
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone and welcome to the NCSG policy call on 21 February 2022 at 11:30 UTC. This meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name for the record when speaking. Attendance will be taken from Zoom participation. We do have apologies today from Andrea. And I'd like to turn the meeting over to the chair, Tomslin. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Andrea. And welcome, again, everyone, to our February policy call. And normally, we'll be having this the Monday before the Council meeting, but we couldn't have it last week, so we had to reschedule it for today. So we'll be looking at some things retrospectively I guess. So yeah, welcome.

We'll move straight to our agenda, then we'll have a look at the Council action decision radar, the ADR, and I just wanted to highlight some three work items on the radar, short term radar that perhaps might require some volunteering time on our side.

The first is the SSAD ODP, of course, which is we received the operational design assessment report now, which was published on 25th of January. The Council already formed a small team to respond to that. And we have a volunteer on the already. But as you will see on our agenda item number five, I'd like us to discuss if we will be submitting a formal response as a stakeholder group separate from the Council response to Org.

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.

The other item on the radar is that the Council is expecting the final report from EPDP on specific curative rights protection for IGOs in April. I think they're looking at their final report now. So I think there'll be some work there as well once that is submitted to the Council. At least they'll be—I think we might need to respond to the call for response as well then.

Then the final one is the charter drafting team that the Council might have to form once the Council receives and reviews the uniform dispute resolution procedure policy status report as well as the UDRP policy status report. I think that's planned to come through in ICANN 73 so next month, so another potential work there for us.

So those are the items I wanted to call out in the ADR and just check if anyone has a comment on that item, or questions. All right. I don't see any hands on that. So I'll move on to agenda number three, which like I said, normally we'll be walking through Council agenda before the items are discussed during the Council meeting, but today we'll be looking at what was on the agenda and perhaps might give some updates on what was discussed during the meeting. Brenda, if you could please bring up the Council agenda and we quickly walk through it and give a summary.

Brilliant, thank you. So it wasn't a very packed one. But there were some interesting things that were discussed. To start with, there was a consent agenda. And that was related to a motion I submitted to approve Chris Disspain to serve as the GNSO ICANN fellowship program mentor.

Based on the decision by the Standing Selection Committee, which they got two candidates for that, and Chris got a unanimous vote to be the candidate. And on the item four, we had a presentation on the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement. I think I had shared the report from that committee on the NCSG list already. And for any comments or feedback as well, noting that the Council was also considering giving some Work Stream 2 work to that committee to do.

And that just follows on with item number five. So I had asked on the mailing list if anyone had any concerns or comments about that, they could send them through so that councilors could use those and bring those concerns to Council if there are any. The report is still open for comments. So the request still stands. If anyone has a comment on it, you can still send, please.

And on item number six, that was traditional planning for the upcoming ICANN 73 meeting. I see a question from Rafik. On the Work Stream 2 group—which one, Rafik, is it the CCOICI one or you're referring to the one they have, the cross community one they're just creating?

All right, if I'm not mistaken, and Bruna can correct me, I think Bruna is on the—Yeah, that's right. Seeing Bruna's comment already. Yes, that's correct, Rafik, that's formed by Councilors and Manju was representing us in the Council one.

Moving on to item number seven on the status of select strategic planning sections. This item was just a follow up on some of the Council strategic planning session action items that have been taken. And the

Council in this listened from leadership about what actions that were taken to follow up. This included things like how to have conversations with the GNSO Board appointees as well and frequent or more Council meeting between councilors and the CEO as well. So that was just what item number seven was about. And I think there were more interesting things to discuss under any other business, actually.

On the EPDP phase two small team, there was an update, which there wasn't much to update yet, because the small team, it's just still reviewing, just starting to review the ODA report. And just to add that the person representing us in that small team, and who is also a councilor is Stephanie, she is part of the small team.

So the small team really is some councilors and some EPDP members, and each is providing one member, really, to the small team. The goal of this small team is not to provide recommendations to the Council, but rather to discuss and identify what are the possible best way for the Council could take based on what came out of the ODA report and also to answer some of the board's question, some of the questions or all of the questions the Board has posed to the Council as well, and how to help answer those, then the Council will take those and deliberate on and make a decision on the way forward.

So that is going on right now, is just early days on that. Maybe when we go to the discussion on that that ODA report, Stephanie might be able to give us an update there. I believe there were some interesting things she mentioned the small team was discussing.

There was an update from the DNS abuse small team, another one which was just starting. They just had one meeting so there was nothing much to update there. Then the one that had significant discussion was the SubPro or ODP update. The Council liaison to the ODP is Jeff Neuman and he had come with some additional clarifying questions from Org. I'll forward to the mailing list. But in addition, he reported that Org had a timeline for the ODP and based on the timeline, it will be finalized about ICANN 75, that's in September thereabouts, might be finalizing the ODP. And he also reported that Org had pointed out that even though SubPro recommended a dedicated IRT, implementation review team for applicant support program, Org had mentioned that that's not the sort of work that is normally done by an IRT. So Org was wondering if Council would like to use an alternative cross community group or something like that for that work, or whether the Council indeed wants an IRT to work on the applicant support program.

His proposal, the liaison that is, to the Council was that the Council uses a cross community group and take advantage of the time between now until next year when the Board might seek to adopt the recommendation to start work on that. And there was a discussion in the Council around that and it was clarified that it is indeed possible to use section 16 of the PDP manual to do this additional work on recommendation prior to the Board adoption but the Council still needs to discuss further on that. So that that is what the liaison reported on the SubPro ODP.

And now I'll pause there to see if there any questions. I see something in the chat. I see Rafik saying the idea of separate group for applicant support is questionable. And he says no to Cross Community Working

Group. All right. So Rafik, I'd like to hear your thoughts more on that, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

I read the email by Philippe a few days ago. I'm not sure really to get what they are trying to [inaudible] in first place. So it means that the recommendation we got from the SubPro working group were not sufficient or responding to what was requested in first place to review the applicant support program and to propose changes or not.

But anyway. I think trying to set some ad hoc working group even if it looks like let's do it, that's cross community, [inaudible] a lot of problems in terms of process and procedure. I know that's not the most appealing argument, but the whole thing for the GNSO Council really is to manage the process, to follow the procedure and not to try to create every time new vehicles or structure.

So if there is an issue in terms of policymaking, we should have then to come back to the starting point. Not trying to do some Cross Community Working Group even if it looks like in theory, it's kind of inclusive, but it's not real case, is more I think two advisory committee trying maybe to push for some direction.

I don't think is the right way. I would ask really to maybe clarify what are the issues, and if there is problem, is to maybe to [inaudible] starting point, don't create a new process or new vehicles or new structure, whatever the reason. The topic of applicants support, it's close to my heart, because it's the first really working group I participated. And that was a long time ago. It's important topic, but I don't think what's

proposed is the right way. I would like more clarification, and to understand the issue at first. I have concerns basically.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Rafik. And I'm sure the transcript has recorded so that we'll remember that. But I wanted to just to check with you. My understanding is that the applicant support program in as SubPro proposed, the review team was not going to—the outcome of that will not be any consensus policy. And that's why I think the Org was asking if Council really wanted to use IRT for that. Do your concerns still stand in that case? I ask because you mentioned the policy should not be carried out by the Cross Community Working Group?

RAFIK DAMMAK: I'm trying, if possible, to read what's proposed exactly, because I think [inaudible] idea. So first is that if I understand correctly, in the final report, the recommendation is to have the dedicated implementation review team, which is separate from the usual one, the general SubPro IRT. And the purpose is to finalize some number of elements of the applicant support program.

I think the main issue here was for the subgroup at the time to not have sufficient expertise to develop policy and so on. Okay, so, basically, if I understand correctly, we have some high level recommendation from the working group, but then suggesting to have a specific community group with the expertise to work on the requirement.

Okay, that looks fine. But I think it's a valid question if we should have something like this for IRT to do. The IRT is for implementation, basically. And we have always this kind of question, to figure out, what is the policy and what's the implementation? What's kind of the demarcation between the two?

Yeah, we're just wondering here if the Council want to go in this direction, it will have then to really to be specific in terms of the scope of work, but then the implementation usually it's not managed directly by the Council, it's by ICANN as organization.

So, yeah, kind of gray area. It's a new proposal and I'm sorry that we missed this maybe when we approve the final report in first place, but yeah, [inaudible] specifics for the policy and to link that to the implementation seems kind of odd.

I understand it's an issue of expertise. But this raise several question in terms of procedure and setting up some precedent and unfortunately, it's becoming kind of trend now lately as we're setting so many precedent. And if we do so, [the whole] process become meaningless in the long run, because it means we can change things anytime if there are enough interest group pushing on that direction.

So it's important it's happening with this topic. It's important one, but then myself, I have to really read carefully and to think about. So just saying for now, my reaction just to put on hold and not really support on the time being, unless we have to respond quickly or something like this.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Rafik. I think that that's helpful. It's something that requires a bit more thinking about. I don't know if there are any other comments or questions on—I think that that that is, in the nutshell, that was how the Council meeting went. I'll pause for a moment to see if there any hands or questions on the Council agenda. And if not, we'll get back to our agenda. Bruna, please go ahead.

BRUNA SANTUS: Thanks, Tomslin Hi, everyone. Just a quick question about the strategic planning session. Like in one of the groups, the group I was at, I think it was with Manju on that group. But I also got the feeling that there were a lot of concerns with regards to policy implementation. A lot of our colleagues in the group like they agreed that it's taking Far more time than usual for community decisions, PDP decision implementation and so on. So just a quick question on whether or not this was addressed by the Council and is if there is like any new solutions or ideas to that one issue.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. The Council attempted to address it and the way it was done was a meeting was hard with Becky and Matthew, an informal discussion really just to get their feedback on how some of those things can better addressed because, like you said, during the SPS, the concern was that once it goes to the board, the Council just sits and watches paint dry. And therefore, a couple of things came out.

One was transparency from the Board back to the Council, maybe update Council more frequently as to why things are delayed or why

they haven't yet adopted a specific policy recommendation. And so, the Council leadership met with the two Board members just to have to have an informal discussion, what is the best way forward. There was an update on that as well which there will be an update, rather a follow up conversation with the Board formally about how—I think this will come up in the in the bilateral meeting between the Council and the Board in ICANN 73 about how to address those.

The other aspect to that was to increase on the consultation between the Board and the Council as well. So those are the two possible ways the Council is currently looking at addressing those concerns you mentioned, but it's still one that's been explored to see whether there are better ways or even more ways to do. I hope that answered your question. If there is no other, we'll get back to our agenda, then.

I don't see any hands up. All right, for agenda Item number four, like I mentioned earlier, the ODA is now available. I believe that was shared already with members. And we had a go this discussion in January. But now that we have the report, the question I had for membership and the policy committee was if we should be submitting a formal response to all Org and the Board in parallel to what the Council is doing.

And so it'll be good to hear what other members think about this. And also the policy committee, what folks think about this. And if there any other comments identified in the report from reading it that some would like to bring up, this is the time to bring it up for discussion. Thanks. I'll pause to see if anyone would like to respond to that question of whether we should be we should submitter for more response. Yeah, Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you so much. So about the response. I think we had some consensus around this last time in the last meeting. But I guess we held back from drafting that because there was a request from you guys, from the Council for us to hold off from writing the proper statement or a letter or anything like that before the Council had a proper chance to discuss it.

So I would be in favor of us drafting something because it helps position us as a stakeholder group who we are, and maybe it's one of the things some of us have been advocating for doing. I would be supportive of this statement so far.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Bruna. And I believe there was a request to hold off just to wait for the report to be released. And now it's been published. I don't think there's anything now stopping us from putting out a formal statement. And I think it will be a good idea for us to do so. I just haven't seen much comment about it since it was shared, so I wasn't sure what folks are thinking about the report.

So I think then since there was consensus anyway, during the last meeting, then having that Google draft started will be the way forward to seek input to the document. But just looking at councilors for a moment, wondering whether anyone has seen anything of grave concern in the report that is worth mentioning. Okay, Stephanie's on phone, but I wanted her to also just give us a bit of an update on the small team. I know she had some concerns. If it's possible for her to

voice that, I will also be glad to hear so that other members can also be in the know.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Hi there. And I do apologize for being late. For some reason. My calendar thought this was 7:30, not 6:30. So very sorry if I've missed much. With respect to the letter, I haven't looked at the Google doc or the draft. As you may recall, I'm not really of the view that we need to fire a letter in at this point as far as the small team is concerned. But perhaps I should explain why. I don't believe that there is a particular consensus position that we need to put forward as NCSG at this point. But I could be wrong. I haven't looked at the draft that has been circulated.

As far as the small team is concerned, there are [inaudible] and we are inching our way forward. But the response of the Board, or the questions from the Board, have us scratching our heads still, in particular, the one for the market research from a [non-market] research firm, to look at the need, and we have said all along that there hasn't been a proper cost benefit analysis because it's missing the rationale for the entire operation. We have told them consistently that the SSAD would be too expensive. Certainly I have since the time I arrived at ICANN because of the inherent costs and the human element. So that's one of the burning issues at the moment. And the sense that we're being manipulated here is of course rather strong.

So the small team will be meeting again this Wednesday. I think we'll know more after that. But I can circulate a short note on what has happened in the small team so far, if anybody thinks that when help

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. And regarding the letter from NCSG, I thought the idea was to the use that to start drafting and come to some sort of common position. And Bruna, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but that was my understanding, that that would help come to some common position, then we can use that to respond to the Board. Thanks, Bruna. Yes, that's correct. Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS: As I said, and we've been discussing for a while now, just because—I am going to insist on this because I think it is rather relevant for the stakeholder group to have a position on this. As much as this could be resumed or a very small one regarding some differences of agreement we might have and everything else, but I think it will be somehow good for us to do it. And the reason why it is not ready yet is because as Tomslin mentioned, we were waiting for ODA to be ready. And then we were also expecting for some discussion to come up on the mailing list and so on.

But since it did not, what I'm going to do is send the ODA, again to the main mailing list just so everyone gets a chance to read it and take a look again, and then also send a link to the placeholder Google doc that I opened a few weeks ago, just so we can get this going and see what are really the discrepancies and the disagreements between our

members and everything else, because it would be good to have something like that. And you were correct on your mention about the document, Tomslin. That's it.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. And thank you so much for confirming that. And to Stephanie's concern too about being swamped with prep meetings, that's also true. I can't recall if there is really a timeline for this. I cannot remember when we have to—and I think we could do this after the meeting as well. Yes, exactly. Thanks, Manju. So we could do this even after the meeting. So if we start now, we could [inaudible] to start contributing to the document and we take it up after ICANN 73 and spend some time with it after the meeting prep dies down a little bit.

I'm with you, Stephanie. All right, I think that we have a way forward then with the with the ODA. Unless anyone has any other comments or concern, we can park that one and move to item number five. I'll pause for a second and see if there's any. Thanks Stephanie. I think that will be helpful, especially on the anonymous contractor for the research. That is something though will be good for the [inaudible] to also read.

All right, we'll move on to item number five. Thanks, Stephanie. So like you might have noticed, there are quite many issues that are on the table, discussions going on right now. And so the NCSG leadership wanted us today to discuss whether it's possible to prioritize, and what we should prioritize as NCSG's priorities and focus on them. And with this one, I'll hand it over to Bruna to help us facilitate that discussion. Bruna if you don't mind.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Yes, thank you so much, Tomslin. And this was supposed to be an NCSG general call but since I got sick a few weeks ago, I was not able to follow up and organize. And then we have also been seeing and hearing from our councilors and everyone that's volunteering on behalf of NCSG on working groups, task forces and everything else, that there is a fair amount of things happening all at the same place all at the same time. And we're not being actually able to focus on things or even to understand and report back and do have a proper conversation on the mailing list.

And as much as I understand everyone is very much tired and also mentally exhausted from this pandemic and so many prep meetings and so many meetings for meetings, and then more meetings, this is just an attempt for us to try to try to understand what could be our priorities for this upcoming meeting, the ICANN 73 and also for the end of the semester.

And just to let you guys know, the strategic session we had a few weeks ago was also a place that this issue was brought up. It's a problem that's not just affecting NCSG, but also many other parts of the community. And we always knew that the extra amount of work always hits us harder because we're the part of the community who doesn't really get anything to be here other than our excitement and willingness to be working on things.

So from my conversation I had—I also had a meeting with the CEO a few weeks ago and this was also something I brought up to him again, that a

possible return to on site meetings will be something strange to us as well, because we have seen some sort of not really a weakening of the strength of NCSG as a stakeholder group, but also what we were experiencing was some sort of a loss for volunteers. And maybe it came from the lack of capacity building we could do with them, the lack of time we could dedicate to mentor newcomers and everything else.

But we also knew that there were a lot of things happening all at the same time. And then when we look at the Council session, we see things like the ODP SSAD, this is something that's been on our minds, the next round of the gTLDs as well. So I just wanted to hear back maybe from you after this very long introduction, what do you guys think we should be dedicating a little more time to? Because every single week, we get a new request for a representative in a taskforce or in a working group or anything like that.

And I don't even know in how many groups Akinremi is in right now, but I also know it's the situation of many of us. So from what we have seen so far in this call today, is there anything you would like us to be more focused on? Let it be the outcomes of SSAD implementation? Or should we put some more gear into the discussion surrounding the next round of the gTLDs? And yeah, just need to hear some feedback from you guys so we can better organize the work for this upcoming month. So I guess the floor is open to anyone who wishes to comment or say anything about that, or if you feel we should keep on doing what we were already doing, then it's also fine, but it will be good to hear from our members on this. Thanks, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna, for the introduction. And so the floor is open. I'll check for folks putting up their hands. And don't forget there's also the DNS abuse as well, which keeps coming to our door. Yes, Stephanie. Thanks.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, I say the same thing all the time. I'm actually trying to reduce my workload. And I have successfully foisted off a couple of the committees that I was on. But I can't take any more on. I feel terribly guilty when I see these things being unstaffed or left lingering there with only one poor soul trying to hang on. We have to find out why some of our people that used to participate are no longer participating because we need them back participating.

I know we haven't all always got along, I have maintained that this acrimony is a real deterrent to participation. But maybe if I left, more people would jump in, who knows. But we are in a dire strait. And I think we have to be straight about that to people. We can't keep going on like this, we're missing key participants on some of the really ugly working groups that are now starting to implement and everybody thinks "Oh, implementation." Well, that's where all the fast ones get pulled. There's going to be a real push for ICANN deliver at some point soon. The press we're getting about not delivering any policies in the last 10 years is I don't know how anybody can tolerate that for too long. So I think maybe that ought to be our top priority for a strategy. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. Rafik

RAFIK DAMMAK:

I don't have an answer, why there are not so many people involved. Just about myself, I think not being involved was good, because I could get free time and enjoy it after a long period. But I think in terms of maybe the representation in participation, I think it is also back to the first matter of planning and prioritization.

So, I see that the GNSO Council for the last years went to this approach to create more small teams and try to delegate. It has its own merit, but also that it encouraged to some extent to try to cover so many areas and then you need to have more representative. The same if we have working group and going with membership-based model. So you need to have representatives.

So, this is kind of matter of when you do the planning, you have to see all this in the same time and to ask the question if we as a group, we can have representation everywhere. If not, then we need to decide where we can have more impact on what matters to us [inaudible].

But other than that, regarding maybe to decide our priority and so on, unfortunately, [inaudible] you cannot escape that. Unfortunately you have to take [inaudible] proposing a draft or something in the beginning that maybe will elicit some input from our members. You don't need to make a full proposal, but if you can have some draft or kind of clear question that maybe will be more easier for people to jump in and to participate. Anyway, I think I took enough time off. I will try to help as much as possible but I cannot commit. And will try to do my best to help out here. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Rafik. And like Stephanie said, we feel guilty dragging you back in. The one thing I dread is the representative model sometimes because that requires I think three members at least from our stakeholder group to volunteer, and we're often not able to get—we're hardly able to get one out of those. That just keeps happening. So it's quite like you mentioned that important that we prioritize figuring out which ones we're definitely going for and which ones are not too important for us. Bro Bruna, I saw your hand come back up.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thanks. I think I can come in back after Ben because he also has his hand up. And then I can sort of just do like a wrap up of this short discussion where maybe further folks want to contribute as well. But I can come after.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right. Thanks. Benjamin then.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Good afternoon. So last week, we had a membership call. And this issue also came up in NCUC. And some of the members who tried to show interest actually suggested something, because as far as I can remember, this has been an ongoing reoccurring conversation.

And one of the things that the individuals suggested was, is there a way people could see how their participation is contributing to the final

outcome? If there's a way of improving communication of some sort, then they will know, okay, this is what I'm driving at as against endless commitment or endless volunteering. So I don't know the answer to that.

My question would be, maybe we could do a good job of our communication around how some of these issues are not just acronyms, or technicalities, so that people can know, okay, this work, this is the essence of it. And this is the benefit. That might also bring some people on board, because I mean, NCUC has this endless list of participating members. But not very much participation was seen. And that was the essence of that conversation last week. And this was some of the feedback we got, that maybe if there's a way we could tailor our messages to show their contribution, where it leads to, members can get involved, although some of the veterans said it's hard work, and people are not willing to put in the hard work and get on board. So I just felt I should share that with you guys. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Benjamin. And so, if I understand correctly, the communication regarding the participation leading needs to be communicated before the work is done, not the communication of how the work has led to outcomes after the work is done. Is that correct?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Okay, so let me try to rephrase. So the individual said, if they could see the outcome of previous contribution they made, and say, okay, for taking this position or making this contribution, this is the outcome it

delivered, then they will see that their contribution does have an effect. And then it will be like a motivating factor to continue to contribute or to get people to know that there's an end to the participation they give to the work.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. Thanks for clarifying that, Benjamin. And Stephanie, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks. And thank you, Benjamin for reporting on those comments. I don't mean to sound like I'm jumping on you. But as Avri said, the work is never done. Members have to understand what we stand for. And that in this kind of struggle, you never actually win. I like to think I've had an impact for the blessed eight years I've been here heading for nine, actually, it's nine now sorry. But tangibly, are we further ahead in terms of implementing privacy? Certainly not because of what I've done, it's only because of the fines for GDPR and the risk that the contracted parties are running that we're making progress.

And if I turn my back and walk away, I am confident that there will be people once again talking utter nonsense about what privacy law means, or how to interpret it or blah-blah, the nonsense will resurge. Right now they know that I will swat it back, either in the chat or in the meeting itself, or that there's a risk that they're going to be exposed as idiots on a panel at an in person meeting.

But there's no scorecard up here that gives you a tangible result for this kind of struggle. You just have to know what you're arguing for and

keep at it and renew the faith. And this is why I find that the way we treat each other is not helpful.

If you work and work and all you get from your colleagues is criticism, or attacks, because you they don't agree with your position, that's not motivating. Not at all. There isn't even a recognition that you're fighting on the same side. One can argue about interpretations and positions and how something can be said or whether we need a particular step like, for instance, this letter without demonizing the other party.

But we're having a hard time even getting people to identify clearly—if Benjamin, you're reporting accurately on what people want, they want to see progress. They want to see some kind of oh, I made a difference. Well, it's really hard to do that in the current climate. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Stephanie. And I think just to put it in context, the question Bruna asked during my summary of the Council meeting regarding the length of time it takes to implement any policy recommendation that has been passed by the GNSO Council, as you could see, even the Council is unhappy with the outcome of a policy that has successfully been passed in the Council and waiting for implementation.

So I think just adding to what Stephanie says, it might be hard to point clearly to a volunteer how they've made impact, but I wonder if that person who made that would consider a successful submission of say, a public comment as impact, for example. That's a question that is on my mind. So I'm just trying to qualify impact here in my mind. So I see Manju's hand is up.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Tomslin. Also, I was at the meeting too, the NCUC one. What I got was actually a bit different from Ben. I think people were talking about more like even if they want to get into like the work, there are too many ahead of the work. Too many things have happened before this work.

So for example, if you want to participate in EPDP phase 2A, there's already phase one, phase two, and if you didn't know anything about phase one and phase two, then it's very, extremely difficult for you to participate in phase 2A. And even if you are aware of phase one and phase two, but prior to this, there were this proxy, WHOIS, kind of all kinds of like very old discussions that really build up to what we are now. So for newcomers, it's really hard to understand all the context and what has happened

And for other people, whenever they're referring to stuff, sometimes you don't know what that is, because it's happened so long ago, but most people know because they were here, they've been here, they've been here for ages, and they're talking about it, and you're like, "I wonder what that is," and you have to do a lot of study, and you have to read a lot.

So for a newcomer, it's not really just the time you have to devote in for like two hours a week for the policy meeting, or for the working group meeting. You have to devote maybe five hours a week, because you have to read through all the materials that you people have been here, they have already read them already. And they already know that by

heart, but you don't know nothing. So you have to read all of this stuff by yourself so that you catch up with other people when they're talking about issues so that you understand.

So I think they were suggesting, actually, we can do something like summaries for issues. And I was thinking, for example, every time before an ICANN meeting, GAC have their summaries, right, they have their briefings for each issue. And they have the secretariat. And I don't know if they pay for it, because I know that like, three, four years ago, they pay for like in an independent secretariat to do all the secretariat work. So the briefings, the materials, but like, they stopped having the money, like nobody wanted to sponsor secretariat anymore. So now the secretarial work is done by ICANN staff, I believe. So I don't know how that works for GAC, [inaudible] for us, because we are really in need of a secretariat. If we have any money allocated to us that we can use to hire a secretariat, I think that's definitely what we need. But I'm not sure if we do have that.

And if we can even get our volunteers, those who don't have time to participate in working groups anymore, but they're willing to just write up summaries for what they know about a topic and then just we have this archive where people can just go in and write stuff, then maybe it will be nice, it will be giving more knowledge to whoever new and want to participate in policy work.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Manju. So if I understand correctly, the summary then needs to be tailored to NCSG position, because understanding what you're

saying, the things like the GNSO policy report, or the ICANN meeting policy report, does not cater for this need that newcomers have which ties to exactly how does NCSG position itself in these issues, rather than how the GNSO has been looking at these issues in general. I'm guessing that is correct. Okay, thanks. Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Rafik, and thanks, Manju, for the comment. So it's kind of an old topic that come up many times every time. So first in general about having the briefing to explain about what's going on. Already, I think ICANN staff, in particular GNSO policy staff, they prepare some briefing or for some working group they have even newsletter. So there are several material to share about what's going on in the working group. And they are usually made for that purpose, to be easy to digest.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Yes, I think we lost Rafik again. Okay. So while we wait for Rafik to reconnect, I think, Benjamin, you could speak.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE:

Thank you. So what I just wanted to say, in addition to what everybody else has said, is if something is not working, there certainly has to be a way that things can work, or we can change or try something else. So my take is, just like Monroe said, if we have funding or something, to improve our communication, at least try it, to see if we can get more people on board, they can understand some of the issues were tackling, the reason why we're tackling. It doesn't have to be a job done or

ended. It just has to be something that we could also explore to see if it can bring individuals on board.

Newsletter might be out of vogue. Or, I mean, if we can be producing small snippets videos, who knows, that is timely, that's as fast as—I'm sure there's the sort of thing that [inaudible] are doing is getting people on board beyond just motivating them by their profit margins. So that's just what I want to say, that if we can really tweak our communication style, thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Benjamin. And Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. Okay, yeah, so there are already some existing material that was prepared by the GNSO policy staff about the working group that I advise people to read them. They give overview, a quick snapshot about what's going on there. That's in general, but in the particular case of NCSG, I would be cautious about asking for extra briefing or more work from our volunteers to prepare for this material, because I will be quite frank here, I did it before, like sharing reports from a GNSO Council meeting and so on. I never had or maybe rarely had feedback that enough people were reading that or they find it useful. And it takes time.

I understand that there is some kind of at least some minimal expectation from like our Council presentative to share update as much as possible. But I would be cautious to ask them to write like a briefing

and so on. It will be hard to sustain. It takes time. And when we have no clear idea that people will read it, will use it and will comment or interact, that can be quite discouraging.

So I'm really cautious. I understand what Benjamin is trying to do. But I kind of want to say that this is something we discussed many times. I don't know if you have the response to it, if you have the solution. So we need to find the balance here. Asking for more material or thinking that we can maybe record some video to explain about some complex policy issue, okay, why not, we can do that. But it will take time. It will require those who are involved, really involved to do more work.

So whatever you ask, whatever you think that will be helpful means resources and people to do it. So the question here, do you think that it should be the same people? I don't think that's the right answer. So maybe others who want to be involved can try. But at the end of the day it means they have to do their homework and effort to understand about the policy issues in the way that they can summarize to other.

I don't want to be negative. I'm just saying that we need to be cautious. It's [inaudible] people are not involved with because they don't have enough material. I can tell you in the last 10 years, there are more and more material, material and briefing and updates and webinars. And like before ICANN meetings. That's in general about policy issues.

For NCSG position, I can understand it can be somehow complicated sometimes to come back to history, but there's some space we when we, for example, we commented on like previous PDP or public comments or [inaudible] we have kind of some reference we can use to

understand about previous position. And if you read those letters, or those comment, or statement, you can find the background and explanation and reminders about previous position.

Of course, we can try to write down maybe in some consolidating, it can be possible idea or initiative, but again, it will need people to do it. So whatever you propose, you need to have a mind that needs volunteers to do it. And so Benjamin, if you want this, you should take the lead, and you should really start to do it. If you think that's one thing to do. If you think that will work, you should take the lead and try to start maybe writing on drafting and see how it goes.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Rafik. And there is a very vibrant chat discussion going on. Bruna, do you want to take it up now?

BRUNA SANTOS: I do, Tomslin. Thank you. And thanks, everyone for the points you brought up about this. I agree it's not a new discussions, neither the solutions are necessarily new. We've always had some level of not really concerns but like some small complaints coming from parts of our community who are not on the day-to-day policy work about how the reporting could be improved and everything else and like three years of a pandemic in, as Rafik was saying, we had a duplication of meetings, documents, resources, links, and everything else in a situation that everyone is tired.

So I can understand the frustration from somebody that's trying to understand the issues now. I think it's probably way better than it was when Manju myself or anyone else joined this community. But the idea here is to try to get us back to normality or like some level of normality, or to the ways we used to work before.

But I do agree with some points. As much as I know that everything can be rather overwhelming, I do think that we have all been somehow failing to report some of the things to the mailing list. So some things I wrote down here as you guys were discussing also on the chat. So maybe to have monthly updates from leadership and Council is something we can work on, Tomslin and myself, like a three-paragraph email that we would send to you like two weeks after the policy call just so everyone is on the same page about what's going on. And then we could link some more reports and useful document and everything else for everyone.

I know this is extra work for Tomslin and myself and probably the councilors, but I just think this could help at some level, especially because the main concern we had here was not even—I mean, what I'm saying is that everybody that commented on this conversation was not even able to comment on the issues but on the moment before us getting into the issue. So lack of communication was a problem.

So if we're not being able to go into the topics such as DNS abuse, the coordination group for the WS2 implementation or even next round of gTLDs, it means communication is still failing. So it should be our priority for, I don't know, the upcoming month.

So maybe we can start working on draft reports to you guys, just something we would send every once in a while for everyone to know. But I also took down some notes on participation and outcomes. And I agree with everyone that it's really difficult to measure how good we are or how did we influence a certain decision or how NCSG was relevant to A, B, C or D. But we also had the things that pointed out to our participations which were representatives, policy comments, and a lot of the discussions we did internally.

So we could try to do that, like I've been—and just to reply to the drowning. I've been constantly reporting the drowning too, in my conversations with the CEO, not in the ways of saying like we're dying but I have constantly reported that NCSG is going through a rather complicated phase and we're seeing more and more of our volunteers go. And Göran at least says that he's interested in helping us with anything necessary, him and David.

So one of the things he suggested in our last call was to have an informal meeting with NCG just as an opportunity for us to have a face-to-face chat with him, like an online face to face chat with him, and then just ask questions and have this conversation because he's understanding of our issues and everything else.

So maybe that's something else we could do, like have this conversation with Göran, just so everyone gets a chance to ask about a lot of things. And maybe, yeah, the two suggestions, I would say, were like this report and the chat.

But we can leave this conversation open for anyone who wants to bring more ideas and to also be careful about those things. Because we also know that our volunteers are drowning in a lot of work. So I don't even have the courage to ask for anyone to write reports about PDP participation when I know this person is at three working groups at the same time. So it's rather unfair, and we need to take better care of each other.

So let's think about what can be this email to the list, Tomslin, and then let everyone know. And then I'll go through the chat and your suggestions as well and try to write back to everyone about solutions and everything else. So I guess maybe we can resume this conversation. Yeah, a paragraph or two-sentence email and just let's get back to this conversation, probably in our meeting during the next ICANN meeting. So that's it. Thanks, Tomslin. Thanks, everyone for chiming in.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. Being conscious of time, I think we'll quickly move to the any other business. Bruna, do you have any administrative updates you would like to share? I know that we have the DNS abuse meeting for NCS G on Wednesday. But yeah, Bruna, please go ahead.

BRUNA SANTOS: I do have two things about ICANN 73. First of all is that once again, we are open to any agenda item suggestions you might have. It's also another issue like whenever we send emails to the list, the lack of response has been very frustrating for us in general. So if you have any suggestions for the upcoming meeting in our agenda, if you would like

us to continue this conversation about prioritization or any other topics or to inform me to bring somebody to give us updates on any of the Org initiatives, there's still time for us to at least try.

The second topic would be our meeting with the Board. I've sent two emails to the list already asking for suggestions or questions or things you would like us to discuss with the Board. I've seen Benjamin has suggested some things, I've seen Efrain also suggested something. So I need to send those questions in today. If anyone still has any suggestions they could send to the list, please do so.

And just moving on to the DNS abuse thing, I've told this on the mailing list over and over again, CPH wants to like give us a chance to have a conversation again about DNS abuse. Their topic for this one, this meeting that they want to host with us is trusted notifier expectations and malicious/compromised domains.

They host these meetings every Thursday at a set time, I think it's 15:00 UTC. We could maybe ask for another one. But the idea I think is for us to join their weekly meetings, and we are hosting this preparatory meeting on Wednesday. So if you want to join the discussion and debate, please come to us and we just want to do conversation about this, because there's a lot of things going on about abuse and there's a lot of things going on only on the private companies and in the industry side.

So it will be good for us to have a better conversation around those issues. And just so we know about this duplication in a lot of the things that are going on and just we can maybe get to a point of having

somehow an NCSG position on that. So Wednesday, we're going to have this meeting, preparatory, and then if anyone has input for our community meeting at ICANN 73 or our meeting with the Board, I will be very happy to receive some suggestions. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Bruna. And yeah, you just brought it to the top of our—but I wanted to thank everyone very much for coming today. And I just wanted to add that let's—eve taken the suggestions today about how to make the participation better. And I thought the idea of two paragraphs or something was a good one. So we'll act on that.

See you—next week is the prep week. Is it next week or this week? This week, sorry, is the prep week for ICANN meetings. Hopefully, many folks will be present. And don't forget to attend the GNSO policy briefing call which will give us ideas of what is going on as well. As much as it's general, will be helpful.

So thank you all again for attending today's call, and see you during the week and during the meeting. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]