they were like, “Okay. Let’s refer this decision back to the Council and see what Council would say about this.” But I think they all assumed Council would just say yes because I’m not sure. But I guess we, as NCSG, will probably be the only stakeholder group who is against this facilitated dialog.

So basically, we decided first to defer this decision back to Council. And secondly, we’ll wait for the Council’s decision. If we decide to go forward, then the small team really have to come up with suggestions of how to proceed as dialog and stuff. But yeah. Some of them, they really wanted to even meet before the Council meeting to just work on the dialog and stuff. But I was like, “We can just wait for Council to decide our next step.”

I think they were probably wanting to have Council to decide on this, like this Thursday—well, my Thursday. I don’t know if it’s your Thursday. So the Council meeting this week, they probably want Council to decide

---

whether we want to have this dialog. I don't know if Council can decide this by just—in 15 minutes. If not, I think they probably will want to have more meetings between this month and the next Council meeting in May. But then, I don't know what we are going to talk about because we don't even have this agreement on whether we have to have this dialog.

Staff, Steve, he has suggested if they really want to move forward with this, they may probably consider to raise a late motion according to some kind of GNSO Council procedure. But as for now, nobody was replying to that thread. Nobody was saying they were going to draft a motion about that so I'm not sure what our next step will be. I don't know if we're going to decide this in Council on Thursday. If not, we might have to think of what will happens.

And I would really encourage people to read our drafted response because I think we have kind of agreed that we want to make a statement when we're discussing this in Council about closed generics. So I kind of provided notes. But as I'm not an English native speaker, I don't really have the ability. So I will really need help from those people who are native English if we want a formal statement because now it's just notes—a lot of points and stuff. If we want to make a formal statement, maybe we have to really draft one like under this document. That was probably it. Thank you very much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Manju, for that elaborate update. I believe it will be ... In terms of expectation, I think it's an update. And the team is



---

presenting that question back to the Council. If a vote needs to be taken, then obviously, it won't happen on Thursday. A motion will have to be submitted and deferred in May, I think. So if the no remains no, then it means it cannot move forward. Therefore a motion ... It has to come to a vote, basically. And I think a motion will be submitted on that. But so far, it's a discussion item. So it will move from a discussion to a motion, I suppose.

But the question I had ... And if anyone wants to put their hand up anytime, they can, please. I'm just going to start with my question as I wait for the queue to build up. I understand that the team also agreed to start looking at how--if it were to move forward, how that would look like. Is that a correct understanding? Is that something the team has looked at, at all?

MANJU CHEN:

It was an assignment. like if the answer is yes, we are to have this dialog, then one of the tasks of the small team is to look at how we proceed with this dialog. And we might provide recommendations to the Council on how to proceed. But I insisted in our first call that we shouldn't even be talking about that because we didn't even decide. We haven't even decided if we want this dialog. And I don't think we should decide as a small team because we don't represent the whole stakeholder groups in the GNSO. So we didn't really talk about it.

Of course, others were eager to talk about it and they were like, "Let's just put aside whether it's a yes or a no. Let's just dig in and talk about it." But I was like, "No, we don't. So we kind of ended there." That was

---

what happened in the small team. But yes. If the Council decides we are to have this dialog, then the small team will be tasked to come up with recommendations of how to do it.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. See if there are others—

KATHY KLEIMAN: May I join the queue?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you. Go ahead, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Great. First, I think Manju's doing an incredible job. Closed generics is an issue that's been in front of us for over a decade. For anyone who doesn't know, this is about Amazon applying for .book in the first round and wanting to own every second-level—not only just wanting to be the registry but wanting to own every single second-level domain. We heard from small booksellers around the world, particularly Latin America, that said that that would be really unfair. They all wanted domain names in .book and how could we give this word to Amazon?

We heard similar complaints about .cloud, and .blog, and .search, all of which would have been closed generics to Amazon, and Google, and others. And we forced this issue open and Board banned closed generics

---

in the first round. But monopolizing a word, particularly a top-level domain, is very lucrative.

I think Manju knows this, but Manju, let me share. Jeff Neuman was, indeed, the co-chair of the SubPro working group. But he's so committed on this issue—he wants closed generics for his client—that he had to recuse himself and Cheryl Langdon-Orr chaired when this issue came up in the SubPro Working Group because he wants them so much, and so does Paul McGrady, and so does Kurt Pritz. I'm not sure. Justine sees both sides a little bit, from ALAC.

But Manju, what you've done is brilliant to bring this back to Council. This is very unusual. With every other issue that we've dealt with for new gTLDs, whether it was the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group or the SubPro Working Group, if we couldn't come up with consensus, that issue did not go forward. This is the one exception because so many people want it. But so many governments—so many have told ICANN over the years that this is very dangerous. Closed generics are very dangerous.

So how do we ...? I think the path that you're on is right, to go back to Council and to ask Council to do an outreach. We know Kurt's view, we know Jeff Neuman's view, and we know Paul McGrady's view. All of these people, just as Manju said, were in the SubPro Working Group. But what about the rest of the GNSO. Can't we, shouldn't we be talking to the rest—to other people—other registrars, other registries, other groups? Because a lot of businesses were against closed generics too because it cut out a lot of small businesses and entrepreneurs.

---

So can we take this back? I don't know what the motion does but can the GNSO Council and can this committee get input from the GNSO before proceeding? Because if we proceed straight, we'll get exactly what Jeff Neuman, and Kurt Pritz, and Paul McGrady want, which is all ... They're ready to go ahead because they've made up their minds. But as Manju says, I'm not sure the GNSO has.

So how do we slow this down a bit and get more input? Is there a motion? Do we need a motion to go forward and bring it back to the committee? Do we need a motion to go out to the GNSO and ask for public input on this very, very unusual request from the Board? Thanks. Let me hand it back.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Kathy. I think we can request for that, to get input from the community. It's within our right to do that. You make a good point because I think if ... The question will be what options are we proposing when we say no? That's going to come up on Thursday. Once the no comes up, that will be the next question.

So what are the options? I think our statement needs to cater for that— what option? So if their intention is to read the statement out on Thursday, it also needs to include what we think is the best way forward as well so that is considered with any decision that the Council chooses. I see Bruna's hand up. Bruna, please.

---

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Hi, everyone. Apologies for joining late. I unfortunately had an agenda clash today. But two questions. I sent one of them to the list before. We thought and agreed in previous meetings about asking for a meeting with the GAC on this topic. Would this still be interesting?

And, b, in terms of the statement, wouldn't it be a little more strong if it's directed straight ahead from NCSG leadership, like to Philippe, instead of just you guys reading the statement at the meeting? Because I think if we send this as an official correspondence to the GNSO Chair, this will have to be acknowledged at the meetings instead of just you guys reading that.

So if you agree that's a good solution, I'll be happy to help finalize this with Manju and send it straightaway. But just saying this out loud to hear whether or not you agree with that or if you prefer this just being like a read-out statement instead of a proper correspondence. Thanks, Tomslin.

MANJU CHEN: Tomslin, you were on mute. I think you were talking.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Sorry. I was just saying that, first, thank you, Bruna. I wanted to see if others have any comment to what Bruna was suggesting. Yes, please, Manju.

---

MANJU CHEN: I don't really know about meeting with the GAC. I don't know what we're going to talk about. I'm nonchalant. I have no idea whether we should meet with the GAC or not.

The second one, I think it's good. I think we can still have—I don't know—like a moral oral and short, brief version of our opposition that we say in the Council and then we have a formal letter to the chair. I'm just not familiar with what options we have in our utensils. Actually, I think that suggestion is great. I don't know what different weights it carries. So, yeah.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Manju. From current practice, what I see will happen, the chair will forward it to the Council list as a communication he has received. Obviously, if it's a statement that requires response, he'll respond. But from what we are writing, it doesn't look like it's one that requires him to respond. So he will share it and then I think it will be up for discussion. He'll make comment—not make comment but bring it to their attention again on Thursday, that on this item, that that was received.

So I think it comes ... It brings the effect that you mentioned, that it's sent as a written communication and then we also have the opportunity to verbally mention it as well in the meeting on Thursday. Yes, Kathy, please.

KATHY KLEIMAN: No, no, when you're finished. I'm sorry. I thought you were finished.

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay. No. I was just going to add that I think it's a good suggestion that Bruna gave.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Absolutely agree. I think Manju's question is perfect. She is on this committee and yet she and some of these people on the committee were ready to go talk to GAC, and she's not, and we're not. Probably, most of the GNSO is not. So Manju's question is perfect and I'd bring it to Council, which is what do we do when we sit down with the GAC? Is it just the personal opinions of Kurt Pritz, Jeff Neuman, Paul McGrady, and Justine? And, Manju, there's nothing to bring to GAC yet. Manju, you're exactly right.

So the reason for going for input from the community, to quote Tomslin, is ... And I think that should be our ask—what we're asking for. Input from the GNSO community is so that this committee knows what they're taking to the GAC. This is a huge responsibility if the community agrees with it and if the community provides direction.

So first, we don't know if the community agrees with the GNSO Council going forward into negotiations with the GAC. That's the strangest policy development process I've ever seen. And then, what guidance does the community want to provide this committee if they do this type of negotiation. So do we need the negotiation? And if so, what guidance to provide the committee so it's representing the Council and the community and not just the interests of these individuals.

---

So I think a letter from Bruna to Philippe that you read out as a statement, or like a statement, in the Council meeting, asking for this input from the community as guidance for the committee is perfect. I think that is absolutely the best way to go and hopefully creates a comment period for people to provide input. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Kathy. Bruna?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, Tomslin. Yeah. Just on the letter, that's the reason behind my suggestion because if you listen to some of the discussions that were being hosted ... I joined the ALAC EURALO readout from the last meeting and everyone was dealing with this dialog between the GAC and GSNO on closed generics as something that was set in stone, and very good, and very profitable for the community, and positive, and blah, blah, blah, while the community still has some doubts about it. Also, why are we doing and how are we doing that?

So the point about maybe us meeting with the GAC, or just sending the letter, is exactly what you guys are discussing—like raising this doubt about the consensus because this is not something that everybody is welcoming at the same level. It's not something that everybody is very much happy with. Once we send the letter to the GNSO leadership, it will make them answer instead of just putting this on the record as part of a statement from the NCSG. So by making things a little more formal, we will have to have a formal answer. And this will probably help us in terms of raising our points and so on.



---

The only thing we need to discuss is whether we want this letter to go straight to the GNSO leadership or if we also want to direct this to other parts of the community. So it can be something for the GNSO leadership but also to the Board or the GAC with different concerns, and doubts, and questions about the dynamics.

But as far as I'm concerned, we need to put things on the record beyond just a statement at the meetings because these help us show that there is not a full consensus around this strategy. So that's why I'm suggesting this. But I'll be happy to talk to Manju and you, Tomslin, on how direct this letter and how to shape this strategy further.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. Manju?

MANJU CHEN: Yeah. Just very short. I guess the point I forgot to raise is that GAC already agreed to the dialog. So that's partly why people are like, "Oh. If we say no, GNSO looks very bad." Of course, I couldn't care less why GAC has already said yes can make GNSO look very bad. But that's going to be one, I guess, counterargument to our position that I want to make, just so that everybody knows. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Manju. Rafik?

---

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Hi, everyone. First, I want to thank Manju for the work done in the small team. It's not easy. It's more about negotiation and how prevent bad things from happening. The GNSO Council now delegates a lot of those discussions to small teams and I think it's to remind everybody that you have a representative there.

Saying that, I think this one topic is not just about the specific issue of the closed generics, but I think about the approach taken by the GAC, and to some extent, encouraged by the Board, who is saying that they want to facilitate discussion and so on, is that the GAC is still trying to have more, let's say, weight in the PDP itself—like in the PDP with their representatives, were leveraging their interaction with the Board and all the [inaudible] that they have. Now they are also trying to have this kind of, I think, [inaudible] as their regular approach.

I understand that we need to discuss or have interaction with the GAC as we do now, during meetings, to share updates. We have what is supposed to be the GNSO liaison to the GAC. That's not always the case. They are trying to push for this authority to go outside the PDP—push for the issue they care about. And they want a specific outcome from it. It's quite irregular. It's really not following the process. And every time, we are creating an exception, it's ... When you set a precedent, it's hard to move back where [it is].

So we need to be very careful. Again, it's not just about the specific topic here. The problem is, it happens with this one, it will be heard later in how to manage the other issues. And we can see that theme in, for example, DNS abuse and so on. So again, it's really about following

---

the process. We need to state clearly our rational argument and to make that clear and loud. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Rafik. Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hi. Apologies for being a klutz at getting myself unmuted. I wanted to make a couple of points. First of all, A, I agree with what Rafik just said. B, as a former government person who participated in lots of things—although I never participated in ICANN as a government person, I certainly did at the OECD and various other things such as the cybercrime convention and discussions—governments vary enormously in how they pre-consult on these issues. So it is not a given that all government representatives who are polled on these issues when we bring [inaudible].

[Inaudible] but the US delegation does. It has massive interdepartmental meetings before it comes down on a particular issue. But that cannot be said for many of the other governments. So the idea that this is an authoritative process just kills me every time I hear, “Oh. Let’s consult the GAC.”

I have discussed this matter with Canadian former GAC chairs, too. So I can’t really cite them but I think it’s a well-known problem. This is a particularly obstruse matter that I cannot see the benefit for countries whose companies are not bagging these names. I have no idea why they would support it because they are ... I’m trying to look for a ladylike

---

term. They are disadvantaging their own registrants, companies, small business, etc., as Kathy has demonstrated with her examples. So that's a real question. I just had to throw that on the record.

Second, I do think that some members in the community are enraptured with the idea of meeting with GAC. Somehow those reps from the GAC are illustrious beings and it's an honor to be with them. I don't share that view, of course, being a former bureaucrat. I've met with these guys a lot.

Anyway, thirdly, I stepped away from the improvements committee of the GNSO Council. I can't remember what the acronym for it was. But one of the first things we were going to look at was whether the SOI serves its purpose. I have to say, as I have said before, I'm stunned that three guys who've got clients can sit on a committee [inaudible] action that backs up their clients' needs. It's a conflict of interest.

It may not be in the SOI that these matters are declared. It may be at the beginning of a PDP, or a small group, or some other procedure. But at some point, people have to blessed well declare their financial interest in an outcome. And I just can't believe [inaudible] like this.

[Inaudible] wishing to pick on Michael Palage. He's building a system. He's got clients. And he's chairing the accuracy committee and he really monopolizes the conversation. It's hard to think that he's not advancing his own interests. How do we call him out on this process? I don't know. And I don't mean to pick on Mike alone. He's just doing what plenty of others are doing.

---

So whoever has taken over for me on that improvements committee, we should have a discussion about whether our SOI/conflict of interest procedures are adequate. We go through this ritual at the beginning of meetings. Anybody have any new things to confess? It's like an empty confessional. They discuss their change of firm but they don't talk about their clients. Thank you. Rant over.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Stephanie. It's interesting you say that because the Registrars, if I'm not getting it wrong, or it was the Registries—I think it was the Registrars—actually did ask that Jeff doesn't go on that small team. But the challenge came when Justine also wanted to be on the small team because the argument was that he is a GAC representative. So the question was does that mean we will have to say all—sorry, liaison, not representative—liaison to the GAC. So the challenge was should all liaisons not be allowed on the small team? So because Justine had requested to also join the team, a decision had to be made to just let the liaisons be there.

The registrants were asked to seek more support from the Registries on that issue and they didn't. So it didn't proceed any further. I just wanted to make that comment that it's interesting. I see Rafik's hand up.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Tomslin. This is kind of now another issue that's happening a lot. It's not a new thing, depending on what you have as liaison. I mean, it's good to have a liaison from the advisory committee or SO. But we need to remember what does it mean to have a liaison. It's really just to

---

observe, to share update, or to be the channel to the other side to bring updates from the GNSO Council, but what we are seeing, here they are participating as kind of non-elected councilor in discussion or drafting. That's a different level, and that's quite questionable.

I have no problem with the individuals and understand their interest but that raises a lot of issues here. Again, we have remit in the scope of each advisory committee. [inaudible] you create, to have different powers and be separate. You need to avoid this kind of gray area of blurry [inaudible] otherwise that doesn't make sense anyway.

So it's good to have them to follow, to observe, but to participate in the discussion and try to influence it's kind of something quite questionable. And understand the GNSO Council we have hard time to have hard discussion and to make those kinds of points because nobody wants to look really bad or not nice.

But I will first think responsibilities, how we can keep things working, functioning, but to keep also the [right] process and networks correctly. So yeah, you should not mind to speak out and make it clear. I think that happened like when we talked about the GAC liaison or the appointment from—what should the NomCom appoint as councilor. It's important to make those points. It's not fun, doesn't make you a lot of friends. But I don't think that's our first goal anyway. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Rafik, I think we will not be making friends anytime soon. We've gone six minutes past the time and there were some AOBs that were very important. I know Stephanie had brought one up for discussion

---

regarding the consent forms we need to sign for travel. I don't know if folks can stay for five minutes and whether we're allowed to do that, but we can quickly cover those AOBs.

First is that the public comment for the policy status report, the draft is in so I'll be forwarding that to the policy committee for finalizing the text for us to submit that. And we still have the root zone label generation version five open.

I see Bruna's hand up for AOB. Since I suspect it's related to meetings, I don't know if Stephanie, you would like to wait for Bruna to first go.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah, please, Bruna, go ahead.

BRUNA SANTOS: Okay, thanks. Thanks, Tomslin as well. I don't know if you wrapped up what you were just saying, but if you want to, you can finalize in the NomCom afterwards. Did you finalize everything?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes.

BRUNA SANTOS: Okay, good. Thanks. So about next meeting, just a few details. This is going to be the first hybrid in over two years, as you know, ICANN Org is taking a different approach like meetings will have smaller capacities than usual, everyone that's traveling to the meeting will have to do

---

some sort of a check-in before actually going into the meeting, because they will be very thorough in following the room capacity and only allowing people with good and healthy social distancing measures and so on.

And there is, as Stephanie was talking on like something before, there is this liability issue about health travel for the ones who are going. As I said, this is the first one in two years. So we should expect a somehow different meaning than before. I know Org is taking all the measures necessary for checking vaccines, checking whether everyone will have their temperature taken at the entrance of the venue, we will also have to wear masks, social distancing will be highly enforced, at least during the meeting, and so on.

So this will require from us some different, maybe some patience and also different expectations with regards to what this meeting can be. And also, bear in mind that the actual meeting slots are smaller than usual. We're going to go with the NCSG's meeting approach, is keeping the NCSG meeting, the membership meeting, keeping the policy meeting, the policy committee meeting both as one hour meetings, since there were way less slots available than before. And we will also have a one hour and a half meeting for both our constituencies. So NPOC and NCUC will share—it will have a 45-minute slot for discussing their internal matters. And I'm glad we were able to get that because there was something that was really hard to find.

And also last but not least, staff was proposing a different thematic approach for this meeting. They were suggesting a full turmeric day. But that was somehow refused by community. Each of us weighed in on this



---

topic and said that given that this was the first on-site meeting in years, it will be good for us to keep things as they were and not overcomplicate things because the social distancing and the health issues will already be something of a high concern to the whole community.

So what they are doing in the end is the one thematic session about SubPro instead of the thematic day, so this will pretty much be the event. And I would just like to remind everyone that's able to travel, if you're a councilor or part of the NCSG leadership team, to let me know that you're traveling by Thursday.

Andrea just confirmed to me that we can use the slots from the councilors that are not able to go to take somebody else, to take some substitutes. And even though this is a hybrid meeting and the folks are joining onsite, you'll still be able to participate at the Council meeting. I would encourage anyone that's involved in the policy work that would like to go on one of the councilor traveling slots to let me know, because I think we will need our best on site. And this should be a very disputed meeting as well as the last one, given the too many topics that have arose during the pandemic.

So that's kind of it for me. I don't know, staff, if you have any additional comments on the liability thing, about the health liability issue, or anything else, but I'd love to help answer any questions you might have. Thanks, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Bruna. Thanks very much, Steph.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks. Well, for those who haven't read Michele's blog, it's up on ICANN Bad Attitude. And if you're not on ICANN Bad Attitude, you're missing a lot of fun. It's on Facebook, join the group.

Anyway, basically, he had his lawyer look at that liability waiver. And the lawyer told him "Hey, you can't sign this and you certainly can't, as an employer, ask your staff to go to a meeting where all liability is waived."

Obviously they are waiving liability because they don't want to be responsible for anybody who gets sick. At least I presume that's why they're waiving liability. But it's such a broad waiver that if they totally messed up, if, I don't know, imagine some terrible, despotic scheme, and they got us all infected, or they didn't do adequate security and there was a bomb going off, they would be immune from liability. So you can't really sign something like that.

Now, the second irritating thing is, I don't want to have to hire a blessed lawyer to find out what my accountabilities and responsibilities are if I agree to go to this meeting. I think in plain and simple terms, it means if I get sick, and I'm a funded traveler, I will have to pay for every additional night in a hotel until I am clear to travel.

Now, that's fine. But they should make that clear to everybody. We don't want to be dealing with folks who have come to the meeting and get a hell of a surprise afterwards. Now I've just had two of my sons have their entire families come down with COVID because of course two-year-olds aren't vaccinated, and I've got two two-year-old grandchildren.

---

They were two weeks getting through it. Two weeks in a Hague hotel is going to break us, some of us anyway. So let's make sure everybody's aware that nobody's going to bail them out if they get sick, if that's the case, or if there's some kind of backroom deal for important people, air quotes around them, that might get compensated and not so important people—that would be NCSG—not being funded, let's find that out.

Sorry to throw that one at you Bruna. But we've got three days to decide whether we're going to go. Nobody knows what it's going to be like in The Hague in two months. We could be well on to our way with variant number three. And that's the other issue. Am I responsible? If I say yes, I'm coming and then the risk assessment changes because there's a new variant, the hemorrhagic variant that I continue to make jokes about, but it's not a bloody joke. No pun intended there. I want to be able to back out without being stuck with paying for my airline ticket. Thank you for the rant.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Steph. Bruna, is that a new hand?

BRUNA SANTOS: Yes. I was going to suggest that if folks—I just posted on the chat the announcement for next meeting. And on the announcement, you can find the liability waiver, for those of you who are interested in understanding what this document is and so on.

But as far as I'm concerned, like with regards to travel in general, we are like not legally but like we are already assuming some part of a liability

---

around like what risks are we exposing ourselves to, whether or not you're going to the meeting, or just staying inside your hotel room or if you're attending any reception or networking hour or anything like that.

So there are some parts of the liability with regards to the COVID in general that we are kind of responsible for as well. From what I understood, the thing is that ICANN is not fully responsible for everything that happens during this trip, especially outside of the venue and outside of the meeting hours.

But what I can do is try to gather all of your questions and doubts about the liability waiver and send an email to staff about this. Carlos and Andrea are on this call. They are probably aware now about our concerns with regards to this topic, so if you have doubts, just write me or send me a Skype message. And I'll collect them all and send them to the staff and the organizing meeting team, just so everyone is on the same page about this.

And yes, I know this is kind of a troubling situation, because we do in fact don't know how the situation is going to be in July or June, or whether things are going to be better or anything else. But I do think it should be interesting for those of you willing to go to this meeting, and if you are, we can work around those issues and try to gather more information.

But as I understand, both staff and the community leadership are still navigating this first hybrid meeting after two years. So there's a lot of doubts from everywhere in the community. And it's not just us that have some concerns about this.

---

But regardless of that, we still have the deadlines for traveling and so on. So that's why the Thursday deadline has been enforced on all of us, and it's not just NCSG but everyone. So that's it.

Again, if you have doubts and questions, please let me know and I'll send it to the planning team and try to get the answers we need before Thursday. So that's it. Thanks, Tomslin. And Thanks, Stephanie, for your points as well.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Bruna. And yep, we are 20 minutes over time. So thank you all for a very lively meeting today, and see you all on Thursday my time during the Council meeting. Have a good day or good night, everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**