BRENDA BREWER:

Good day, everyone. Welcome to the NCSG policy call on 15 November 2021 at 11:30 UTC. Today's meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the record. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. Manju and Juan Manuel have sent apologies. With that, I'll turn the call over to Tomslin. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Brenda, and thank you to those who are with us today. Hopefully we'll get more joining us along the way. I think I'll jump right into updates from the GNSO Action Decision Radar. There are a couple of things for members not following the GNSO Council project tools. Because it's a new Council, most of the items are still very administrative, like the refresh of the SCBO. I think our members will still be on there, there is no change in that. And the SSC has significant change from our side, because two NCSG members have resigned to take appointments in ALAC. So we're doing a refresh there as well.

The other item is that the project plan for the registration data scoping team I believe has been submitted, and the Council will be looking at that this meeting as well. And the final thing is that we'll be getting, I think, the EPDP for curative rights IGO is meant to submit their final report next month, so that is something we'll be keeping an eye on as well.

Brenda, if we could move to agenda item three as I pause to see if anyone has any questions or comments to make regarding the earlier items.

Seeing no hands up, we'll move to the Council agenda which, like I mentioned earlier, is very administrative since a new Council is coming in. However, some items for discussion. In general, the agenda is a bit lightweight compared to a typical one.

There are two consent items, basically getting the new GNSO Council leadership into ... One is the ex officio capacity to the Standing Selection Committee and another motion to confirm the chair, Philippe Fouquart to serve as the GNSO representative to the empowered community administration.

The next agenda item is an apparently very controversial one as it's unfolding, and this is revising the GNSO Council job description for NomCom. The previous leadership had submitted a motion to add clauses in the job description where preference would be given to those applicants who had no affiliation to [SGs and Cs.] And that raised quite a bit of concern among councilors, and a small team was put together to draft a text that would be agreeable to most.

However, being in that team myself, I would say the team has not been able to meet. We've tried to agree on the text or contribute to an agreeable text by e-mail, but it's a bit challenging. Some councilors are not really participating. There is one thinking that they'll rather just— they want the status quo to remain and therefore no change to that job description. But we're still pushing to see if there is a proposed text now based on the contributions from the small team. If we can agree that is before Thursday, then we'll probably have a text. But for now, this is a placeholder in the event that we have a text for that motion. I'll pause

to see if anyone has any comments about this one. Rafik, please go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK: [Thanks, Tomslin. As I understand, it's not an easy topic. But I think the point needs to be made, and I saw the response from—]

BRENDA BREWER: Rafik, excuse me, it's difficult to understand you. Are you able to speak into the microphone? That's better. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. So I understand that to make this point is hard and not easy. And I read the response from [Paul.] But I think it's important to be clear about what's in the job description. We don't want to focus on one person, but because the last appointment from the NomCom, that's why you had to make things more clear.

Paul was for four years an active representative for the IPC, and he was speaking for them in many topics critical to us. So I'm not judging that. He did his role. And after just two years, he's joining again through the NomCom to the Noncontracted Parties House is quite problematic. It's a big issue. It's not that simple. I don't judge the person, but it's not right, doesn't look right in any way. And what happened, happened.

I really want to understand how the NomCom thought it's a good idea to appoint a former active councilor. So I think you guys need to push. It's not easy, but I think you need really to stick to those points. Just

avoid watering down the job description. I didn't see the latest version. I'm happy to check it. But I think in terms of discussion, we need as NCSG to be quite vocal about this. We need to understand the NomCom appointee has kind of a tie breaker vote because of the structure of the house. So someone who was in another constituency and appointed to the house would have big impact in the vote, when in many topics, we have really opposite point of view or position. So we need to be careful and quite vocal about this. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Rafik. And I agree. I did second that motion myself. However, we do not seem to come to any sort of compromise in the small group. So the way things stand, what I can tell you is it's very likely that we will not make that change this time, because there's no agreement whatsoever in the small group. So it's likely that that change will not happen.

You make a point about the IPC, because the IPC have clearly stated that they don't want text in that job description. And there are some things which I have also rejected as well. But the revised text is not yet available outside the small group, because there is no agreement. That's why you haven't seen it yet. If it does become available, then we will share it immediately when there is some hope on it. But that's where it is. I'll pause to see if there's any other comment.

Seeing no hands, I'll move to the next agenda item then for the Council. After that, Council will be looking at getting an update from the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. Now, this is not something that

the Council itself is directly involved in. However, the Council believes that because the IDN EPDP is going on and this group promotes interoperability of domain names and e-mails in every language to work in all software applications, they thought the Council should get an update from this group. So it would simply be an update. There's really no action there from the Council other than that.

Item number six, that's the GNSO Council strategic planning session, which has been going on since last week. I think the Council also has a development session tomorrow, and a breakout session later in the day before the Council meeting. So on this item, the Council will be looking at what they've discussed and probably talk about the wrap-up session that happens after the Council meeting.

Moving on to agenda item seven, this is about the thought paper that was provided, sent by Org, on modifying consensus policy, which I sent on the mailing list during ICANN 72. And I wonder if NCSG has its own thoughts on this agenda item. The Council will be hearing from councilors what their thoughts are.

Preliminary thoughts based on our conversations from the SPS, the strategic planning session, is that the Council would probably like to know from Org why Org believes this is important now and why the Council should be spending time on this right now and prioritizing it. Because it seems like Org wanted a response seemingly soon from Council on this.

And Council will be inviting members from all [SGs and Cs] to participate in that response. Rafik, please go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK: So I believe if there is need to respond, we have to respond and take strong position on this. My reading—and we need always to see what happened before, because it's kind of continuity of many what looks like small action, but at the end, they are impacting the whole process. Like when we talk about ODP or other initiative in particular coming from ICANN Org or in particular from the CEO. So we should respond.

I went quickly through the document. Maybe there are some interesting questions, but yeah, it's a good point, why now? Why are we doing this? The GNSO Council has its own process and we went through review and continuous improvement. So it's kind of strange it's coming form Org or if it comes from the Board.

So if there is opportunity that we need to respond, I would be happy to help as much as possible. I'm not saying I'm volunteering now, but I think it's quite critical. And for everyone here, we need to understand why it kind of can be risky, because nobody says we have a perfect process for the PDP, but it was built through bottom-up process, through discussion and through careful review and dialogue. And we need to say it.

Since the CEO take over, five years, four years, I'm not sure, there is a kind of continuous effort to have influence in the process, to push for more, I'd say, [the GAC] in particular, the ALAC and so on to have a say in the PDP. And that's a risk for the integrity of the process.

We have the different SOs and ACs, supporting organizations or advisory committees for a reason. They have a scope and a mission. And the GNSO is the place where we are making policy for gTLD.

I understand for those maybe who are member of different groups, they might not see the danger, but it's important to have the demarcation, that difference in the role and the mission. So that's why for us as NCSG, the group representing civil society in GNSO, we have to have a say on this and to be careful.

So just to conclude, we have to participate and review this document if we have to do that, and to take a strong position. I'm not saying there is some conspiracy, but the problem is this is kind of continuity of many efforts and initiatives here and there that at the end, it'll undermine the PDP. It'll change how it works. And also, it can undermine our influence as a group and the GNSO as a whole supporting organization.

So I hope that helps to give more background and some thought why we need to be careful. It's not like what looks like, benign. It can have big impact in the long run. Sorry for taking too long.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No, you didn't, Rafik, and thank you very much. I'll encourage members to read the document. Please share your thoughts on the mailing list if you can. One reason is that that will guide councilors when they argue or when they put forward their arguments in council about this.

And I did mention that the Council will invite all SGs and Cs to participate in that group that will draft a response to Org. However, yes,

like I mentioned earlier, the question remains why should we be doing this now, why does it seem to be urgent.

I notice that the paper mentioned there is a gap after the recommendations are provided to the Board and the IRT implementing them, especially for those that anticipate making changes in other policies. But the question is, are things really that bad that we should be prioritizing this now? And why should we be doing it? So please, if you can, have a look and share your thoughts. It'll help councilors, I'm sure, form their argument.

If there are no other questions or comments on the item, then I'll move on to the next one. I think that's Any Other Business. 7.1—that should be 8.1, I believe—update on the approach for—all right, on the response to the ICANN Board's letter regarding the IDN implementation guidelines version 4.0. I think we've been talking about IDNs in the last three meetings now.

But the background on this one is regarding the fact that when the Council was about to form the EPDP on IDNs, there was a realization that—prior to that, there was going to be an operational track for the implementation of these IDN guidelines, and then there was a policy t rack to develop policy items and there was a realization during the chartering process that there'll be overlap. So the Council asked the Board to pause on implementing IDN guidelines version 4.0.

And the Board has now written back to the Council asking—they mentioned security and stability reasons and wanting the Council to look into all the items in the implementation guidelines and see which

ones do in fact have an overlap with the policy track and so that the Board can implement, can proceed to give a go for implementation of those guidelines that do not overlap.

The Council wasn't very happy with the response that came back, because they had asked the Board to help the Council understand which specific security and stability issues were affected by these guidelines. And it seemed like the question was somewhat asked back to the Council.

Whatever the case, the Council is drafting a response back to this letter and there were some suggestions that the IDN EPDP should be asked to draft a response, but councilors thought they'd do this themselves and use the expertise of the EPDP members.

So that's what this item is about. I know that's a lot of information, so I'll pause to see if anyone has any questions or comments about that one.

No questions. Excellent. Then I'll move to 8.2, which shows 7.2 on the screen, and that is really Council's response to the ICANN 72 GAC communique. And then the final item is the acknowledgement of the registration data accuracy scoping team's project plan. That's really what's on the agenda for this week's Council meeting. See if anyone has any further comments or questions. Please feel free to raise your hand and speak.

No one? Okay. We'll go back to our agenda then. Thanks, Brenda, for putting that up. I just wanted to mention about some changes we are making with some appointments. Like I indicated at the beginning of our

call, a couple of GNSO teams have been refreshed, and one of those is the GNSO Standing Selection Committee. Two of our members resigned from that team, so the Policy Committee has appointed Sam and Olivier to replace the two members who are leaving to take other leadership positions in the community.

The other appointment is the Council—that's a very long one to say, but I'll try to remember—Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement. For this one, only Council members can represent each SG and C in fact, and we had three members here, one for NCSG, one for NCUC and one for NPOC.

Stephanie was representing us for NCSG and she has resigned, so we had to look for another Council member who could represent NCSG to replace Stephanie, and Manju has kindly volunteered to do so. So she will be replacing Stephanie on there.

Stephanie also resigned from the EPDP phase one IRT, and I believe I sent that on the mailing list requesting for volunteers. So we need a volunteer for that as well. So if you're keen and interested in the registration data issues, please consider volunteering for it.

And that's all I had for today. If anyone would like to add anything, Council members, policy committee members, if anyone would like to add anything, please raise your hand.

Okay, I will not keep you all any longer. That's all we had for today. So thank you very much for joining the call, and hope to see you at the Council meeting later this week. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]