
BRENDA BREWER:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the NCSG policy call on the 19th of April 2021 at 11:30 UTC. This meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the record and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance will be taken from the Zoom participation.

And with that, I'll turn the meeting over to Tomslin. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Brenda. Welcome to our April NCSG policy call in which we prepare for the Council meeting. Looks like we have a very low turnout today, but we will proceed, and hopefully, the others join us. We have planned to shake up the agenda a little bit, so the Council call prep item will come later, the fourth agenda item, so I'll go straight into some of the items on the Action Decision Radar that I thought were important to comment on, and the first one which we did have a chat about at the extraordinary meeting, that was the restart of PPSAI IRT. And I was just going to mention to members about how keen some constituencies were in restarting this immediately and how we were pushing back that this waits at least after the EPDP phase 2A since our IRT representative to the PPSAI is busy with EPDP as well.

So if for some reason somehow this is pushed to start before EPDP phase 2A ends, then Stephanie might need some help, I think, in the IRT. And I think, yeah, the translation and transliteration will also be amongst the items on the Action Decision Radar to be restarted as well. But at

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.

least we'll have a conversation on the PPSAI. So that's an item we will need to look out for because there is quite a push there.

The other item to mention is that I think the charter drafting team for the IDNs EPDP [draft to EPDP] rather, I believe is still on track to submit the deliverable on April 22nd. I'm part of that drafting team and I don't think I've heard otherwise. So it's on the ADR as well that the Council will be launching that EPDP soon. I think it's in the zero- to one-month timeframe section of the ADR. So hopefully, we'll have some volunteers for that when it comes up, noting that for the transfer one—but I'll talk about this later, but the transfer policy, we haven't had any volunteer for that. So hopefully, we have one when the IDN track comes through.

The other item on the ADR that I thought I'd mention is the one about Council considering forming a charter drafting team for RPM phase two UDRP. So another one to look out for. And then, but that's within the one to three months, so it's not one that's going to happen in the zero- to one-month timeframe. So those are some that I thought I'll mention in the meeting today. Stephanie, sorry, I'm just seeing your hand now. Please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

No problem. I'm kind of responding to the fact that we have no volunteers for that transfer policy. Now, I'm no expert on transfers, believe me. However, I'm kind of concerning myself with the privacy issues relating to the transfer policy, but it does seem to me that if we don't send somebody to represent the end users' rights on the transfer policy, what we will be looking at is basically the competition issues and

possibly abuse issues being fought out without any thought for the individuals who are trying to transfer their domains. And I wonder if we have explained the importance of this to our members adequately. Like really, we need somebody on there just to keep an eye on it. I don't suspect it's going to be heavy workload, but just to watch what's going on with an eye to the end user. Anyway, should we do some kind of a discussion of what this means on the NCSG list, which is somewhat moribund at the moment?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Absolutely, Stephanie. And I have tried to put some context around that every time I mentioned the transfer policy. So hoping a discussion just starts out of that. But Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thanks, Tomslin. No, just about this PDP, I was just going to remind you and Stephanie that when the transfer policy PDP was discussed, we did not oppose the creation of it, but at the time, we did point out in the leadership list—and I think the Council list as well—that we were slightly out of volunteers for now, I mean just to nominate somebody from the very start to be part of the PDP.

But in more general terms, I agree with the discussion on the NCSG list. there hasn't been much discussion around there. I don't know whether it's me or the membership or the times we're living. But I don't oppose any further [explanations] about that and I can even help. So just [inaudible]. Thanks, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. Yeah, so in the ICANN meeting—I forget which number now, but I think also regarding the transfer policy, I was in the panel as well talking about the necessity for the end users to be represented on there, and I did try to share that on the list as well so people could attend and at least get a sense of why we need volunteers. But yeah, I agree we're running out of volunteers. Hopefully, we can get someone to volunteer for it.

So I'll move to the next agenda item if there are no more comments on item two. Stephanie, I see your hand up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. I have noticed that there's been lots of activity in NPOC with respect to webinars and I guess training. Now, I don't know who's been organizing the curriculum for that, but I'm wondering if perhaps we could persuade them when they're doing these things to include a voluntary exercise of having some of the students on these training sessions volunteer to shadow a working group, because we're not running a university here, we're trying to get volunteers up to speed to do some of the work with us. That's what volunteering at NCSG is all about. Just suggesting maybe we reach out to NPOC and say, "Hey, how about having a training exercise of joining a working group?" Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. Sounds like a good idea. I see Peter's hand up. Peter, please go ahead.

PETER AIKNREMI TAIWO: Thank you, Tomslin. I just wanted to [buttress] more on what Stephanie just said, [inaudible] volunteer for the transfer policy PDP if we can actually take that up maybe and have a call to discuss what is expected so people can actually [put that forward, what's expected] in the transfer policy. So [that can actually assist in that] or allow people to join, also volunteer for that. Just wanted to add that.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Sorry, Peter, I could hardly hear what you were saying. If you could please repeat it.

PETER AIKNREMI TAIWO: Yeah, is it better now?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes. Thanks.

PETER AIKNREMI TAIWO: Wonderful. Just wanted to add to what Stephanie said on the transfer policy, on getting a volunteer for that. And just suggesting if we can have a call on that, that people that want to join that can understand what is expected on the working group, then the outcome, then they can see if they're up to the task, they can join. So maybe people don't understand the outcome or what is expected, maybe that's why we're not seeing a volunteer. Maybe we can do more on that.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. So allow me to ask. You've probably read the call. What do you think we could add to that call so that it becomes a bit clearer to those guys? Peter, sorry, I just wanted to follow up on your suggestion.

PETER AIKNREMI TAIWO: To me, if I say to me, maybe to others, I don't know the way they feel. Actually, [inaudible] but I'm just speaking out loud supporting what Stephanie said, it's something we can take up to just have a call on that, to just be able to be clear on that to the list. [Maybe people can step forward.]

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. Bruna, please go ahead.

BRUNA SANTOS: Just wanted to say [but I was typing it in the chat,] and maybe as a task, can we then have Stephanie and Akinremi working together in e-mail to the list about the transfer policy PDP? Because I think the call already gives a little more detail, but often, what we miss is explaining to our membership how and why NCSG needs to be there or how and why NCSG can contribute to a certain discussion. So if [this email] or reinforcing the [inaudible] that goes on, giving them details, explaining why we should be there and in more simple terms, what the transfer policy PDP is, I think this is a good one. So that's it.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I typed it in the chat, but for those folks who were just on the phone, one thing we could do is for a call, invite some of the contracted party folks to explain how transfers work and what happens and what we're really trying to resolve in the transfer policy, because let's face it, we don't do these on a daily basis. Not that they do either. Transfers aren't like every day all the time. But it happens, and it's important for registrant rights.

The whole issue of a registrant rights policy is something that in my opinion, having fought about it on the EPDP, we should try to resurrect that document, because we are putting high expectations on registrants to understand what they're doing and what the risks are and what's going on, and really, a transfer is one piece of a larger registrant rights issue. So it could all fit in together. So maybe a little training endeavor on this would be a good thing and maybe we could get our community allies, folks to come and help us explain that. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. And on Bruna's idea as well about writing detailed explanation of what it is about, I think it's a good idea. I know you suggest that either Peter or Stephanie do that. I can also share with whoever chooses to do that, the talking points I used at the webinar at the last ICANN meeting on registrants' participation in this PDP.

I think I don't see any more hands on item two.

BRUNA SANTOS: Tomslin, just for us to decide on—Stephanie [inaudible] right now, either inviting contracted parties to an NCSG call or holding a specific call about the transfer policy. I think both are possible, I just wanted to know which of them are you more comfortable with, because I do think that both could be really relevant to us, like having an in-depth call about the transfer policy PDP, something that you, Tatiana and myself could work together in organizing, or either inviting just somebody from the contracted parties. So just [inaudible].

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. And I might have missed that. Just before I answer that question, I think one thing to note is that that request for appointments says that it should be done by the 26th of April. So I'm not too sure about how soon we can organize a call and invite the contracted parties before that date to convince members to come for the 26th, and I'm not sure how possible to request for an extension. But yeah, I see Tatiana saying she doesn't think we can do that under such short notice. So it sounds to me like the best way will be for that writ-up—yes, 26th of April, Stephanie.

All right, so there is a suggestion of requesting for an extension. I think we can do that then, get the call to happen. I believe so, Tatiana, it doesn't close forever. So Bruna, my preference—I think it makes sense to ask someone from the contracted party, because based on the conversations I've had with the contracted parties on this PDP, they're really keen to hear the registrants' point of view and participation in the

PDPs. I'm pretty sure they'll be keen to come convince us to be there. That would be my preference. I hope that answers your question.

So I'm not seeing any more hands. Let's move to item three. I think this conversation actually has kind of moved into item three already, because we've already begun discussion, a discussion that was meant to happen on the transfer policy PDP but has already happened right now. So I'll just talk about the public comment then which we have just one proceeding that's open, and that is the one on review of all rights protection mechanisms in gTLD PDP phase one final recommendations for ICANN Board consideration.

So we do have a volunteer there, but just one, so more volunteers are welcome. If anybody is interested, please volunteer for that too. For the upcoming ones, I'd just like to mention so people can start preparing, if they have any interest in them, there is one that will be, I think, started in April, and that's one to obtain community input prior to ICANN Board's consideration for the SubPro, I think, final outputs. So, who is our volunteer on RPM? It's Pedro. I don't think I can pronounce the other name. Yes, so that's our volunteer for that comment at the moment.

So I'll continue. So that was the one, like I mentioned, that's coming up in April as well. It hasn't been announced yet, but I believe it will be, probably next week. There is another one for May, domain abuse activity reporting will be seeking public comments as well in May. Then there is the proposed renewal for [.error] registry agreement that will also be seeking comment in May. And finally, the root server system governance working group will publish for public comment its draft

proposal for evolving the governance and accountability of the root server system in June.

I think we also have submitted comments on this work before, so those are the comments that are in the radar for the next two months. I'll just see if there are any hands up for any comments on the update. Seeing no hands up, then I'll move to agenda item four now that we have Tatiana with us.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Hi. Thank you very much, Tomslin, and sorry for being a bit late, I had a work call which I couldn't jump off quickly. So about the Council agenda, I do hoped that we can go through this fairly quickly because it's not a full agenda as usual. And for those of you who don't know, the GNSO Council had the extraordinary meeting on April the 8th which allowed to balance between absolutely overloaded with issues agenda and solving some of the questions, trying to solve them in Council discussions.

So the agenda that we'll follow will discuss some of these issues, but basically, we almost have nothing to vote for. Agenda item one, very usual administrative matters, roll call, updates to statements of interest, nothing to expect here.

Item two, for those of you who are going to join, will be the update on the project list, like what's on the GNSO agenda, the GNSO plate, and action list. This'll take 15 minutes. Then we'll move to agenda item three, which is the consent agenda for the GNSO Council. And we have quite a number of items here. The first is adoption of the motion for the GNSO Council response to the GAC communique. As you might know,

GAC at the ICANN 70 was able to produce a communique, and there is some consensus advice that they are producing which is following on the EPDP phase 2A because they want the Board to take into account GAC minority statement in this report and take appropriate action—whatever that means—and two of the follow-ups on the IGO/INGO and on the CCT RT review which is following up on previous GAC advice.

And I have to admit here that I haven't seen the motion yet. The small Council team was working on the GNSO response to GAC communique, but I don't have much to update here because I have not seen the motion and the Council response yet. So I hope that this is something that is going to come on the GNSO list pretty quickly, because we are kind of running out of time here. But as I'm not involved in this process directly, I can't say anything up to now. We are waiting for the update here. I'll pause here and ask if there are any questions.

And I'm seeing no hands for now, so I'm going to continue with the consent agenda. So that was the first item. The second item is going to be a motion that'll approve the second GNSO representatives to the community representatives group, that'll nominate the IRP, independent review process standing panel. And as you might remember, those of you who follow this process, the standing selection committee of the GNSO nominated the first representative because we had only one application for this community representative group before, although we have two places there. So Heather Forrest applied and was confirmed a few weeks ago, and now we are proceeding with a second representative and the standing selection committee among the excellent applicants has selected Donna Austin to be the second

representative. So right now, on the consent agenda, the GNSO is going to just confirm the selection of the standing selection committee.

Then there would be acknowledgement of the GNSO Council liaison to transfer policy PDP. As far as I understand, this is going to be Greg DiBiase. So this is just a confirmation on who is going to serve the liaison from the Council to this newly launched transfer policy PDP which we have just discussed thanks to Tomlin, Bruna, Stephanie and others. I missed the bits of that at the beginning of the call.

And the fourth item on the consent agenda is going to be the approval of the chair for the transfer policy PDP. So the name is still to be added. The GNSO leadership has discussed the applications and there is evaluation now, and watch the Council list, the name is going to be announced soon. I'm not sure that I can announce it now due to it not being announced publicly yet, but this is something that is going to be confirmed by the Council. I'll pause here and ask if there are any questions about the GNSO item number three, consent agenda with all these approvals.

All right, seeing none, I'm moving to item four, and this is going to be the briefing from the Contracted Parties House DNS abuse group. So this agenda item is going to take 40 minutes, and perhaps it is still kind of a restrained time. So, what is the rationale behind inviting the Contracted Parties House DNS abuse group? As you might know, the topic of DNS abuse has been on the Council agenda for quite some time as we call it an expected item, and during the last ICANN meeting, we also had a meeting with the GAC for example who insisted that GNSO Council has to move forward with the DNS abuse. And of course, we have incoming

pressures from, for example, SSAC work on this and Contracted Parties House is doing something there.

So what we wanted to get here, especially in relation to consumer trust and consumer choice review team and the SubPro recommendations and GAC position on this, we just want to see what Contracted Parties House is doing right now so we have a starting point for discussion. For example, should we address the points raised by SSAC to the Board on the SubPro report? Should we start the discussion about, let's say, scoping the DNS abuse issue? Should we start to move forward with perhaps launching the policy development process? So we don't know yet, and this meeting with Contracted Parties House is just the starting point to see what is being done, where the gaps are and how the Council can take it forward from what is being done. I'll pause here and ask if there are any questions or comments about this.

All right. I'm seeing no hands, and I must admit that even if you had any questions, I don't feel that I'm in a capacity to answer because this is just a starting point, and attending this briefing and listening to Contracted Parties House DNS abuse group and trying to decide what to do with the issue from there is actually on the agenda of the Council, so not so much answers right now and maybe not even so many questions.

So I'm moving to agenda item five which are the Council discussion on IGO Work Track update and Council acknowledgement of the work plan. You might remember—and we did have update from, I think, Ioana about this and we have Juan on this call who is also the member of this Work Track, I believe. So I don't think that we need extensive update here as NCSG because you know that this work track is going to deal

with some outstanding remaining issues of the IGO INGO access to curative right protection mechanisms. So this working group was started quite recently and they were scoping their work and trying to figure out what they were going to deal with and how they were going to make meaningful progress. So basically, this agenda item is about reporting from this Work Track and getting acquainted with the workplan and discuss the next steps on the progress.

I would ask if Juan has anything to add here. I will happily give him the floor. But otherwise, I do think that this agenda item is more about general progress and how we deal with this, how we take this forward. Juan, do you have anything to add?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS:

Thanks, Tatiana. No, I have nothing to add because there is not much new here. The discussions last time were just—we are discussing just about conceptual things about how—we’re forming a group and work together and that the last time advance. And I think Chris—[not Chris—]the liaison, he will be [giving this point] on our Council agenda.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Juan, and that’s exactly what I thought. So just reporting on the progress. I would say I wouldn’t anticipate any questions about this agenda item from you, but if you have any, please raise your and meanwhile, I'm going to move to item six on the Council agenda, and this is status update regarding EPDP phase 2A, expedited policy development process. And we did already have an update from this policy development process at the previous Council meeting, and as

far as I understand, we have decided that there is a chance that EPDP phase 2A is going to make progress and come to consensus, so we are not calling it off yet, we're not closing it yet. And this is going to be yet another status update, and I believe that Philippe Fouquart, the GNSO Council chair who is also the liaison to the EPDP team, is going to update us on this progress.

I do also think there would be some update about Bird & Bird and legal committee questions, so just procedural update. The council is not going to take any decisions on this, just to get informed. I'll pause here and ask if you have any questions or comments about this.

Right, so seeing none, and we're almost at the end of all this. Council discussion agenda item number seven. Here, it might get a bit contentious, although it's supposed to be the wrap up or sort of follow-up on what we have discussed at the extraordinary Council meeting on the 8th of April. So we discussed the EPDP phase one recommendation 7 wave 1.5, and it was contentious issues whether we can resume working on those issues as privacy proxy services—Stephanie, you have to help me here with this—PPSAI.

So there was a discussion on whether this work can be resumed while there is a general community burnout and lack of volunteers and the outcome of the process can overlap the EPDP phase 2A [inaudible] there is still no general agreement. The same with accuracy requirements, what are we going to do? The ICANN produced a paper study, so, how do we take it forward? Is it the time to take it forward with the scoping team? Because many of the Council members actually raised again the issues that this overlaps with EPDP phase 2A work and also in terms of

volunteers, can we actually get enough people to join if they're not IPC and BC but also the entire Council?

So this is still contentious, and how to take it forward is not clear. The Council is going to discuss this. Then the GNSO Council consideration of SSAC 114 about the report, SubPro PDP report. Tomslin, you have your hand up. Would you like to jump in right now?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes. And this is regarding that PPSAI restart. And while we discuss at the beginning, I've just thought of a question I have for Stephanie, and this is with regards to the action item for ICANN GDS staff to reach out to PPSAI, our team members, and I wanted to ask differently if they have already done that.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: What was the question again, Tomslin, exactly?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: So regarding the action item for ICANN GDS staff to reach out to you guys, the PPSAI [IRT] members, to gauge interest. So I was wondering if they have done that already.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, if they have, I haven't read it, but that's not saying much because frankly, there's a deluge going on right now, and we've been in the middle of quite a discussion over the approach to permitting the

designation of legal person, and that's a discussion that we should probably bring up under Any Other Business, because Milton and I don't agree. And in fact, the contracted parties have reached out to me asking, is that an NCSG position that Milton is espousing, or just him? So we need to decide on an NCSG position. So that's kind of been preoccupying me, and I might have missed reaching out on PPSAI, but I don't think so. I think I would have seen it. But we can bring it up in the next meeting if that's any help, which we're now up to two meetings a week of 90 minutes, because we're getting nowhere, and that's really galling, to have to spend 180 useless minutes a week fighting over this stuff.

My position on the PPSAI is it should just stay where it is until we finish the policy. I can't help but suspect that the reason the data seekers want to proceed is so that they can continue the uninformed approach that the PPSAI had originally. We could not get anybody to understand that data protection applied. So we were talking about privacy proxy services as if that was the only way to protect your data.

Now, if we lose—or at least if my position on the selection of legal person or not loses—then I would certainly, if I were the contracted parties, I would advise them to promote their privacy proxy services at the same time as they ask people whether they're a legal person. And for those who are not following this fight, it is my position that—and supported by folks like Kathy Kleiman that small organizations, NGOs, persons working from home, sole contractors, people in countries where the concept of legal persons is not utilized in doing business. Those people have a hard time answering the question, are you a legal person or an individual? And if they're not informed about data protection law,

they'd have even a harder time. And the fight—Milton's position is it's up to them, it's their responsibility to inform themselves and make a decision, and once they make a decision, the contracted parties are off the hook. If they declare that they're a legal person, and you have warned them about disclosing the data of everybody—in other words, be aware that it's being published—then they don't have liability. And we fired a couple of legal questions to Bird & Bird, and they indeed came back with advice about minimizing risk for the contracted parties, and it is true, of course, that the more you say, the more the risk is minimized, getting down to the—you're all familiar with your 75-page contract that you get from Apple to which you have to agree or your iPhone's no good.

This concept in data protection is outdated, and in fact, [Julie Cohen] who is one of the best US scholars in my opinion on data protection thinking has just written a good article on how not to write a data protection law. And indeed, the GDPR [inaudible] to get beyond mere consent and places a heavy burden on the controller to make sure that the individual is aware. That's why the contracted parties don't want to—they want to have the discretion to say, no, we're going to protect that data because we're not sure.

The threshold of work that is required to adequately explain to individuals what happens if they make the wrong designation is, in my opinion, way too high, and furthermore, keep in mind we're only forcing the contracted parties to do that work so that the people seeking information that they don't have a right to don't have to do any work. The response to all of this is if you really need the data about an individual registration, then you can come back with your justification

for seeking that data and you'll get it. We're talking about preemptively publishing data that might be public, that might be personal, either because your employees are entitled to data protection either under the GDPR which they qualify under or under their own law which they qualify under.

So that's a mug's game, in my opinion, [inaudible] work in this field. Anyway, thank you. That's my response to that. So proceeding with the PPSAI, bear in mind that if we lose on both of these battles, then privacy proxy registrations are the only way that some of our vulnerable human rights groups and women working at home in places where women aren't encouraged to work at home, etc., and political free speakers, that's the only way they'll get privacy, is through privacy proxy registrations. So I say we put it on hold until we get the policy set. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Stephanie. And I don't know if Tomslin has any follow-up. Before I wanted to go back to the GNSO agenda, I would like to propose—because I don't see Milton on this call, so agreeing on the NCSG position [and this] looks a bit unclear to me if we don't have the second [party] speaking as well. So perhaps I will leave it up to Bruna and Tomslin to handle this because I'm not the chair or the policy committee chair. But I believe that we should listen to both Stephanie and Milton and see on the list if it's about making it the NCSG position.

With this, I'm going to move to the next item on the Council discussion, on the wrap-up from the extraordinary meeting. So as I said already

with the briefing paper and accuracy requirements, there is still a discussion when we're going to proceed and how with the scoping team, because some say that it is too early. But the GNSO Council consideration of the SAC 114, it is the communication which SSAC wrote to the Board, so in a way, we're not a part of this, but we still want to see if there is any need to react to this one. And then last but not least, the GNSO framework for continuous improvement. And I believe that Bruna and others might—especially Bruna because she's the chair—be aware of what is going on, because the Council is trying to decide how to move forward with some of the tasks that have been stalled, like for example, the reviews or the Work Stream 2 implementation, so how to handle this administratively and how to make it in a sustainable way.

So the framework for continuous improvement was drafted with this thought in mind how we sort of institutionalize this work, but there's still no clear way forward, so that would be a call at the beginning of May with stakeholder groups and constituency chairs, because some of the councilors indeed expressed the concern that institutionalizing this process is ever more work on the Council because you need people who are going to do this, and not only in terms of doing the work but also forming the groups and so on.

So this is still under discussion and we'll see how it is going to develop. So all of these items will be discussed in a way like introduction of the topic, a short Council discussion, and the outlining of the next step. Bruna, your hand is up.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thanks, Tatiana, and it's really good that you brought that up. The call is scheduled for next week, if I'm not mistaken, and we have representatives from every single SG and C from GNSO, so maybe my suggestion here would be for us to also, again, open a new thread, either on the BC list or on the NCSG list for us to go in that, into some of the points that are planned to be discussed.

I don't know any [inaudible] about that, but that's it.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Yeah, Bruna, I suggest that we wait for the call and see, because of course, we can open it now, like what is our attitude towards this, and in this regard, the framework was shared before with the GNSO Council and with stakeholder groups and constituencies. We can start the thread now.

Alternatively, we can start it after the call when you and us will get some takeaway from the discussions happening in there so we can see the attitude of others and bring questions back to the group. Whatever you prefer.

BRUNA SANTOS:

I'm okay with the decision you guys think is best. I was just thinking [inaudible] about this upcoming call and some things that will be discussed there, and then we can go back after it with the discussions itself. So yeah, but I'm happy with whatever you guys think is best.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you, Bruna. We can see. I mean, nothing hurts. I'm personally absolutely and completely overloaded at work before that call, so I'm not sure I can take part in the discussion on the list, to be honest, because right now I have super limited capacity for the next few days, but I can try to follow just to see what can be said on the call.

So if anybody wants to start the thread, Bruna, especially you as the chair, that would be great, I think. Alternatively, it will not hurt to wait for the call and get back to the group with some of the thought from there. So I think that I will leave this decision up to you and Tomslin and then we can see how to handle it best. Does it sound okay?

Right. With this, I'm going to go to the last agenda item for the GNSO Council, which is going to be the timeline for the GNSO chair election. It feels to me like it was 1000 years ago when Philippe was elected and I was appointed the vice chair, but apparently, it's already half a year. So we have to proceed with a timeline for the next chair election. This is what is going to be discussed briefly. And also, the discussion about GNSO Council liaison to the SSAD Operational Design Phase. I don't think that there is any need to introduce the Operational Design Phase. It was launched by the Board at the last ICANN meeting to carry out the cost-benefit analysis about SSAD, so this system which creation is following the completion of EPDP phase two.

And with this, I'm going to pause. There are no more questions on the agenda. Do you have any questions about all these?

And I don't see any hands up, I don't see questions on the chat. So I will hand it back to Tomslin or Bruna or whoever is going to lead on the next agenda item. Thank you very much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Tatiana, for covering that. That brings us to the admin items. So I'll invite Bruna to please take on ...

BRUNA SANTOS: It's just a short information on the election timeline. As you know, as Tatiana just mentioned, GNSO is starting its election timelines. And I say generally because they're going from the very top of the GNSO leadership to the NCSG, NCUC and NPOC leadership elections right now. A few years ago, we had all to update our election timelines to fit GNSO's. So we are about to start ours. I shared this weekend a draft timeline with the NCSG EC, and I'm assuming that is approved, but all of that to say that—can I share my screen? No, I cannot, but I can just read them out.

So check-in is going to supposedly begin on the 7th of May, and then from the 13th of May until the 27th, we will have the nomination period. Then on the 28th of May is our tentative date for the Meet the Candidates call and also the end of check-in.

And voting phase will be from the 7th of June until the 21st. So just to let everybody know that the upcoming two months will be filled out with election information and also disclaimers and everything else, and for everybody on this call, on the day that I announce the NCSG

timeline, I'm also going to announce every single spot that's going to open up, we need to take a look at the Council slot, we also need to take a look at the NCSG leadership slots. So I will send out a [inaudible] e-mail about all the slots. And in case any of you is thinking about running again or running for new spots, please give it a little thought until the 13th of May, which is the date we're preparing to start the nomination period.

So that's it. The other item I had, [Tatiana] just went through, which was the council call next week, and other than that, the leadership of GNSO is already starting preparations for ICANN 71. We have requested two meetings already with Maryam, so NCSG general meeting and also a policy committee meeting. Please let me know if you think that's too much, please let me know if you think we should have an extra meeting about something else, I'll be happy to discuss with you about our main agenda for ICANN 71. And in the upcoming weeks, we'll also start the prep calls as well. So I promise to update everybody about preparations for ICANN 71 and to send out the election timeline as soon as possible to the list.

So that is it from me. Thank you very much, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Bruna. And I'll just check if there are any hands for comments or interventions or questions. I see no hands. Any Other Business? I guess we've covered all the Any Other Business items from Bruna, and if there are any that the committee members would like to bring up, please feel free to raise your hand. I don't see any hands up. So

that brings us to the end of our meeting today then. If there are no more comments or questions, I will say thank you to those who made it today, thanks for joining, and I'll send a note, Stephanie, to the list about people, members joining to listen in to the Council meeting so they could get a background accuracy. See you all next month. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]