
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the [inaudible]. Thank you very much. We'll begin shortly. May I also remind everyone to please mute your microphone if you're not speaking? Please mute your microphone when you're not speaking. Thank you so much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, everyone. I think it's time to start the call. We're already two minutes past the [inaudible]. We have several items to discuss, so let's start the recording. Can we please start the recording?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the monthly NCSG policy call on Tuesday the 17th of July, 2018, at 12:00 UTC. On the call today, we have Rafik Dammak, [inaudible], Ayden Férdeline, [inaudible], Farell Folly, [inaudible], Olga Kyryliuk, [inaudible], Tatiana Tropina. And from staff, we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and when you're not speaking, please mute your microphones. Thank you very much, and over to you, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Maryam, and thanks everyone for [inaudible] today in our monthly NCSG policy call which is held usually prior to the GNSO Council

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.

meeting. It's, as always, an opportunity to prepare for that meeting to discuss the motions that will be voted in other policy items. It's also an opportunity to get update about anything in PDP working group or public comment and so on.

For today, [inaudible] somehow particular. So, the council meeting, while we have the agenda with several items, we'll say 40% of the time of that meeting will be around the approval of the PDP charter and initiating that process. So, I think, for that reason, we need to focus on that part and also to give more updates on what's happening [inaudible] for the EPDP charter and scope, so we can have everything on the same understanding on what's going on there and also what we can expect in that process.

So, with that said, [inaudible] go to the agenda. We'll do some [inaudible] here and start first with the EPDP. Can we go to the agenda first, please? So, we will keep these agenda items, but we will come back to them later, since we have another motion to [inaudible] in the next couple meetings.

So, the first is about the initiation of the expedited policy development process on the ICANN board temporary specification on gTLD registration data. I think most of you heard for the last days either in the mailing list or during the Panama meeting or in our last NCSG call about the EPDP. So, this is the time that we will have to vote from the approval of that charter, so [inaudible] initiating that process.

I shared a few hours ago two documents. One, a Google doc, which is the more updated charter with [inaudible] of the scope and the

[inaudible] which is about the scope. While all the section of elements of the charter are important, I think the focus usually is about the scope because it's defined or [inaudible] what the team or the working group will focus on.

In talking about the scope, I would like to add, Stephanie if she is here with us, maybe to give a kind of briefing and maybe outline what are the main items from that scope and what we can expect. Since she was in part of the small team [inaudible]. I know it's a little bit complicated, but a small number of people worked on the scope of the charter for a few days. I think it was quite interesting because they have a really short timeframe to work on that. So, I think she's the most knowledgeable person about that part and she can give us more update or highlight the main parts. Stephanie? In the meantime, I would like to ask Maryam to put or upload the scope document into Adobe Connect. Stephanie, are you with us?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much, Rafik. Can you hear me?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, we can hear you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay, very good. Thanks very much. As Rafik was saying, this was a serious amount of work to get the documents ready for approval at the council meeting this week, the document being the charter for the expedited policy development process. Complicated by the fact that

we've never really done an expedited policy development process before, although that really doesn't have a material difference in terms of the charter, just that we have a very shortened timeframe to achieve this work.

The first thing, the major argument about, was the composition of the team. And I think we may have spoken about that recently. At least you may have seen traffic on the list. The drafter of the original document – that would be Keith Drazek from Verisign – had proposed us having only two members on the group as opposed to the Business Constituency having six. Two per constituency. Then, that's moved to four at some point, but it went back and forth.

We had a bit of an argument about that in which we actually had asked Milton to phone Keith and have a little chat with him, that this was a lay down and die on the tracks effort.

Part of the reason we're adamant about this is (a) we're fighting for privacy for the last 20 years and [inaudible]. Can you still hear me?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yes, Stephanie. Please, go ahead. Maryam will come back.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Okay. It's not just that we're the ones that have been pushing for this for a long time, but for those who haven't followed GNSO restructuring, the Business Constituency, with whom we share the non-contracted party house, has been pushing since the inception of NCUC to reduce our presence on council. In my view, at least, and I think it's shared by

some of my fellow councilors, any move at all to disrupt the delicate balance of seats on council, which I would read this as being, has to be fought and fought hard.

So, we did. We got our seats back. The actual composition of the group now threatens to be unbalanced because we have been letting in all the advisory councils to the three seats each with a couple of alternates. So, that means the GAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Council, the ALAC were not very happy with their two seats. They wanted more than that.

The Root Server Advisory Committee, the latest, they discovered they were not on the list and wanted to be on the list, [inaudible] about it. Now, this would be fine, but I would warn everybody that I think that the common characteristic for all of these advisory committees is that they basically share the view of the security community that they want a free and open WHOIS. So, it's really one opinion coming in from all these advisory committees.

So, you can imagine that there has been a lot of traffic on the issues and it's still going on. So, what happened last week was that we struck a [inaudible], one representative from each constituency. So, I was NCSG. Keith Drazek was the pen basically for the registry. Susan Kawaguchi represented business and Paul McGrady represented the IPC. Together, we went over the draft that Keith had come up with when we were in Panama and continued to work on the difficult issues of the scope. Once we got beyond composition, scope was a very difficult issue because the intellectual property community was adamant that the – sorry, I'm listening to background noise there. The appendix of the interim

specification, which refers to a [inaudible] included and we start working on it obviously right away. They rejected the concept of a phased approach. There has been a debate over whether we should have [inaudible] expedited PDP, because the business community and the intellectual property community are refusing [inaudible] the others to work and then the second work. In other words, the first [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] just to let you know that [inaudible] joining the conference.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Pardon the interruption. [inaudible] the call? Okay. So, please mute if you could. Where was I?

Oh, yes. So, the first job was to determine whether the [inaudible] is actually going to work, whether it's compliant with law. And we have in the meantime received a letter from what used to be the Article 29 committee and is now the European Data Protection Board. Basically, my read of it is saying, "Well, yeah, nice that you're working on it, but keep going and here are some issues that you need to address."

In particular, they pointed out that an asset system is totally voluntary, that the controllers are in charge of who gets third-party access. So, we've been trying to say that for many years, but nobody is listening, of course. I believe that the non-contracted parties, other than ourselves, want ICANN to come up with the framework for that and make it mandatory, just like WHOIS was mandatory.

So, in any case, that issue has predominated the discussion of the mission and scope. So, it's up on the screen. Who's got scroll control? Everybody? Okay.

Unfortunately, this is no pagination, so that doesn't make it particularly useful. Maryam, if you are scrolling, could you go back to the top of the page? Background. We argued about that, but it's alright now, I believe. Second page, please.

Okay, so the second page is the terms, the purposes, for processing of registration data. This contains a number of gating questions in it, which we have to answer before we move to the work on the access model. One of the reasons we're insisting on this is we cannot possibly figure out who has legitimate need to access the data until you figure out what the original purposes of collecting, using, and disclosing the data are.

So, we have argued back and forth that we obviously want it phased. No work at all on the access model until we're done with the first part. The other parties are willing to compromise and say, okay, once we have the gating questions answered and an interim report released, then we can start work on the access model.

This, in my view, is an important point of principle here, just because the committee has come up with an interim report. Community feedback on that interim report is vital. We are supposed to, in the multi-stakeholder model, consult the community and then reflect their comments in a redraft. So, to move ahead on an access model before that stage is done is a breach in our regular conduct. I won't say that

procedure works all the time, but theoretically, that's what we're supposed to do.

Anyway, those are the purpose questions, and if we could move on to the next page, I'm not going to go through line by line because it's quite long. Part two there, the required data processing activities – that's a loaded word, by the way, that may be being misused in the interim spec. But, these are basic gating questions about what the registrar should be collecting and what legitimate reasons for collection are.

Now, there was a very long and, if I may say so, tedious debate in the RDF PDP where the third-party actors tried to get every possible use that they could have of data included in the legitimate purposes for collection because they, in my view, misread the GDPR deliberately so that they could get a broader scope of data processing activities for ICANN.

An example being, well, we have to be able to give data to academic researchers, so if we don't list academic research as a purpose for collection, we won't be able to disclose it. That is not an accurate reading of how data protection works.

Anyway, the section C there is the transfer from registrar to registry. Everybody should be aware that there are many policies related to WHOIS that are in question now with the GDPR, one of them being thick WHOIS, the transfer of the last remaining registries that do not have thick data and that would be Verisign and dot-com, dot-org, those early ones that are still thin registries.

So, keep on going there. Section D, transfer of data from the registrar or registry to the data escrow provider, also potentially illegal and the waiver policy, that is the only way that you could stop a transfer of data to an [inaudible] country, namely the United States, that has not worked well, although ICANN finally started to accommodate European registrars back about a year ago.

Transfer of data from the registrar registry to ICANN, there are policies – at least the policies regarding ICANN’s ability to access personal data need to be clarified. The publication of data that is [inaudible], of course, referred to as classic WHOIS, we have an [inaudible] detailed what folks are going to ... They’re using the term redact, but in fact the reverse is the data protection of view of what’s happening, what might we be allowed to publish.

You’ll note that note there, questions under F are gating for the determination of access. Well, they’re all gating. This is still a sloppy document and we commented on it umpteen times. If I may just make an editorial note here, one of the things we are going to have to watch on the EPDP is version control because what happens is we started a document as a Google doc, our edits were not on the documents itself. They were to be sent to Marika. I did a full edit of the document in Panama [inaudible]. There was a complaint that it was way too many comments. Well, I’m sorry. It wasn’t a good draft. What can I tell you?

Of course, you then have to ... Those are not in the documents. Then you have to check back and see whether they have taken any of your comments and it becomes ... The only way to manage this, in my view – and I had the same problem when I was working on the expert working

group – is to print them all out and have a gigantic binder with markers where you go back and forth because, I don't know about you guys, but I can't keep track of about six electronic versions on my laptop at once. It's just too hard. Maybe that's a factor of old age. Maybe you guys find it easy, you youngsters. But, let me tell you, I need to have them kind of spread around me volcano style so I can check each section, particularly when the order is changing.

That's just a note that we really need someone – it's a good [inaudible] if I can do a little advertisement on the side, Rafik. There are many jobs that do not require in-depth knowledge of WHOIS and many historical fights we've had over the various policies, but that would be really helpful. So, if you feel like getting your feet wet, we're going to I think, in the EPDP – I'm assuming I will be selected to be on it. That's why I feel I can speak on this. But, we will have a backroom, a strategy room, and if we could have some volunteers to help keep all the versions straight because I don't think this problem is going to go away. And if we split into subteams, and that is provided [inaudible] in the scope document, the problem gets even more insane.

Anyway, carrying right on, that's there and then [GE] data retention. Then the implacability of the data processing requirements, whatever that means. That [central] question on whether operators and registrars should be permitted or required to differentiate between registrants on a geographic basis, extremely difficult for the contracted parties to do that. It means keeping track of where their customers are. [We don't want that].

Secondly, the next one is legal and natural persons. We had a huge fight on the privacy proxy services accreditation working group on that very issue and we actually beat the IPC on that matter. And if you'll read the eco workbook that Thomas Rickert and his associates put together, he has a very good description of why registrants can't be doing that, and one should not that's also something that the data protection supervisors noted in their latest letter. In some jurisdictions, employees of a company would be entitled to data protection. So, figuring this out on a broader database is a real monk's game. So, we don't want to lose on that particular point, but it's still in there to be fought over yet again.

I inserted one of the risks associated with differentiation of registrant data. We managed to get that in there, but it's a very long [inaudible].

Next page, if you will, please, Maryam. The transfer of data to the emergency backend registry operator or [inaudible], there's a discussion of whether we need a policy on that or need to deal with it. Section J is the part that we've been fighting over the most and that is the matter of reasonable access. The interim specification says that registrars and registries have to provide reasonable access to third party, and of course all of the items in here we think should not be dealt with until after we have the first policy finalized, partly for various [inaudible] logistical reasons. We've never been able to sort out a WHOIS policy in this kind of aggressive timeline, which means done by Christmas in order that the council can deal with it and we can do the required consultation process.

However, they're trying to get a draft [inaudible] out with [inaudible] questions answered by Barcelona. So, this is, in my view, just hopeless. However, we soldier on.

So, under J, this gets into the detail of how access should be provided, and of course the business community, it wants WHOIS kept to the maximum and they are joined, of course, by all the other parties – the GAC, the SSAC, etc. Anybody who's in security doesn't want to [give this up].

So, we have not agreed even that there should be a community-wide model, because let's face it, things have changed. Registrars and registries are liable for the ... ICANN has declined to assert its controllership and if it did, if it said we are the sole controller and you guys are data processors, then the liability would be on ICANN.

On the other hand, if the registrars and registries are controllers, then they have the authority, and they only, to decide what data ought to be released in a framework or other. Then, if they are joint controllers, then the data commissioners have then probably joint controllership, but that could be changed depending on ICANN's policies. Then they share the liability and they have to sort out where that liability division lies.

So, really, to manage the items in J, we haven't even agreed that there should be a standard framework. And I'm going to keep fighting because I don't think a uniform framework complies with law.

Then, we get down right into the weeds, which we have said all the way through this, certainly in my big edited version and every time I've had

another crack at it since then, we have basically told them, look, you're getting into implementation here. Still working out who is going to determine who a legitimate person is to be granted access to the data. That is way down into the weeds. That's not policy.

Now, the non-contracted parties, the Business Constituency and the IPC, they basically, what they're driving for is we are intellectual property lawyers, we should get access to all the data. There's a distinction here that has been made in some rhetoric around this, but you might want to be aware of, and that is the difference between tiered and layered access. I believe in data processing or at least the data protection terms, the two are synonymous. However, they're being used in different ways. Layered being used in a way that implies once you qualify as, for instance, an intellectual property, you get access to all you can eat in this layer of data, things that might be required for a potential [inaudible].

In tiered access, it implies more discrimination at the granular level. So, I think those are terms that we'll ... Exactly, Rafik. Layered is buffet and tiered is a la carte. So, that's a distinction that we need to ... If they're going to insist on this kind of reworking of the language, well then fine, but we'll have to have it defined in the document.

A major problem, of course, is these terms have not been defined, so as we argue about the scope document, we argue about terms and we don't actually have a common understanding of what we're talking about, so slightly crazy making. Okay, next page, I guess.

You can all see the very tendentious assertions in here. Building on to K ... And again, this is a gating question. So, J is up there in the middle, and [Farzi] has pointed out that J should be somewhere else, but definitely not in the middle of these things. [Sowing] out ICANN's responsibility. I just described all of that. And the registrar's responsibility. I think that's clear enough.

Moving on to part four, the updates to other consensus policies. I have been pointing out that the number of WHOIS related policies that are actually compliant with GDPR is a short list. Now, they're bringing in these other ones, URS, [UDRP]. They need to be revised as well, but there are ones much closer to ICANN, or rather to WHOIS, such as the thick policy and the privacy proxy services policy that need to be revised.

Now, under privacy proxy services, [inaudible] I just want to point out to everybody that these are being priced out of the market. ICANN is insisting on a costing formula of total cost recovery, so while we won the battle on the policy argument on keeping privacy proxy services available for individuals – because countries that don't have data protection law are still going to need this. While we won that battle, now in the implementation review team, these things are being costed out of the market and the accreditations team is becoming so onerous that no registrar, particularly not the small ones, are going to be able to do it. They're just not going to offer the services.

So, not to be discouraging, but we need a big, strong fight on that. That IRT is kind of on hold at the moment while all this EPDP stuff is going on.

And the registrars are still fighting back, but fundamentally, they won't care once GDPR is implemented, the big ones at least.

So, moving right along to the next page, here we have the system for standardized access, and we've fought over every word, I can assure you, over the last week. Work [inaudible] shall begin once the gating questions above have been answered.

Again, my take was this thing has to be accepted by the community before we start working on something, but that approach lost, and the decision we have to make is do we go on record and vote against this document which is the best we could get [inaudible] principle, or do we go [inaudible] get along and accept it?

So, you can see the various detailed elements in this system for standardized access, some of which have already been referred to in the text above, which the mixing of the two does not reassure me that we're going to actually not work on this until we're done, and as late as Sunday I sent in comments saying, "Whoa, didn't notice that we're talking about subgroups." And if a subgroup is struck on day one of the EPDP to work on access, then we will have to send all our people to that subgroup because that's where the biggest fight is for the purpose of our stakeholders.

Okay, moving right along to the terms of ... I don't want to go over every little question here. Let me just do a little [inaudible]. Is everybody following me at this point? I'm getting a terrible echo. Whoever is unmuted, please mute again. Maybe we pause here for a few questions, just in case anybody has them. I realize I'm walking through deep stuff

that those of us have been fighting over [inaudible] understand, but perhaps others are not following. I don't see any hands up.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie. That was good, I think, interesting brief about several elements. I just want to make two comments before going to the queue. Regarding getting help and the idea of backroom, I think we have this discussion in policy committee and see how we can organize ourselves to coordinate, so we can get everyone involved at the different levels, so that something we will do for sure.

With regards about the voting, yes, we can vote again to make a point, but I think I'd rather see [inaudible] threshold for voting. I don't think we can really stop the process. But, I think what we can do really to be effective is not for the voting now. That's maybe, as you said, best what we can get. I mean, it's not better than ... It doesn't mean it's better. There are several flaws. But, I think it's really time to think more how what we can do in the EPDP when we get our representative selected and appointed is to really think how we can strategize and how we can [inaudible] for each items in the charter, because at the end, I can't expect that there will be a lot of discussion and interpretation of [inaudible] and each [inaudible] question. So, this is just I think the first battle. There are more and more when the EPDP will start.

So, just saying this and moving to the queue. We have Kathy and I think Stephanie who want to comment. Kathy, please go ahead.

KATHY: Can you hear me, Rafik? Can you hear me?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, go ahead.

KATHY: Okay. To everybody who is working on this, Stephanie and everyone else, what you're doing is incredible. Getting this edited to actually reflect what we need to legally do versus what everyone else wants to shove in and do for themselves and their communities, it's incredible. So, let me agree with you that access and J is way out of line. It shouldn't be here. And if it is here, it should be at the very, very end.

So, two questions, Stephanie. One is where is the section on what happens when things go wrong? Am I missing it? What happens if there's a breach? What happens if there's some kind of data dump? What happens if there's a sale of data by the registries, the registrars, or those receiving the data?

The other question I have is ICANN ... There's a section here about ICANN receiving the data and ICANN's WHOIS accuracy reporting system has become a horror. They take anonymous complaints, often harassing against registrants, and will cancel domain names if there's a comma missing. There's something strange going on there. So, can ICANN's accuracy reporting system become a backdoor for getting data if IPC members file two million accuracy complaints? I was wondering if anyone thought about that.

So, two questions. One is where is the section, not just on abuse of data, but when things actively go wrong, when third parties get the data or when someone does something they're not supposed to do. There are requirements under GDPR of course for that. Then, what about ICANN getting data that it really shouldn't be getting? Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Stephanie, can you respond to this?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes, sure. There is a section that we have been arguing over and I think I put in language that basically said what other laws, what other penalties, should be considered in addition [inaudible] prescribed by applicable law. Not quite sure where that is. But, needless to say, the IPC tried to fight us back on that. That would certainly deal with ICANN stepping out of line.

If ICANN steps out of line, it could be sued under the GDPR, but that's going to be really difficult and unwieldy, and frankly I don't think we're going to win a case on that. They're going to claim administrative error or something like that. They definitely will have to revise their procedure for going ahead on anonymous complaints, because that doesn't meet any of the fairness requirements under GDPR and I don't think ... That is down into the implementation weeds.

But, ICANN is definitely a user of the data and needs – all of those things should be set in policy as to what it does with respect to its own use of registrant data. Just a little note that that's something we're also

fighting over. What do we call it? Registrant data or registration data? It makes a big difference because some of the data is not collected from the registry. It is rather generated in the process of assigning a domain name. We fought about that in the RDS. It's an important distinction because we want registration data. Once the registration data is generated ...

This is like the old fight we had back in the 90s over whether a telephone number belonged to the individual or belonged to the telephone company that assigned it. The mere fact that the telephone company assigned it and owns the block of numbers doesn't mean that it isn't your personal information. The same thing that registrant versus registration. So, we're fighting about that.

But, I take your point. We will get down into those weeds as we go over the interim spec. I am planning to do a detailed analysis of the interim spec [inaudible] annotated version. But, I haven't done it yet. I mean, we've been just solid working on this, so I got to get that done before we actually start EPDP so that I can at least understand in my own brain how much they've messed up.

The point I raised my hand on, regarding the vote, I can see the argument that Rafik is making, that we should just get the vote out and go along. I actually disagree. I think it's important at this point in the proceedings because Keith has sent out a letter saying, well, a small team has all agreed. Actually, no. I've been objecting to J nonstop since the [blasted] thing was put in there and I am overruled.

So, it's not like we conceded the point. And I don't agree I've been overruled. This is not rough consensus. Welcome to the world we're going to face on the EPDP, if we don't at least put a marker in and vote against section J. I understand we're not going to win that vote unless the registries break ranks and vote with us. And they will be [inaudible] difficult position because, quite frankly, they can live with the interim spec I suspect, and if this thing doesn't come out the other end, let's be clear, the interim policy falls away and the registrars get back to doing whatever their lawyers tell them to do. That works in their favor.

So, I don't think that they have as many dogs in the game as the commercial guys do. I think it's symbolically important. Otherwise, every time people will refer to this scope and say, "Well, you agreed to this." No, we didn't agree. We think it's legally wrong and you can wait until we're proven right in court or you can at least note on the record that we don't agree and this is legally incorrect.

I say that quite assuredly. There are things in here that are still legally incorrect, and yet we're charging ahead as if it were okay. If it were going to hold things up, but I've counted the votes just like everybody else has and we can't win on this unless, as I say, registries and registrars break rank and vote with us.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Just to clarify what I said about the voting is that I made that point because in relation to the last policy call we had two weeks ago and it was kind of understanding at the time that votes can [inaudible] the approval. I double check it in the bylaws for the [inaudible] for the

EPDP. The [inaudible] that either the super majority in each house or it can be a simple majority in one house and three-quarters in the other house. So, we can be overruled. That's why I wanted to highlight that, just for people to be aware that we may not be able to defeat. We can try, but we might not [inaudible]. That's why I want to highlight it as [inaudible] voting.

But, if people feel that we need to vote against at least to make a point, I see no problem. I see that can make sense and that will be on the record, but I don't think that [inaudible] we need to think already about what we should do in EPDP. I think, or I believe, that you already made the one point, that we need to have kind of an updated analysis of the temporary spec, so people already be aware what's there and what are the implications of [inaudible].

But, that's a good question, how the registrants and registries will vote [inaudible] remain really confused about what they were doing on the whole drafting.

Is it an old or new hand?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Sorry, old hand.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. So, thanks again, Stephanie. That's a really clear briefing. It's not an easy document. There are a lot of details and I advise everyone to read it anyway, particularly before the council meeting. But, I think if

there is any question regarding the scope part or any comment, something you want to clarify, since we had Stephanie with us?

Okay, I don't see any other questions. So, we have the presentation about the scope and composition. The other section of the charter, I don't think they are controversial. Several of them are just standard language. I don't know if anyone from the drafting team has anything to share. I don't recall any specific issue with that. So, just want to be sure here that we have a clear understanding about the charter as a whole or if people have any question or comment that you want to add, this would be a good time to do so. As soon as [inaudible] two days we have to vote for or against this charter. Yes, Kathy, please go ahead.

KATHY:

Thanks, Rafik. Looking back at section J, as well as the rest of it, it raises the question of legal advice. What kind of legal advice is going to be available to this EPDP? A lot of the skills for negotiating the temporary specification, the rule, are one thing. Section J is a whole different set of access. It's a whole different set of expertise that very few people at ICANN will have at this point in time. So, where is the money and the provision for independent legal counsel? Not ICANN legal counsel, independent legal counsel? Because ICANN now has a vested interest in this process. Again, how can we shove section J as far down the path as possible or into a different EPDP? Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Kathy. With regards to the legal counsel, independent one, I do believe that [inaudible] section. I don't have it handy now, but I think

we can share that document. Maryam, can you please share the other document? So, we have that part, but I think that was requested several times that we have an independent legal counsel that we can – I mean, the EPDP team can use, depending I think that there is consensus on that.

So, why there is the staff liaison, two staff liaisons, one from [GDP] and one from the legal counsel. The EPDP team should have its own independent resource, so they don't need to count on that counsel. I hope that's maybe clarified. I can try here to find that part, just to be sure about the text. [inaudible] and that will depend if the ICANN board will put the required budget for all what we ask it. So, this is one the recommended [working papers] and resource [inaudible] to be available. Yes, external legal counsel advice to be used when [inaudible] necessary and budget-wise [inaudible] compliance of the [inaudible] policy recommendation deliverable with GDPR. External legal counsel advice should only be sought if adequate support cannot [inaudible] existing resources, as well as data protection authority guidance that is already available. The decision to request external advice should be approved by the EPDP team, the leadership.

And also, there is something maybe that can be useful and we should really push for it is to have external expert and advisor as data protection GDPR expert. So, this is the kind of thing we need to have so we can strengthen our argument with the EPDP team.

So, Kathy, does this respond to your question?

KATHY: Yes, it does. Thanks, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. Sorry, I'm missing [inaudible] Adobe Connect. Maybe there are some questions or comments. Again, double checking if there is any question or comment on [inaudible] want to make really good time for that.

Okay. Stephanie, I believe that you will need to leave us in a few minutes, so maybe before that, if you want to add something or you want to make any further comment, it's a good time for that.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks, Rafik. As I say, I think we need the document on the interim spec to be done, so I'm going to focus on that, because for those who are maybe not as up on data protection law – not that I'm a lawyer. Remember, there's always caveats. Still, I don't see us getting independent legal advice anytime soon and I'm not sure that the registrars and registries care enough to spend ICANN money on outside legal counsel. So, I think we need that document and we need to discuss it as a group, so that we're all on the same page because we will be fighting in detail over this stuff. That's my immediate focus. Happy to answer any questions. I think the sooner we get a group of volunteers focused on this in the backroom to help out whoever is selected for the EPDP and the backup people – remember, I think we need a total of nine there. Six regular members and three backup. And we did fight pretty hard to keep those, so I hope we fill them.

There was some discussion earlier among the counselors about whether 30 hours a week is a realistic amount of time. I'm very sad to say that I think it is. I'm the one who came up with that. I have it on a spreadsheet because I have been working on WHOIS. And if you have been reading all the documents and you go over all the comments and you follow the e-mail traffic, which you have to because things move in e-mail traffic, and you discuss with your own constituency and stakeholder group, well you're up to 30 hours pretty quick. So, division of labor will help us reduce that amount and very thorough organization. I realize if you've got a day job, if you've got kids, if you've got a family life, you don't have 30 hours, let's face it. And I frankly don't really want to spend 30 hours a week on this for the next – on this alone, because I've still got other groups that I'm on and they [inaudible]. So, we need to cut that down to a manageable size, and so that takes organization and willing hands. I'm sure it can be done.

We often work in a kind of haphazard manner because we're a bunch of volunteers but we need leadership and we need management of tasks and we need somebody keeping track. There's all kinds of roles for people who don't necessarily know much about WHOIS, so feel free. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

[inaudible] Stephanie for this transition because [inaudible] to make some [inaudible] this. We have to do this division of labor and to use the different kinds of resources. I think we [inaudible] policy committee to support the work. We will do the logistics to coordinate the calls, to have a mailing list and so on, and [inaudible] any other channels that

can be helpful for the rules appointed to the EPDP team. So, also, how we can include everyone and to see what are the interests of what kind of volunteering they want to do. That's something that is on our to-do list and hopefully we can share more information in coming days.

I think we can expect that the first meeting for EPDP team will be in two weeks [inaudible], so we have the time to prepare and organize ourselves and hopefully we can share more details and information in coming days.

Also, I want to ... I sent a reminder today, at least my time earlier today, regarding the call for volunteers to EPDP team. So, I encourage those who feel that they are satisfying requirements and having the experience and they want to apply, the more we have candidates – I mean, that we help us, as the policy committee, to make selection. Any kind of help is welcomed. It's not [inaudible] to have to be appointed to the EPDP team. As we said, there is this idea of backup and support and doing many kinds of activities. I think, if there is no objection, we will extend by 24 hours the call, so to open opportunity for more people to apply since we are doing all this really short timeframe, so we are trying to put all chances in our side for [inaudible].

So, I wanted to make those points and we will organize ourselves and try to coordinate, which will be kind of a really busy six months. I think we can achieve a lot if we are doing it as a team and working together.

Okay, that's it. I think we almost spent one hour on the EPDP, so if there is no other question or comment we can move back to the rest of the

agenda. I want to thank Stephanie again for the briefing and responding to all comments and questions. Thanks, Stephanie.

Okay, let's move back to the agenda. Let's do the GNSO Council agenda, please. As usual, we will keep all the administrative part of the agenda, just like an update, [inaudible], and so on. There is nothing in the consent agenda. But the first item of substance and for [inaudible] related to [inaudible] NGO, access to privacy proxy protection mechanisms.

So, we talked before about this working group because there was a motion from the GNSO Council in its last meeting asking the working group to deliver its final report in July for council consideration. So, we [inaudible] that after some hiccup, but we get this report. But, this motion is not really about approval yet of the report and the recommendation because one question is how the council will develop a possible path for [inaudible] inconsistency between the GAC advice and the [inaudible].

The whole thing about this working group is really that this kind of concern raised by the GAC before. There they put I think in several of the GAC advice regarding this topic. To be honest, I didn't check yet the report and I don't think anyone within NCSG did yet, but if someone did it, it would be helpful if he can give us an update.

So, I think we need time to review those recommendations. I'm not expecting that they are really responding to what IGO and NGO are asking for, so we have to think how we will deal with the GAC and likely the world on this matter. So, I'm not really knowledgeable about this

working group in terms of discussion, and I don't recall who was there. I think in the beginning it was Kathy. I'm not sure if you continued to be involved with that or who. Because it took more than four years, and so many people kind of dropped from that working group and this is one of the main issues with this [inaudible] consensus about the recommendation. I see, Kathy, you are in the queue already. Please, go ahead.

KATHY:

Yeah. I did drop out about two years ago because this was moving ... It was moving very, very slowly, so I was doing much more work on the rights protection mechanism. But, this is a really complicated problem, with one person who really wanted to kill the working group and I think we have to ... It's too bad because a lot of good work went into this working group. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Kathy. I think [inaudible] time to go through the report and so on. If it's checking them often, I think it's not about approving the report for now. We have around one month in the next meeting in August to make an opinion about it. So, I would really ask any councilor to make effort to go through it. We need to be careful because we are not involved in this EPDP and we don't have people there, so we need to pay more attention. Checking [inaudible] motion, I don't see that we are approving the recommendation. This is the whole question how to deal with GAC advice and this maybe can raise concern for us in terms of how much the GAC advice should have impact on the

recommendation coming from GNSO PDP process. Any question or comment on this one? I don't see any question or comment. I know that it's straightforward.

Okay, so maybe we can move to the next agenda item, item number five, since we already [inaudible] the EPDP. I think we have more clarity about the charter. For the vote, I think we can [inaudible] that in the next two days, just to be sure how we should vote as a group to avoid any kind of, let's say, [inaudible] or not we should do it as a group and we need to make an opinion about that.

So, the next agenda item is number six, which is the short and long-term opinion to address the timeline of [inaudible] review and organizational review. So, this is two public comments regarding the timeline for [inaudible]. There is one, just to make changes, related to the ATRT-3 and RDS, but I think RDS was dropped. The review team is already in the middle of its work. The other document is suggesting that we don't have more than one specific review and one organizational review at the same time, just to avoid to have so many in one year.

We have [inaudible] NCSG two drafts that were made by Farzaneh and they are under discussion and they're under review, so if you want to make comments, you can find the link in the mailing list.

But, here, this item, if the council will draft its own comment for [inaudible] public consultation. I don't think we have any draft yet, so what we can expect is just to get an update from the [inaudible] taking the lead to work on the draft comment. Any questions? Okay, I don't see any.

I think, Farzaneh, you are only in listen mode, so I cannot ask you about ... Oh, she's not here. I cannot ask her about our own public comment. Okay, so we can move to the next agenda item, which is about consideration of CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 final report.

That cross-community working group finalized its work and delivered the report to the [inaudible] organization. So, we will get an update here I think from the co-chair and also the GNSO appointed members to give a briefing about [inaudible] the different recommendations in this report. So, the council can make an opinion about the report ending for approval maybe in the next meeting, if possible. I'm not sure how many of you are familiar with the recommendation of the report. We have several of our members that led different subgroups [inaudible], so the group, the stakeholder group, influenced a lot the outcome of this cross-community working group.

From our previous public comment response, we are supporting ... I mean, we have many some concerns and some recommendations, but in general we are supporting the report of the CCWG on Accountability. Any question or comment? I don't see any questions. It should be okay, just an update and preparing for the vote in the next meeting. I don't see any concern.

The next agenda item is a council discussion regarding the GNSO policy development process 3.0. [inaudible] the GNSO Council had its strategical meeting in the beginning of this year and we discussed a lot about [inaudible] issues with PDP and we had data from the staff from their perspective what they see as a problem. So, we initiated kind of consultation in San Juan meeting [inaudible] Maureen in the usual

GNSO working session to get input about those kinds of issues and try to foresee what is the path forward and what we can do as a council and community to make PDP more effective and efficient.

The outcome was a report or paper summarizing [inaudible] idea for improvement based on what we got as input in that time. We've had this now document for a month, four weeks, a month now. But, unfortunately, because the focus on the EPDP, we didn't have so much input except from the Business Constituency. The other groups didn't share any input [inaudible] while we tried to do that.

So, it was agreed in the Panama meeting to get an extension until mid-August [inaudible] all stakeholder groups and constituencies to share their input on the paper. So, this is one on how to do this and we will try to make input because this kind of can be ... It's an effort we started and we should not drop it, even if we have now the EPDP [inaudible] as a manager of policy to ensure that PDP delivers and within the timeline and within the [inaudible] and resources and so on.

So, this agenda item is really kind of trying to ... It's more like to prepare for the next steps and how we can use the input we received, so we are expecting that [inaudible] share that input [inaudible] ourselves and the council will discuss about the next steps. So, we started this effort and we need to get feedback.

We tried to share later the paper for information and I think [inaudible] aspects for people to see what are the [inaudible]. You can see the link of the data already in the agenda if you want to read it.

Just to add a bit. No worry. I have all this on my own to-do list and I will chase people that we can feedback. So, no worry about that. Okay, any questions or comments? Okay, thank you. It would be helpful, if you have any questions. I'm not sure if you love or like my voice, but I would appreciate if you have any question or comment. I'm trying to respond to them. Okay, seeing none, we can move to the next agenda item.

Council discussion regarding starting the standing selection committee to [inaudible] GNSO appointment on the accountability and transparency review team. So, usually, the appointment or selection [inaudible] review team from GNSO is [inaudible] by the council to this standing selection committee. Indeed, [inaudible] while ago, December 2017, to appoint – to make at least a recommendation for representative [inaudible] to the ATRT-3.

So, we have three candidates that they will be [inaudible]. I mean, they have [inaudible]. The other four, we [inaudible] and it depends on a discussion between the SO and AC leaders, so they can vote from each group. We've got a situation here [inaudible]. One of the three was Stephan Van Gelder and he passed away in March. So, we have here a situation that we may need to replace him.

Also, since this was – I mean, the appointment was made quite a while ago, we need to confirm that those on the list are still available and ready. So, that's why we are asking here the standing selection committee to do that work. We have to do that and with the expectation that this review team, the Accountability and Transparency, will start as soon as possible because it's quite important in terms of [inaudible] regardless of the previous public comment we got about

regarding adjusting the timeline. So, this is the kind of task to be given to the [inaudible].

As far as [inaudible] that list of seven, one of the top three is Wolfgang Kleinwächter who is from NCSG. Then we have Tatiana and Martin. So, there is possibility we can get more from NCSG, so it's something to ... So, the [inaudible] will work on the confirmation. I know that Tatiana is here. Yes. I know that maybe you ... Yes. You withdraw your candidacy. Yes, Ayden. That's the point is to really reconfirm that who is selected will want to continue and [inaudible] case because it was a really long time ago and we see how many things happen. It's not just for Stephan Van Gelder, for example. I think Brian Cote left his job as the CEO of PIR, so the question is, is he still available for this review team or not? So, [inaudible] the council will give to the standing selection committee to work on. Yes, [inaudible] in the queue. I think he has a chance to be in the top three. Any questions or comments on this? I hope I was enough clear and not boring. I see no comment or question. [inaudible] when we do appointment, I mean [inaudible] time. That's why we have to be [inaudible] on what we are doing in ICANN and does this make sense. Appointment for starting a review team takes forever to be initiated.

So, yes, [inaudible] the rest is just any other business is just ICANN 63 planning. So, just starting the planning already for the next meeting that's in Barcelona, so we get just an update for what's going on [inaudible]. I think even for NCSG starting planning for its own session there. Also proposed updates with the consensus policy implementation framework and post-recommendation consensus policy review framework. That really was in the agenda. It was postponed many times. We go to work at the council at some level. We cannot just keep

postponing it. This is kind of framework proposal [inaudible] in terms of implementation and post-implementation and how we can review what was implemented as consensus policy and so on.

Okay, I don't think there is much more to say about the agenda. That's it. Again, if there is any question or comment, please do so.

So, let's go back to the NCSG agenda. So, it's usually this agenda item is about giving the policy update, starting first with the public comment and to remind what we have as open public comment and to see if [inaudible] if there is anyone who wants to volunteer to join the drafting team or to [inaudible] public comment that doesn't have any penholder.

If so, what we have first is the open data initiative, data set, and [inaudible]. We have kind of quite large drafting team. I think five or six. Relatively large. And they are making steady progress. They have several calls and they are working and going through the list of ... I mean, the spreadsheet that was shared in the public comment. They did the [inaudible]. So, they are making progress. I think that we share their draft hopefully by this Wednesday, the 18th of July. So, this is one in good shape, I think.

Second, the proposal [inaudible]. I think we had only one or two persons working on this. I tried to get an update. Unfortunately, I couldn't get any [inaudible]. So, this one public comment we have to be careful about. I'm not sure we have any progress or not, but I keep [inaudible] something. I am monitoring this one and we have a really short time to get something done on this one, just ten days.

The third is the draft proposal for the new policy program approach. There is also quite large, relatively large, group working on this draft. I think they have some discussion about what should ... I mean, because what's happened, there are several ideas and comments, so now it's more how they need to get [inaudible] to get one to share the draft. So, there is still discussion on this and I will check with the group again by when they can share their draft with the membership, since that should be done within the next ten days.

The two next, the short-term auction and the long-term auction. We got the draft shared on the mailing list last week. They were drafted by [inaudible]. One of them still needs some work. It's the long-term option. But, I think the short-term is almost done and just needs people to comment their thoughts.

The other one, the initial report on the protection for certain red cross names and [inaudible] gTLD. I think we got two or three people from the policy committee that will be led by Farzaneh, and the same for the independent review process implementation oversight that also will be led by Farzaneh. So, this is kind of [inaudible]. But, at least for now we get volunteers to work on them and I am also [inaudible] public comment.

The last one is initial report on the new gTLD subsequent procedure policy development process. That one is quite heavy. I'd say a big report and a lot of recommendations and questions. So, we get two volunteers here. It's [inaudible]. Then we start working within this week having kind of [inaudible]. I understand that Robin and Kathy are offering their help, support for them, if they need any help. Just a head's up. We'll

have a webinar about the subsequent procedure report in early August, so we are organizing that. The idea is to have a webinar, so we can go through the report and give an update, so we share the highlights, recommendations, and questions. So, this one is quite important and we need more people to join, to help, because there are many things to cover, so we can share the [inaudible] the work here. So, if someone wants to volunteer or something, please let me know and I can put you in touch with the drafting team.

So, that was the update about the current status of the [inaudible] comments. As [inaudible], we have eight comments that we need to respond. That's what we get and that's what we will [inaudible]. So, even if we get the PDP now [inaudible] still have to do the other policy work. So, again, if someone wants to volunteer or to help, please let me know here or just send me an e-mail and I will put you in touch with the drafting team for [inaudible] public comment. Kathy, please go ahead.

KATHY:

Hi, Rafik. I wanted to put in a plug. As you said, I'm going to be part of the subsequent procedures group and I wanted to put in a plug. We need lots of people and it's actually a really exciting ... It's a really exciting comment period. We're creating the next round and possibly many next rounds of new gTLDs. This is something that we were really excited about. NCSG was creating a first round of new gTLDs. It took a long time to create them. So, there were five subteams of the Subsequent Procedure Working Group. They call came back. And this is a really strange interim report. They didn't just come back with policy

recommendations. They came back, in some cases, with lots and lots of questions. It's kind of a pre-policy recommendation.

So, if you have any kind of interest in new gTLDs, there's got to be some subteam that's looking at something you're interested in. We could use lots of help in this, but also, it's going to be a fun process. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Kathy. There are a lot of things to do there. There are some areas where people can help, like for example, I think for the applicant support, the working group has put more question than recommendation and this is one of the topics, I think it was discussed just a few days ago on our NCSG list. I just tried to highlight [inaudible] the 14th if you want to make changes now. Again, just making this call if anyone wants to help, wants to join, just reach me so I can put you ... I mean, just I'm trying here to coordinate, not to [inaudible], to ensure that we have a group of people working on each public comment and they can organize themselves. So, [inaudible] put you in touch and also [inaudible] volunteer on our Wiki page, so at least we can get it created later about the work done. It's quite fun. It's a lot of fun. Otherwise, we won't be here. Again, just making this [inaudible] if you want to help. Any comments or questions on this? I don't see any.

So, as we [inaudible] the public comment, you'll get the kind of ... I mean, you heard the status of several of them. What remains is that there is possibly [inaudible] any briefing or update from the different workings groups. I think, for example, there is not so much to say about the RDS since it's [inaudible]. I think we still have rights protection

working group and subsequent procedure committee that's in the new gTLD subsequent procedure. They already delivered their initial report for work track one [through four]. But, they are still working on the work track five. That will come later. So, there's still opportunity for [inaudible] the different working groups if they want to hear any update or just to let us know there is something going on that you should be aware of. This is good opportunity to do so. Yes, Kathy, please go ahead.

KATHY:

Hi, Rafik. Me again. So, the rights protection mechanism working group is still deep in its data dive of the uniform rapid suspension. We've been going through and looking at this new gTLD rights protection mechanism, the URS. It's an ultra-fast, ultra-quick, ultra-cheap version. Not of the UDRP, but of dispute resolution. So, we're trying to see how it's different from the UDRP and whether it should remain separate and what we should do with it and whether it should be fixed or not.

So, a lot of interesting things going forward. For one thing, we found that notices aren't going out in local languages, even though they're supposed to. So, with new gTLDs, with IDNs (Internationalized Domain Names), of course you need local languages. Hopefully, we can fix some of this stuff. That's where we are now and then we'll be returning in the early fall – late summer, early fall – to the trademark clearinghouse issues. So, if anyone is interested, they should contact me. We've got lots of people on the list now in this call and also on the list who are members of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. So, if you want to come in, it's not too late to join.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Kathy, for this update, and yes [inaudible]. There's always time for people to join. I do believe we have now a good group of I won't say newcomers. They're not newcomers anymore. It seems they are enjoying being in the [inaudible] working group, which is quite positive.

So, just maybe thinking about opportunity here to ask you, Kathy, what is the timeline for [inaudible] issue report? I want to know in terms of for us to plan when it's coming and when we have to comment a public comment.

KATHY: That's a good question. I think it's going to be early 2019. I think we'll be working on it until the end of the fall. I don't have the timeframe in front of me, but I think it comes out in the first quarter of next year. And our interim report will probably be [inaudible].

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Kathy. I think that is good for us because it should be just after the EPDP, so we should not have too much work in that time, so we can refocus our attention to respond to that public comment. So, I think that's positive. Kathy, I see an old or new hand?

KATHY: Old hand.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thank you. Any question or comment on this? Hearing none. In terms of cross-community working group, we saw the one on accountability really finishing its work. So, I think the only cross-community working group is the one on auction proceeds. I think they are working on the report. They are expecting to deliver a recommendation by Barcelona meeting, but I'm not sure. I'm kind of guessing because they were supposed to have a cross-community session in Panama and then they decided at the end to just have a face-to-face meeting or working session. If someone in that working group can give some update or any recommendation, that would be helpful.

In terms of review team, for now, we have only the RDS2 Review Team and I think we have Stephanie there. For the SSR2, they are supposed to have resumed their work, but they're just trying to kind of fix the [server] issue they had before, so we should hear from them maybe in the coming month. But, that's what we have as current review teams.

So, I just put here I want to highlight about the cross-community working group and auction proceeds and review teams. If there is any update or something to share, I don't want to put you, Stephanie, on the spot, but if you have anything to share even just in the chat, that will be really helpful.

I think that's it in terms of working groups. Oh, Stephanie, yes.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

What were you looking for in terms of an update?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

I asked about two things. One about cross-community working group and auction proceeds. I think that's the only cross-community working group that is operating now. I'm not sure about the one on Internet governance. That's a different [beast]. Also, I was asking a question about the RDS review team because I think that's the only review team ongoing now.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Right. With respect to the auction proceeds, I have not been able to attend the meetings lately, so I think I'm going to have to step off that group, assuming that I am accepted to work on the EPDP. It's just too much work at the moment. The auction proceeds is going very slowly, but I've had conflicts with the calls. I think they're about to release some kind of an interim report, but I'm really not up to date and I have no time at the moment.

On the WHOIS Review Team, we are chugging along. A lot of the subgroups have also been too busy to produce their subgroup report. I've actually done mine on anything new. In particular, the security team has been slow and several others. If you go to the WHOIS Review Team website, you will see a very handy little chart of what's done, what's not done, what has been shared with the working group and what hasn't.

We are heading to Brussels for yet another wretched face-to-face meeting for two days on July 26th and 27th. The goal is to have a draft interim report by then. I believe that Alan is thinking of pushing that timeline further back, but we certainly hope to have a draft out for public comment by Barcelona. Again, he's trying to push for a high-

interest session at Barcelona on this. Quite frankly, I don't believe it's high interest anymore, if it ever were high interest. So, I hope he doesn't get it because, personally, there's a lot of things we need to work on on the EPDP that are a lot more high interest than this.

So, that's it in a nutshell. I will, of course, as soon as we have a draft, send it to the policy committee for review, just so that you know what's in there. Again, I haven't been able to push everything back because Volker and I are seriously outnumbered on this working group by folks who want WHOIS to continue as it is and become more accurate. So, that's a five-minute summary.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie. I think that's quite perfect because you give a sense by when we will have the report so we can plan for that. So, if it's happening by Barcelona meeting, then coincidentally probably with the same time with I think the first deliverable of the EPDP, so we know that we have some workload to cover that. Anyway, having this helps in terms of planning and knowing what's coming. Thanks, again, Stephanie. I'll just check here if anyone has any question or comment. I see none. [inaudible], can you please ... I think you are in Adobe Connect.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

No. I'm actually using a mobile phone to connect to the call.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Please, let me just finish, so I can go to the next agenda item and I can give you the floor.

So, I think we are done about updates in terms of policy, but if still people have any question or comment, you can ask anytime on the mailing list or [inaudible].

We are moving to the next agenda item, which is just any other business. This is an opportunity to put any kind of agenda item or question or any update, anyone wants to suggest. I see [inaudible], since you are not in the Adobe Connect, you wanted to intervene here. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks very much. Basically, my comment was around volunteers who can participate in the cross-community working group on auction proceeds. I think that if we have an interest in participating in these discussions, [inaudible] provide some updates to the wider community. But, I think links or leads would help in this [page] in order for the [inaudible] to start getting involved [inaudible] of this particular cross-community working group because during ICANN 62, we never actually got opportunity to attend these types of meetings. That's just [inaudible]. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. Regarding the cross-community working group on auction proceeds, my understanding is that's an open working group. So, if a member of the NCSG committee wants to join or participate, I think

they can do that. So, we just heard about [inaudible] they are working on, but I think it's still open for participation and you can join anytime. I think that's open and probably maybe Stephanie can [inaudible] for us. So, I think [inaudible] participating, they can give you some guidance about the participation there and try to catch up quickly.

So, we move to any other business section. If someone wants to suggest any topic for discussion or a question, that's a good opportunity to do so. I don't see any. We have [inaudible] and Martin unmuted. I'm not sure if they want to [inaudible]. Martin?

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Yes. Just a quick note on the emoji issue. We [inaudible] draft [inaudible] to be shared with the council. It's just [inaudible] on the review, which is to support the recommendations of Patrik Falstrom.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I think that you are talking about the team from the GNSO to respond to the emoji resolution from the board. [inaudible] for that. Okay. I'm not sure if Peter wanted to intervene here or just is unmuted. Yes, Peter?

PETER: Sorry. It's a mistake. Sorry.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. If you are trying to speak, we cannot hear you. It's quite low. So, guys, we have 30 minutes left on the call. I think we covered the whole

council agenda. We also tried to get as much as possible update on policy. I don't see any proposal for any other business agenda item. I don't want to keep you more on the call and I'll leave you to do something else. I think we can adjourn the call for today, but before, I want to thank everyone for joining and making effort to listen. I know that's not always clear and maybe we have to do better job in trying to expand those topics, but again, thanks for joining, attending this call. See you soon and bye-bye!

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everyone, for attending the call. Have a good day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]