

---

BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the NCSG Policy Call on 17, October, 2022 at 11:30 UTC. Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name for the record. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation, and I would like to turn the meeting over to Chair, Tomslin. Thank you very much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Brenda and Andrea. Thanks, everyone, for coming today. For those who are new, we usually have this policy call every month, usually the Monday before the council meeting. Not only to go through items that will be on the council agenda, but also to catch up on some policy items that of interest to NCSG.

As you can see on the agenda, there are quite a bit today. Most of those are on the council agenda which is why I've put the council agenda walkthrough towards the end so that we will spend time discussing these items and quickly go through their council agenda towards the end just to get counselors ready for Thursday's meeting.

So without much ado, we'll move on to our first agenda item, which is an update on the WHOIS Disclosure System. Some might not recognize this name if you haven't followed the recent discussions. It used to be called a satellite, and the name has moved to WHOIS Disclosure System in the last ICANN meeting.

So I believe we have Stephanie to help us. She's a member to a council small team that has been looking at a proposal from Org to build this

---

*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.*

---

system. It's a test or proof of concept system, whichever people prefer. Stephanie will help us or give us an update on where they're at in the current discussions and proposals. So I'll hand over to Stephanie to give us an update on this. If you're there, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I am there. Thank you, Tomslin. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I do apologize, it's been a little busy here and I haven't had time to sort through where we are at the various groups, because to be honest, it's all starting to merge in my mind and I haven't even had COVID, so this is not COVID fog, but we're arguing about the same things in all the different groups.

So we have the small team, we have the accuracy team, which appears to be on some kind of hold at the moment, we've got as far as we could go in terms of thrashing out accuracy. I understand that Mike Palage had a bit of a nod down at the meeting, he's our outgoing chair, because we're still arguing about basic definitions of what our accuracy means and what the contracted parties should be required to do.

The WHOIS Disclosure System, which is not a term that I approve of, but, of course, nobody's listening, basically we have this proposition from staff. I believe I am late to comment on the document, so I have to get to that this week. Some of the contracted parties have already done their comments to see whether this proposal is worthwhile.

One of the reasons I have dropped the ball on that is the actual Disclosure System does not appear to me to be a worthwhile expenditure of funds. As we may recall, the decision has been made

---

that none of these WHOIS Disclosure Systems will authenticate the requester.

So, that is the one role that I thought ICANN could profitably offer to convene somehow through a contractor, through accreditation bodies, because if you are a small -- if you're GoDaddy, you know who's asking for the data, probably because you've seen them around before. If you're not, you might not have.

There still remain a lot of transporter issues, particularly with respect to law enforcement for releasing data. So, since that is not being done, all it has been proposed is some kind of a form that would make sure that at least some of the data would appear, but there would be no checking of that, of course.

Then, what actual use is this system? It's possibly convenient for the requester because it would go in one portal, but it's not efficacious in terms of reviewing it as an access to personal information request. So, that has me throwing up my hands. So, I'll know more when I get to look at the document again.

Obviously, this is a document that we've seen before, but the final winnowing process may have turned up some new language that needs a comment or two. I would say that we're kind of spiraling down into stalemate on this thing.

I know that the contracted parties are agreeing to do various things such as this trial just to keep the ball moving, but the arguments remain the same, and it's really getting very tedious, fresh blood would be most

---

welcome. Manju, you're on the call, have you got anything to add to this? I'm throwing out a lifeline here. Save me, I'm drowning. No?

MANJU CHEN:

I'm here, but I don't know if I have anything to add because you've said it very well. Like, there's nothing -- well, essentially there's nothing new in this stuff, right, but then we're trying to keep things moving as if we're moving forward, but the fact is, it's the same most stuff that's been rolling around,

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes, we're dribbling the ball down the court, but that's about it. There are no baskets to be had anytime soon. So, I will send the policy committee a comment when I finish commenting on that document, but I expect we will hear these arguments charted out at council, so stay tuned.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Steph and Manju, and, yes, that was a question I was going to ask considering that it's on the council agenda, are we expecting just to get an update and the dribbling that is going on? So, we don't expect any movement in any specific direction or concrete movement in any specific direction.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

To be honest, I don't know what we're going to do about the accuracy committee. We have fulfilled a couple of parts of our mandate, but

---

again, we're not agreeing on some basic stuff, and it's not clear. There's quite a distance between the two sides, so what's going to happen there?

I don't know. We need a chair, but that would be a real martyr that would come forward and step up to chair that committee, in my opinion. I don't think it can be anybody from our side because we're too low in resources. A chair has to be neutral, and I'm anything but neutral on this issue.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. Can I just ask with regards to the WHOIS Disclosure System itself, do you think the small team will be recommending that the council approve for Org to go ahead and build this?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay. In your opinion, it's something we should support or not?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, there's the question, do you want movement on this? Is it going to prove anything? I think the data they're going to get is going to be garbage because it's a voluntary trial, right? You can opt in or opt out. The last conversation we had on this, they were trying to see if you

---

could go around the registrars that were not participating, and send them the requests anyway.

I'm going, "Don't you guys understand what opting out means in a trial?" If they don't want to participate, they don't want to participate, you can't just sort of opt them in and flush the stuff through the system. There's several issues behind all this. If you are gathering all of the requests for data, you are gathering personal information about individuals, right?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: The issue of ICANN'S controllership continues to rear its ugly head. It doesn't want to be a controller. So where is this data going? This is like the argument that the networks always have that they don't actually have any personal data because they don't store it. Well, it passes through their system and it can be siphoned off through their system, therefore, they are processing personal data.

So make up your mind, where's the liability going, right? Same thing's happening here. Somebody that ICANN is contracting is going to be running this thing, and that's a question too. So, who's accountable for that data as it flows through? If somebody's mirroring all of the requests, then there's been a breach.

The other question that, of course, is a perennial irritation, I think, well, certainly to me, and I would hope to NCSG, is we have always said all

---

the way through the EPDP, that this disclosure system cannot come as an expense to individuals, that they can't download the costs of accessing personal information on the data subjects.

What's happening here, well, there's no cost to the requesters, it's free. So that's a bad precedent. The argument, of course, is that it doesn't benefit anybody, they don't know whether it's going to benefit them, so why should they pay for it? Well, why indeed, but why should the-- the cost has got to come somewhere.

So at the moment, ICANN is absorbing it, and it's a significant expense, I can't remember the number, but it's non-trivial, and it's also taking, of course, ICANN resources that they're observing. It's coming out of a special fund. Okay, so people like it at the end of this, where's the money going to come from? We've already set the precedent that it's going to be downloaded on the individuals whose data is being accessed.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Very annoying. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I just have one question, then I'll open it up for members to ask. There was a request from the CSG that for it to make any sense to them, even requests that go to contracted parties who haven't volunteered to

---

participate in the trial should be logged as well. Did that get discussed in the small team and did it go anywhere, you think?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I think that one's on hold, but that's why I have to look and see, update myself on what's been going on. Staff are busy after the meeting compiling stuff and pushing it out, and frankly, I took a holiday, it's Thanksgiving, so.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: It's well deserved.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: It's probably going to be pushed to Council for discussion at least, but not a decision this week. To the best of my knowledge, I think I would've heard.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: It certainly is only a discussion. Thanks. All right. Does anyone have any comments or questions to ask regarding this item? All right. I don't see anyone keen on asking any questions. Well, thank you, Steph and Manju, and we hope we'll understand a bit more during the discussion on Thursday. We'll move on to the next one, which will be the first time that report is discussed.

The DNS Abuse Small Team report has been shared with Council and will be discussed for the first time. I have shared this last week on the

---

mailing list, but just as a quick summary of-- before I do the check, if Wisdom is here, he is our member on that small team and he doesn't seem to be online. So I'll go ahead and give a quick summary of the recommendations that came out of that.

So I believe there are four recommendations, and there were only two that I was quite interested in personally. The first was the fact that the small team recommends that the council only focuses on maliciously registered domains and not on compromised domains in determining or rather, as a way to help keep our focus on ICANN's remit in whatever we do in that DNS Abuse space.

Then the second was a recommendation for a tightly scoped PDP. If I can find the wording for that, I believe it said -- bear with me. It said, "A telescoped PDP to explore whether it is possible to identify indicators of malicious registrations that would trigger actions from contracted parties, either at the time of registration or shortly after."

The concern I had with that is that I fear if that went ahead, it might make proactive and even automated monitoring and take down of domains of a more acceptable phenomenon or approach like the EU currently does today. So, those are some of the recommendations that are on that report that will be discussed on Thursday.

So I'd like to hear your thoughts if you've read the document, or at least for those two items I have shared my views on, if anyone would like to comment or ask a question. Steph, I see your hand first.

---

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes. It's Stephanie Perrin for the record. On this one, I'm trying to be helpful here, and I do think that the argument for some kind of automatic prompt action on bulk registrations, I'm willing to accept that in good faith and say, yes, we should find a way of dealing with those, because it seems quite obvious that to me at least, I don't know what the threshold, what the number is, what's a bulk registration?

Are we talking hundreds, thousands, ten? I can see 10 maybe being put into play legitimately by some keener, but I can't see 400. I accept that argument. So if we could agree on a definition of what a bulk registration is and on what a prompt action is, like in how many minutes, how many hours, we could throw the group a bone and try and concede.

I think we should, wherever possible try not to be always the one saying, no. Personally, I'm sick of it, but if people are going to break the law on the time, you have to say no. On this one, it seems common sense. Thanks. I think that's recommendation two or three, I can't remember which.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

It's two, but you would, and it's Tomslin for the record, you would it-- the thing though with that recommendation is that it doesn't specifically ask for the council to do anything other than to request for more information from the contracted parties, right?

---

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Could we not agree to do that without doing a whole wretched PDP and dragging in all the other stuff?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think we could do that because that recommendation says based on what we receive from the contracted parties, we could act on it if you understand more about bulk registrations. One suggestion was that, maybe not a suggestion, that if one way to identify that it's probably malicious is if someone registers 300 domains in the afternoon and activate them all in the evening, then surely, those will be used for malicious intent.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, both [00:22:02 - inaudible] and Rod Rasmussen came to a meeting we had in Barcelona and gave that as an example of a no-brainer. At that time, the SSAD was going around with a -- and I think this is about the time that Rod took over from [00:22:19 - inaudible] as head, they were running around with a presentation on abuse where they could show how fast these things -- the hockey stick of how fast the abuse was getting pumped out.

So if in fact, the contracted parties are acting on these now as they have to when they see evidence of malfeasance to take it down as fast as they can, then surely procedurally, there are existing actions that we could recognize as being legitimate and say yes to that.

That's my hope, because clearly as soon as they get evidence that there's malware coming from one of the 400 or two of the 400

---

registrations, they take a look and they block it, right? That's how it works. It may be unofficial, but we don't want it to stop. Pardon me.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I agree. So, looking at the fact that there certainly is one recommendation that recommends PDP, and we are saying we like some aspects of the report, but not the PDP one, how then do we approach this? Do we say, do this and not do that? I'd like to hear-

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, it does open a door. This is Stephanie Perrin again. It does open a door to policy development without a PDP, which we don't want to sanction. On the other hand, as somebody who's been on too many bleeding PDPs, don't even talk to me about the SSAD WHOIS, maybe that's why I don't like the name WHOIS Disclosure System, just the mere name puts me into paroxysm.

So, I think that's well worth us unraveling and having a look at, but it is so tempting to get a small team and agree that this has to happen, this tiny, small piece of the abuse puzzle, and let it be so.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you I guess. Let's hear from others on the call to see whether folks have any thoughts and views on this report? Don't go quite now. All right. Manju, thanks.

---

MANJU CHEN:

Yes, I'm saving you from the silence. So actually, I don't really hate the idea of a PDP if it's like what they promise. Like it's going to be tiny scope and it's like only concentrating on this very issue of malicious registration, but, of course, we have to get a little bit of hurt of what's malicious registration, which I guess will be the test of the issue report.

What I'm worrying about is actually the issue report because it's like, I don't know if it's a thing now that we have a scoping team that's composed of community and to have to scope this issue for the PDP, because from what I understand or what I read from ICANN Learn, it used to be like the Org do the issue report and the Council will just review and decide whether we are having a PDP, but we are doing this accuracy thing all over again, which we get the community members, and not only GNSOO.

So GAC, and all the ACs doing the scoping thing for this PDP, then it's like another whole, I don't know, like ages of debating on definitions and then debating on the scope and then like, we're doing nothing but just wasting everyone's energy and we're facing another burnout.

So that's what I'm worried about, but I don't know if what's going to happen if we agree to this PDP. It is promising as it is tiny, and like it strictly has to focus on only one issue, which is like, not something we have for a PDP for a while. So that doesn't look that bad, but is it going to be carried out as it's promised?

That's the problem. I think if we are agreeing to do this, we really have to push for not a community scoping team, but just like the old days

---

where we have to stop to the issue report and we just comment on it.  
Yes, that's my 2 cents. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Manju. You're right about the issue report traditionally comes from stuff and it's usually just based on facts. So, it would make sense that we, we get that issue report from staff studying the issue and providing such a fact-based report for us to review and see whether it makes sense to proceed or not.

Because I guess that's the intention for that research to be done, not for the community to provide subjective views to the issue report, but it should just be fact based, my understanding of it. So, I think we should definitely -- if we are going with this, if it's going ahead, then it should be a fact-based report, not something like the Accuracy Scoping Team.  
No.

Yes, I guess if that goes ahead, we may want to be heavily involved to make sure that the registrant protections are put in there, even if it seems that it's clear cut that a malicious domain can be identified even with bulk registrations.

MANJU CHEN: From what I read from the issue, the recommendation, they're not dealing with block registration for the PDP, right?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No.

MANJU CHEN:: Yes. Okay.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No. Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Stephanie for the record. I made this suggestion in a couple of the meetings periodically, and it was universally ignored, I have to say. Many years ago, ALAC was supposed to be in charge of organizing a charter of register rights, and it kind of petered out, you won't find too many records on it.

What we need post-GDPR, post-EPDP, one and all the rest of it, of course, we haven't really implemented the policy as yet. What we really could use is that charter of register rights that would be real based on law, because then we wouldn't have to re-argue this in every blessed committee.

We could just say, okay, here's our charter of registrant rights, and we have not addressed it holistically from the point of view of the registrant, we have taken this approach to applying GDPR from the perspective of what we were originally doing, okay, what can we still get away with is basically the research question, and we've gone through all of these committees arguing the same things, but I want to keep doing this.

---

What can I get away with? Has been the question. Instead, if we looked at it from the perspective, the charter of registered rights, okay, what rights does a registrant and have now?

Then we could just plunk it down on the table whenever these issues come up I think we should embrace this as an NCSG project and push it forward to clarify exactly what those rights are. That would include not having to pay for the movie business to spam you with take down requests.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think I'm on mute. Thanks, Stephanie. I don't know if anyone else has any comments or questions on this. I would just note that we are still developing, NCSG still developing its position on this. We do have a draft that has received quite a bit of comment, which was drafted by Ephraim, and I believe, Ephraim, you mentioned you'll be taking into consideration those comments and modifying the document this week. Am I correct, f you're still on? I think Ephraim might have -- no, Ephraim is still on.

EPHRAIM PERCY KENYANITO: Yes, you're correct.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks.

---

EPHRAIM PERCY KENYANITO: Can you hear me?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, I can.

EPHRAIM PERCY KENYANITO: Okay.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. So, I guess there's still opportunity to comment on that position. Ephraim, I don't know if you have the link at hand to drop it in the chat, for those who do not have access, especially the new members who do not know where to reach the document, could take a look as well. All right. We will move forward then, if there are no further questions or comments on this.

The next item is the public comments, and since I didn't put that on the agenda, I'll just drop a summary of them in the chat, then I'll talk to them. So there are five current ones, which I thought NCSG would have interest in responding to them. The first one is the registration, that's a consensus policy.

We have in the past, NCSG has submitted comments, related comments to this in the past, and we do have some volunteers. One is the pen holder for that. They are currently working on that, and hopefully, they will share that with the rest of the community. I think I'll ask Juan because he created I think a second document from the one I created, so I'll ask him to make -- this is to Stephanie's comment, I'll ask Juan as

---

well for the document they're drafting for the registration that's the consensus policy, they'll be sharing that this week for the wider community comment, NCSG community comment, I believe.

The second public comment open is a public comment proceeding on proposed updates to the GNSO operating procedures. I think this is what the CCOCI, if I got the acronym correct, worked on. Those are currently -- I think one of the recommendations was related to the SOIs, I think, and that is -- Stephanie, please help me.

I believe you are part of CCOCI, and Manju, I believe, if you can help me with what those recommendations were again or what the CCOICI was working on. I think there was conflict of interest, that's one of them.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I actually dropped out of that committee because I was overloaded with all of the WHOIS accuracy stuff, but I think Manju took over. They were looking at whether the SOIs were adequate and whether they dealt with conflict of interest, and I have strong views on that. I don't think they did, so it was going to take a lot of my time.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

All right. Well, the news is that we don't have any volunteer for that comment actually. I'm hoping that someone listening today will volunteer to drop something on that. That is due on the 27th of October, so a couple of days left on that one. The third comment that's open public comment is the Draft IANA and PTI FY24 Operating Plan and Budget.

---

That's due on the 31st of October. I shared on the list as well. There is no volunteer as well on that one, so if anyone is keen on reviewing budgets and strategies, please let me know off list or after this call if you're interested in volunteering to draft a comment for that.

Then there is the Pilot Holistic Review draft terms of reference, and I think this one might suddenly affect us because I believe the Pilot Holistic Review would have an impact on ICANN structures. So I think there is definitely need for us to look into this one and draft a comment.

Unfortunately, we don't have any volunteer. No, actually we do have one volunteer for this, and that is Caleb. This one is due on the 10th of November, and we could do with more volunteers. So there is some time for this one, so if anyone else would like to join Caleb in drafting a comment for this, please let me know.

The last one I wanted to bring to your attention is the NPOC Charter Amendment due 14th of November. So the NPOC Charter Amendment for now, I think the board has open a public comment proceeding for it. I don't know if there is anyone from NPOC who will be happy to talk to it.

BOLUTIFE ADISA:

Yes. Hi, Tomslin. This is Bolutife for the record. Yes, like you rightly said, the NPOC Charter has moved to the next stage of public comments. So we are looking forward to members from the NCSG and also NPOC to comment on the new charter. There were a couple of changes that we made, and I think it went through the different processes, and currently we're in the public comments stage.

---

So yes, we are looking forward to your comments and suggestions before it's finally approved by the board. I think that's pretty much everything to be said about it. Please, take the time to also look at it. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bulotife. I see Manju's hand. I believe that's a question in relation to that.

MANJU CHEN: Oh, sorry. It's actually not. It goes back to the CCOICI recommendation. So if Stephanie has a question about it, I can wait until after.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Stephanie, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hi, Manju. This is Stephanie. Yes, my question was this charter, the NPOC Charter Amendments has taken, gosh, at least three years, might be five. I wonder if someone from NPOC could walk us through what the charter changes are and what the issues were and why it's taken so long. I'd also like to get a reading of how the NPOC charter stacks up in the light of the Pilot Holistic Review because we are about to have Structural Review.

Is there anything in the NPOC charter that we think could be problematic in the light of the Structural Review? I don't like that the

---

timing is coinciding here. I think it's really important that we have a very thorough and intelligent comment on that, because I suspect there may be comments coming from outside NCSG on that charter.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. I would just quickly say before someone from NPOC answers to Stephanie's question. We don't have anyone from NCSG who's volunteered yet to draft this comment. So if anyone is keen on drafting something that's structured and addresses some of those concerns that Stephanie has, please let me know. With that, I'll see if there's anyone from NPCO who like to respond to Stephanie's question or concerns.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Sorry, I didn't really catch the question from Stephanie. This is Caleb for the record.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. Hi, Caleb. It's Stephanie again. Basically this charter amendment has taken four or five years, correct me if I'm wrong, so clearly there are some important changes the entire charter's been discussed. What are the main issues you've been looking at?

Why the amendments? How does this stack up in terms of the structural review that is coming, the Draft Holistic Review? Those of us who have participated in previous reviews know that there has been a fair bit of criticism of the fact that we have six seats on Council.

---

So, I just always worry about any attempt at rebalancing. Lots of people have been fighting for more seats on NomCom. To me, the real issue is hanging on to the seats we've got on Council. Anyway, that's my comment. So, I think it's really, really important that we view the things somewhat together and that we have a strong comment that takes into account any of the previous criticisms that have come in the reviews, because there've been quite a few.

CALEB OGUNDELE:

Okay. I'm not a chair of NPOC, and I would probably just speak a little bit from my personal view here and not something as a statement from NPOC here. So I just wanted to just clarify that I'm speaking in my personal capacity.

So first few things that I think I'd like to note while looking at the charter is that one, we reduced the number of seats of the EC members which we felt was very important because we wanted more effectiveness and we felt that we could combine a couple of EC titled seats so that we can have more people putting in the work and have more effectiveness in what we're doing.

On that, I don't think we also talked about NomCom related issue in the current charter. If the charter is looked at thoroughly, we didn't put anything NomCom because we've not clarified that.

However, we did make room for an annexure in the event that there are some changes that we are likely going to face or have, and those annexures, we decide, like we'll try and have like an internal operating procedure which maybe the EC can do a quick approval with the

---

members that won't have to maybe go through legal and then OEC, and then have other people have to -- like the long process of charter.

So the annexure is just more of an internal working document that we are planning to have. So I'm only just speaking in my personal capacity, so I need to be careful here that what I'm saying, it's not an authority or I've not been authorized by the EC to speak specifically on this, so I'm only just making this as a person comment, just to clear a little bit of the hair on what some of the issues Stephanie raised. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Caleb. Thanks for clarifying those. I don't if there are any other questions before we go to Manju, who'll like to talk a bit more on CCOCI. Manju, please go ahead then.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Tomslin. This is Manju for the record. So about the public comment, it's actually not about SOI, it's about this working group survey assessment tool.

So we've been reviewing questions for the surveys that we want to send out during the working group is working and after the working group has done its work, or after they have sent out their initial report, just to keep this constant grab of the atmosphere or how people are feeling about their work in the working group.

So that's, I think the recommendations are about, and there are a lot of survey questions I think as a template, so people just can look at it and

---

say, oh, so I think this is a good question to ask afterwards or during the working group period.

So, when Council feels like, oh, the working group member are not happy with what the work progress is now, or they feel like the work hasn't been as positive as they hope, they can decide what to do with the working group or just those kind of things. So it's not really about SOI, and to be honest, when I started to work in this CCOIC, I think we are already working on this, so I actually have no idea what the SOI thing is about, but that's what we've been working on and that's the recommendations about.

I heard from you that there's no one volunteering to drop a comment yet. So I think I probably can do it, but it's really not something I'm super against, so I'm probably just gonna be like, oh yes, we like it, because we've been through the recommendation during the committee and I thought the questions were pretty good. So yes, that was some explanations for the public comments.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Manju. I think also supporting it will be helpful if it's good, like you said. I don't think there's any harm in writing a support in comment as well, so I'll still be interested in you writing one, if you don't mind.

MANJU CHEN: Yes, of course. I'll try to do it by the end of this week so we at least have some time to review it before I send it out.

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. That'll be lovely. Stephanie asked a question on the chat, whether we'll be able to have another PC meeting before the end of the NPOC charter comment, and I don't believe so. I think our next meeting should be on the 14th of November and that, I think on the same day as the due date for the public comments.

So, if NCSG is really keen on having NPOC EC officially present this, then we might have to organize a separate meeting just for this. Ephraim, your question on the chart about asking for an extension on all those three, we can try. Well, I don't know if we will get it, but we can try, we can certainly put a request to staff and ask if some of those can be extended.

All right. We'll go ahead and send the request to staff and see if they accept or not. All right. I think that's it about public comments, and I think our next agenda item is the Council agenda. So, we will quickly go through this. What's the time? Stephanie, I see your hand up. I think we can take it before we proceed.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, thanks, Tomslin. I just wondered in summary, how many drafters of comments have you got signed up for all those comments?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: For the [CROSSTALK].

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I think [00:54:32 - inaudible] of getting extensions sent to mail, but.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: For which ones? Because the ones that request for extension has come in. I think they're pretty close. So, 24th of October, 17th of October. The 31st of October one, I think there is time for it to be considered, and that's the Registration Data Consensus Policy. We do have drafters for that one.

So, for that, I'll simply put Ephraim with the current volunteers. One is the pen holder for that, so I'll put in connection with one on that one. For the other two we do not have drafters. Stephanie, to your question specifically, I only have volunteers on the Registration Data Consensus Policy, the Pilot Holistic Review, and the proposed updates to the GNSO Operating Procedures. So those are the only ones I have volunteers for. Does that answer your question?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. It seems like we're in mission critical stage for comments.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: We certainly are, which is why I included this in the agenda today. Yes, we are. I see Brenda kindly has put up the Wiki, or no, sorry, that's for -- I'll send the Wiki which has our comments as well, so that we know those for which we have volunteers are not as well. I don't have it at hand now to paste it, but I'll put it at some point.

Okay. I don't if there's any other comments on the comments. If not, we can proceed with the Council agenda. I don't know if there is any

---

other business, but I'd like us to have some time at the end for some AOB.

Alright. I think if we look at the consent agenda for the Council meeting, could you please scroll down, Brenda, please? Thank you. So we have quite a packed one. We have the approval of the updated standard term for the GNSO liaison to the GAC, which I shared that document on the list as well.

I think we fought for some of those governance changes or amendments to be included in the document, and even though we didn't get everything we requested for, we had some. So we can leave with that for now and try proposing more some of that time, I believe. We also have the reappointment of Jeff Neuman to serve as the GNSO liaison.

So you would notice there is a term limit now for this term, and that is based off on the approval of that Updated Standard Term because it takes effect on Jeff's second term. What we had put in there or proposed was a maximum of four terms. That is two consecutive terms to align with the Council or councilors duration in Council as well.

So a term is two years. So GAC liaison has a maximum of two consecutive terms. This will be Jeff's second term, and therefore, his last term, and the Council will have to advertise that position at the end of AGM 2024. So that's on the consent agenda as well. The third item that's on the consent agenda is confirming of the GNSO representative to the Empowered Community Administration.

---

So, traditionally, in the past it has been the Council chair who automatically represent the Council to the Empowered Community Administration, but I believe the current leadership has decided that the vice chair, Greg, should be the representative. So that will be on the agenda item for us to give consent to that. Finally, confirmation of a chair for the GNSO Guidance Process on Application Support.

So Mike Silber happens to be the only candidate for that, and so that's been brought for the Council to approve. So those are the items on the consent agenda. I'll pause to see if anyone has any comment on any of those items or questions. Please go ahead, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Stephanie Perrin for the record. I know we've discussed this whole business of Jeff Neuman being the GAV liaison perhaps to death, but I just want to note that on his SOI, the famous SOI, that needs revision in my opinion, he's identifying as an ALAC member.

Now, we all know that half the people in NCSG are also ALAC members, but I'm a little troubled at the predominance of ALAC activity. IPC has made substantial inroads in terms of leadership of ALAC, and we have the NomCom appointed Paul McGrady as our NomCom appointee to the GNSO and we have Jeff as an ALAC guy in the GAC liaison. Am I the only one worrying about this?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

I'll see if there are other people who worry more than I do to raise their hands and to comment. Manju. Alright. Manju says you're not alone

---

Steph, and certainly, I think NCSG as a group was concerned, which is why there was an initial request to the previous constant leadership to advertise the position. Because I think primarily, not only for the concerns you've raised, Stephanie, but how we couldn't separate when Jeff was talking as a liaison or on his personal capacity, or when he was engaging in the council almost as if he was a councilor.

So that was the concern that was taken for that position to be advertised. Obviously, the previous chair didn't accept that and so that's why all we could get was Tom limits and here we are. So I don't know if anyone else has anything to say in addition to that, but that's the road we've walked in the past year to get to where we are.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Well, I think it goes part in parcel with the fact that we haven't got anybody willing to draft comments. In a vacuum, the IPC is rushing in, so we've got Greg Shatan in a leadership role in ALAC; there's been others before him, and I do worry that if we don't get more enthusiastic members that are willing to do some work, to volunteer for some of the PDP work, it's just going to be ALAC IPC members everywhere, just saying. I realize that Jeff wears many hats, but Greg Shatan doesn't. Anyway, I'm just registering by discontent and worry.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks. I just threw it in there, that when this was brought up with the previous chair, the question or the concern was that NCSG keeps complaining but they didn't have enough people to volunteer. So I just wanted to throw that in there. I know we've discussed it and say it's a

---

matter of the right thing to do, not whether NCSG has volunteers or not, but I thought I'd just mention that just so that if there are volunteers out there listening, they should understand how badly we need volunteers. And like you put it, Stephanie, if it's just take volunteers.

Alright, perhaps we should continue. I think we've already looked at Item number 4 on the WHOIS Disclosure System, and I think Stephanie also touched on Item number 5, the Data Accuracy Scoping Team where one of the issues is they needed [inaudible - 01:07:50] here and they made some recommendations as well, which I think will be discussed officially for the first time. I don't think we've had a chance to look at these recommendations that came from assignment number 1 from the Accuracy Scoping Team; so we'll be looking at those for the first time.

The last time we discussed it I think in the last month's meeting is the last month before ICANN75, before we went to KL. We didn't have significant concerns about what was in those recommendations of asking whether that scoping team asked for -- requested the council to go back in and do some survey on contracted parties. Is that correct from your perspective as well, Stephanie? Because you have been a member of that team. Do you have any concerns in terms of the recommendations that came out of that assignment number 1?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Not really. I think that we have kind of fizzled out in terms of -- we were in my view kind of bouncing against the wall of our charter here; actually, we're not of a charter as a scoping team I guess, but what we

---

were tasked to do. The discussions over the audits/ -- how did they phrase there?

We argued about whether the registrar survey was a survey or an audit. We argued about the definition of accuracy, so basically, I'm not convinced we're going to get good data from this exercise, but I think that the contracted parties have agreed to it as a way of movement, you know. It's brownie in motion for those familiar with Brownie in Motion, but never mind, if it gets us out of meetings for a while, it'll be a good thing. I think that is pretty well what sums up how everybody felt about this.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks. So, no specific concerns there, then. Yeah, so the next item, I think this is one that would have some debate, but to me it's a no brainer, which is the discussion of GAC's request for additional members in applicant support GGP working group. I think the charter was clear that there would be one member per stakeholder group, and for ACs. So, GAC is requesting for members who haven't followed this, GAC is requesting for two members and two alternates. There were not even alternates in the charter of this GGP.

And for those who do not remember, Rafik is our representative to this group when it starts its work. I know that the council chair was against increasing this for GAC, so basically if this was accepted then we'll have to increase it for every stakeholder group, but yes, I think that will be discussed. I don't know if anyone has any comments about this or questions? Council members.

All right, it looks like everyone is okay with that item. We have already looked at the DNS abuse small team, that is item #7, so we can skip to the next one, item #8. All right, the Expedited Policy Development Process for Internationalized Domain Names. So, those are the IDNs.

Why is this in the council agenda? As a quick background for those who are not following this, and for councilors on the call, the reason this is here is because the IDNs EPDP were supposed to -- the project timeline they had provided after it was chartered, they were made to submit their final report, I think, the first quarter of the year of 2024, if I'm not mistaken.

However, as the work progressed, they found that they had to consult quite a bit of external parties, including also consulting technical expertise, inviting technical expertise to come to the group's discussions. And also, requesting thoughts and information from groups that developed the rules for different languages for internationalized domain names, and in doing that, they've realized that they can't omit the time that was proposed to the council.

In fact, in ICANN75 in KL, the proposal to divide the what into two phases and to have an initial report go to Public Comment on the first phase, which I believe will be ready in April, but that was just a proposal in KL, while now the [inaudible - 01:16:19] we'll be bringing into council and this is based on their last meeting last week.

I think the leadership of EPDP is now proposing that they have two final reports, not just two initial reports and one public comment, but have

---

---

two initial reports, so that's two public comments and two final reports presented to the council. Donna will talk to this on Thursday, but I think the first final report for part 1 will be around November 2023, and the second final report is November 2025. Obviously, that's a significant deviation from the initial proposed timeline, so there will be a PCR they will come with, and Donna will speak to this; Donna is the Chair of the EPDP and she will speak to this on Thursday. So I just wanted to let you all know what this is about.

Our representatives for the IDN EPDP, I think we have Peter there and Emmanuel on there; Emmanuel couldn't make it today, he has a conflict. I don't know if there are any questions on this or comments, and I'll try to answer if I can.

Alright. No questions. Awesome. Item number nine is the SPS Planning, which will be on the 14<sup>th</sup> - 16<sup>th</sup> of December in Los Angeles. So, I think that's pretty self-explanatory. Councilors will be discussing -- will be planning that session, strategy session, that will be held at the end of the year.

And in any other business, the accuracy for councilors -- the Council needs a liaison to that Accuracy Team, there were discussions at KL whether some NCSG members will volunteer for that or not. And then, the participants in the ICANN Academic Leadership Program, I think the Council has two names that it will be put in forward and that Manju will be one of them.

I think NCSG, NCUC and NPOC have their own candidates for that Academic Leadership Program as well. The Council has decided on who

---

is going from the Council. And that's it. I don't know if there are any comments or questions on these. If not, if anyone has any other business they would like to bring up, this is the time. Alright. Thanks, Poncelet. Yes, Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Just an information item. You may recall it, Paul McGrady crafted a document that he circulated among Council members about expected behavior of Council members, our commitment to each other. It was supposed to be in response to people slowing things down. We had a small group discussion among those who had opinions on that document. And I attended it. And I think it was some agreement with -- and like my position was, "We don't need another document. If you need to amend expected standards of behavior, then do it at the ball club, where we don't need separate instructions for Council members."

And secondly, on the slow down and PDPs, it's often not the Council members that are the problem, it is the other members of the PDPs. Notably the adviser groups and the non -- you know, folks at large, who don't belong to an affiliated group. So yeah, we are now discussing, potentially, putting that into PDP Instructions, Charter Instructions, rather than creating a new document. At least, I hope that would be the outcome. Because, God knows, nobody reads the documents we all sign on and click saying we've read. Anyway, we don't need another one. Thanks.

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks for the update, Steph. I guess, that's why it wasn't included on the agenda for this week. Alright, if there are no other comments, AOBs, that was all I had. And I look forward to seeing you, guys, on the Council Call on Thursday, if you can. If not, see you online on next month's Policy Call. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**