
RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, so let's start the call and start the recording.

MARIA OTANES: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the monthly NCSG policy call on Monday, 17th December, 2018 at 12:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call and attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. On the audio bridge, we have Amir Qayyum. If there's anyone else on the audio bridge only, could you please let yourself be known now?

Thank you. Hearing no further names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I turn it over to the chair of the NCSG Policy Committee, Rafik Dammak. Rafik, please go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Maria. Thanks for everyone for joining our NCSG policy call. As a reminder, it's monthly call that we have prior to the GNSO council meeting, and [that is for us] to have that opportunity for us to discuss GNSO council agenda and to help our representative there to get feedback from the membership, and also to have that opportunity to [discuss any] policy topic or anything relevant to us. So we have those two goals that we try to achieve, and this will be the last call for this year, so the next will be in January.

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.

What we do first – and you can see the agenda, I think you can move it. We'll start with the council agenda, we'll try to go through it quickly, but then we will move to the main part of our call. We're trying to get several updates from different policy efforts and discussion, and end up with any other topic that we should cover or discuss.

Let's start with the GNSO agenda. Okay, I think you can move the agenda. Even it looks long, we can go through it fairly quickly. Usually, the council starts with several administrative matters such as update of statements of interest, review of the agenda and so on. That's not really something we should worry about. That's basically just to be sure that things are done.

But then what we usually go with first is to review the project list and action item list, just maybe for the [council.] I think for this GNSO council meeting, we'll try to make that part to take less time than usual, because we find that sometimes we spend too much time there when we should really spend it instead on substantive issues. But I advise you to go to the project list where you can find all the GNSO activities, working groups and committees, and you can see there the status of those different efforts. You can see also in which phase the several policy development processes are.

Okay. After that, after reviewing the project list and the action items, we go to the consent agenda. As you can understand from the consent agenda is just the topic or motion that we can hold without really needing any discussion, but there is a possibility that the councilors ask to take one of the items and to put it in the main agenda. It happens sometimes, and in fact it happened in the last time with regard to the

motion to adopt the GNSO council response to the GAC communique, because representative from the contracted parties – I think, to be specific, the registrar, they wanted to make amendment. I think the registry, sorry. [My mistake,] the registries.

They wanted to make an amendment to the GNSO response and to have a discussion. So that's why we discussed it, we spent some time on that motion, and it was deferred to this meeting to give an opportunity to the council to [inaudible] amendment and also to vote in the motion without any issue. So now it's again in the consent agenda. I don't expect any problem and should be voted without any issue.

The second motion or vote is to approve the nomination for representative from GNSO to serve as the ICANN fellowship program mentor. Sorry, if you're not speaking, please mute yourself, because that creates an echo and noise for the call.

Okay. So the second motion is – okay, sorry, I think someone is using audio and Adobe Connect at the same time. Please mute yourself. That's creating an echo for everyone. Maria, can you please help? Okay. Seems okay now.

So the second motion is to approve the nomination of representative from GNSO to serve as ICANN fellowship program mentor. As you can see, there is no name yet because the committee which was tasked to make the selection is going to make decision today, I think in a few hours. The committee is the Standing Selection Committee, and when they're finished, then we send the name to the GNSO council.

So in terms of process, just to explain here, we have the deadline for the submission of motion, which should be ten days before the council meeting, and so we can usually – the practice is that we submit a motion as a placeholder, and we can leave some placeholder in the motion to be filled later on when we have the details. And this is the case now.

So I think for this one, as the council [really delegate] the selection work to this committee, we just kind of approve the selection. I don't think there should be any problem here. My understanding, there was maybe some NCSG member who applied, so [you can see who would be] selected, and the GNSO council just will approve this motion, unless we find an issue, but I don't see any.

Okay. Sorry, so we covered two motions. Any question here, any comment? Okay, seeing none. So the next item is not a vote, but just a kind of confirmation. It's the confirmation of Heather Forrest to serve as the GNSO representative to the ICANN Fellowship Program Selection Committee for the remainder of the two-year term. This was asked in the GNSO council list if there was any objection to have Heather Forrest, who is a former GNSO chair, to continue in that role of representative to the Fellowship Selection Committee. She was there in interim phases, and it was decided that it makes sense that she would continue to represent the GNSO there since she already started participating in the process.

Okay. The last item is the confirmation of the leadership for the GNSO Standing Selection Committee for the chair and the vice chair to the council. We acknowledge the appointment or the selection by the

members of this committee, so again, there [shouldn't be any] problem. And I think we have one NCSG member, who is Poncelet as a vice chair here, so that's, I think, good.

Okay. This is the consent agenda. As you can see, there is nothing controversial, just kind of straightforward approval or confirmation just to kind of – yeah, let's say it is kind of formality here. Okay, any question or comment? Or if you want to understand more about the process or the procedure.

Okay, I see none, so we can move to the next agenda item, and we don't have that much [inaudible] in fact, but there are several topics for discussion, and the first one will be regarding the IGO/INGO access to curative rights protection mechanism.

This is to give some mechanism to the international governmental and nongovernmental organization, [and for that was] working group or PDP working group that deliberated for, I think, four years to come up with the recommendation, and the working group submitted in last August, I think, or last July. It's final report and recommendation for the GNSO council approval or [inaudible] as the process [deem it.]

But the thing here which is quite unusual is that the working group has some issues in terms of participation, but also with regard that there was an appeal against the co-chairs. It's not necessarily related to that, but [kind of] there are some issues, and also that interested party here, who are the intergovernmental organizations and nongovernmental organizations, were not really happy with some of the recommendations, and they expressed that through some letters, I

think, to the board, but also through the GAC where some of those organizations, I think, are observers.

So knowing that this kind of concern and issue, the council tried to take more time to consider those recommendations, in particular from the standpoint of process and procedure, because the GNSO council initiate the policy development process, and managing the process, but the council tried to not get into the recommendation themselves. When they come for consideration or approval, we try to not get into that. We care about the process to ensure that it was done appropriately.

But [we are here in the case] that we know that the GAC is not happy with the recommendation, and there was a letter in Barcelona meeting just prior to the GNSO council meeting from the GAC asking that the GNSO council and the GAC has kind of dialog, facilitated dialog, and I think one of the main facilitated dialog should be facilitated by the board here [in the way] that we discuss the recommendation.

So in the last meeting, we discussed again this issue, but what we tried is the GNSO council leadership with the staff, the ICANN or GNSO policy staff is to come up with several options, and I think you can find a link here to the summary paper in the agenda. [Several options, I think it's not mistaken,] five or six, and trying to see what are the options.

Either, for example, we just accept or approve as it is the recommendation, or we should maybe send back some of the recommendation to the working group, or sending them maybe to another working group, or not approving them. There are different options, and we have to discuss what can the possible outcome here.

So the idea here for this meeting is really to get the council to, if I can say it, make its mind regarding this topic, and to which approach we should follow. So there is expectation that the GNSO council leadership, the chair and the vice chair to come up with a proposal or framework to move forward, because we should really make decision as soon as possible. This topic is since August, and now it's already December, and I don't think it's really good in any aspect to have this issue on hold for [a while.] We need to make a decision and to move forward.

So I think there is pressure, let's say, to have this facilitated dialog with the GAC. I don't think it's an issue in itself, but I think from the perspective of procedure and process, we need to be careful that it should not be a kind of negotiation.

Right, I think the GNSO council – and this is really for all councilors, they have to pay attention to go through all the material we have, but also try to investigate like the communication we got from the different parties to see the different position and to make an educated opinion on the matter.

So if I can see from my perspective, and also because I'm participating in the GNSO council leadership on this issue, is that first, I think we as GNSO council, we need to be firm about our role as the manager of the process. we should not cave in or lean in because any pressure. But we have also to acknowledge the concerns, so we need to check if the process was followed correctly. And in particular, we have several questions that we try to answer, [inaudible] at least, is to see if the GAC input was considered by the working group. And the previous conclusion that we had in October that, yes, the working group

considered input but didn't see that it was necessary to amend the recommendation.

So, this is the kind of situation we are now. We have to make decision as soon as possible, and I think there is expectation that all councilors to try to investigate more and to know more about this issue so we can make an educated vote. I'm sorry, it was, I think, quite long, a lot of details, but this is something that's [here] for a while, and I'm personally concerned that whatever the decision we are going to make, it can set some precedent, [that I think will have] some unintended consequences in the future. So we have to be careful and cautious on whatever decision we make here.

So we'll be happy, really, to clarify or answer any question. And I can advise you to go through the background [in the paragraphs of background] and this was under that council discussion item, and to check the different links, in particular the summary paper and the slide deck. And in fact, there was also a webinar that we had in October to go through the recommendation and the issue we are aware of.

Okay. Any question, comment? Okay, I don't see any. I hope it was clear there. If you have any question or comment [later,] please feel free to ask anytime. Okay. So, the next agenda item is council updates. This is kind of a recurrent item since we have the EPDP starting in August, so this is a monthly update to the council from myself as the GNSO council liaison to the EPDP. In addition to the update I sent on a weekly basis.

So, here, as usual, it's more like giving update what's going on and what were the latest activity in the EPDP, and also to highlight if there is any

risk [towards] the GNSO council as manager of the process [here] about the timeline particular for this EPDP. Since we have to deliver in time, we don't have that much slack that we can use in terms of timeline.

But we also added another item under this topic. It's [in relation] to the board letter which was sent to the GNSO council regarding the EPDP. And you can see probably on the agenda is that the board asked in fact two questions about the deadline, if the EPDP team is going to submit the final report within the deadline that it's set in its workplan, and if we foresee any risk of a delay or not meeting that deadline.

And also, there was a question if there is any backup plan, if there is any plan B from the GNSO council perspective, including also the next steps. So even if we have the final report, the work doesn't stop there. There is also that phase for implementation, and so we need to think about the next steps here, what needs to be done.

So we put this as an agenda item because we need to respond to the board. I think now it's over one month. We just [inaudible] but I think as a council, we have to respond to the board as soon as possible. So we'll discuss this at that agenda item, and we will try to see what should be the response from the council.

We are also working from the council leadership maybe on a possible draft [response,] but as it [inaudible] draft, we need a proper discussion at the GNSO council level about the possible option or response that we can give to the board.

With regard to the EPDP, we'll have more details later on in the separate agenda item during our call, so if [we suggest to -] [inaudible]

people are going to discuss EPDP in general later on. But here, it's just really to focus on the update of the council and this board letter to the GNSO council. This is the kind of issue our representatives have to pay attention and to think about for the call we'll have this Thursday. So, any question or comment on this one?

Okay, I don't see any. [I see one] question in the Adobe Connect. So, just to be clear here, I'm the liaison of the GNSO, so I'm not acting on behalf of NCSG there, so I need to be really clear here, and also careful. With regard to the timeline, I think we made it quite clear in the weekly update I sent in the GNSO council that we have really a tight timeline and schedule and we still have several topics we are covering, and also [inaudible] the review of the public comments that we will receive [inaudible] this Friday.

And just after that, we have the winter holiday most – many regions, so EPDP team won't be active during that time. So we have really few weeks left before the deadline, and we don't know yet what kind of – we may suspect what kind of input, but we don't know in details, or we have no clear idea what we will receive. So it's hard to say if there is risk of delay. I hope not, but we have to be careful, and there is expectation that the face-to-face meeting will be critical in that regard to work on the final recommendation and the final report.

So I think we will discuss anyway some more details about the EPDP later on. But yes, Stephanie, please go ahead. Sorry, Stephanie, if you are speaking, we cannot hear you. Okay, I'm not sure what's the problem. Stephanie, can you unmute yourself? Because we cannot hear

you at all, so I'm not sure what is the issue. Maybe [Ria] can please help Stephanie see what is the issue.

Okay, so I expect that Stephanie will maybe join later through dialing in, so through the phone. Okay. In the meantime, is there any other question or comment? Okay, I don't see any here, and I don't know when Stephanie can join us, so I guess we can move to the next agenda item and we can take Stephanie when she's online.

Okay, so please feel free to ask any question or comment, yeah, in the Adobe Connect, if you have any, so we'll be happy to respond. Okay, so the next agenda item is regarding the ICANN reserve fund. So this was in the last council meeting agenda but we couldn't cover it, and this was raised during the Barcelona meeting due to the decision made by the ICANN board to replenish the reserve fund partly from the auction proceeds.

And in that time in Barcelona, there were concerns from several councilors that they expressed during the meeting about this decision and how it was and so on. so it was put as a topic. It's not clear how much it's really within the remit of the council, but one can [inaudible] the GNSO is one of decisional participant in the empowered community that [will happen] through the council to some extent, so the council, maybe it kind of needs to offer the opportunity to discuss.

So it's not clear to me what can be the outcome of that discussion, because we had it before in Barcelona. I think some people expressed different opinion, maybe raising possibility of what can be used as mechanism or maybe what should be done in future in terms of maybe

some process and how the board should act regarding this matter, but I don't expect some specific action or decision here. It's hard to see [inaudible] if we will have some common position on the matter. So we will see how the discussion will go during the call and what kind of maybe decision is reached.

Okay, and I see Stephanie is back, and she's in the queue. Okay, so Stephanie, I know that you want to speak, but just maybe to give you the context that we moved to the next agenda item. But yeah, please go ahead. And as a reminder, we will cover EPDP again in few minutes in fact. I don't think that there was so much left in this agenda. but anyway, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks, Rafik. Can you hear me now? Any better? Yes? No?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, we can hear you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: [Delightful.] I don't want to get into a big discussion on the EPDP with relation to the council. Is there any inkling that council has a plan B? Because I don't think there's a plan B anywhere else except [inaudible]. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie. Okay, so when the letter was shared in the council list, there were some reaction, but it was more about [projecting] the EPDP team, to not, how to say, if I recall, to be careful to not send the message that [it's actually risk] and there will be an issue or something. But that was a while ago, so I think that's not relevant now anymore since it was even prior to the initial report publication.

But in terms of next steps, we didn't really discuss as the council. The council leadership may come with some proposal, maybe draft letter. To be honest, I'm not sure what is possible here. And maybe some [options are not necessarily] something we [inaudible] with. So to summarize, we didn't have a discussion really in GNSO council list or during the previous call, and maybe we'll have some suggestion for this week's call. But no more than that. I'm not sure, Stephanie, is it old or new hand? Okay, old hand.

Yeah, I think the plan B is really more not about EPDP team not delivering, it's more really about the next steps, because there is a gap between when we will deliver and when the implementation will happen. So that interim phase, how it will be covered. This is kind of a question, what can the GNSO council propose here? I'm not sure.

Anyway, as I said, we need to discuss, we need to think. So the call will be the opportunity to put that on the radar for all councilor to think about, and so that's why I wanted also to highlight it during our call. So as NCSG, we need to think about the possibility from our perspective, because I think from other group, probably, they have their own vision on the matter.

Okay. Any question or comment? Okay, seeing none. So back to the topic on ICANN reserve fund, and I hope it was clear. So I'd say this is something that was put in the agenda since Barcelona meeting, and it's not a policy issue to some extent, but it's more like about what kind of mechanism maybe we need in this case and what we should expect from the board.

Okay, seeing no comments or question, I guess we can move to the next agenda item. This is a discussion about the GNSO policy development process 3.0 implementation plan. And the plan was shared in the council list for feedback, the draft that was made by GNSO council leadership and GNSO staff.

Maybe as a quick reminder, this effort started in the beginning of this year, and we approved the set of recommendations in the Barcelona meeting, and the staff and GNSO council leadership was tasked to work on implementation plan and to keep the GNSO council updated on that. So basically, the implementation [inaudible] is, how to say, using what was already proposed in the summary, the report, but it's putting some dates, and also determining or suggesting who should work on the different actions. So either it can be the staff, the council, the council leadership or even some drafting team when it's needed.

So I would ask the councilor to go through the implementation plan and see if it's realistic in terms of the suggested date. I think in some aspect, it can be quite ambitious, because there are some actions that need to be done before our strategic and planning session next month, and we're trying to do as much as possible before the end of term, I mean

before the next annual general meeting next year. So I would like to ask the councilor to review and to share their thoughts.

But I think it can be also interesting for everyone to go through that implementation plan to see what is envisioned [without] the priority for next year in terms of improving the effectiveness of the policy development process, and also to go through the report itself, because you can see maybe to get a background why such effort was started in the first place and why the GNSO council felt it was important to try to improve several aspects of the policy development and what was seen as area that should be fixed or improved.

Okay. Any question or comment here? Okay, so the next agenda item is about the strategic planning session for the GNSO council. This will be the second edition. We had first one this year in January, and [inaudible] we'll have the same next month in LA too. So we have a draft agenda that was shared also in the GNSO council list for councilor review and suggestion if they wanted to add a topic for discussion.

So the agenda is not that different from the previous one, but there were some changes to take into consideration that several actions were done already. So trying to optimize the time here, in particular to give more time for the planning ahead for this year from GNSO council perspective. So we'll have three days we'll need to use [in an optimal manner,] and really to get the council to do good planning in terms of the workload and the different efforts and initiatives the GNSO will have next year.

You can find the draft agenda in the document here, you can see the link. I'm not sure if everyone can see it, but you can find it there, and you can see what are the topics that the council will tentatively cover during the strategical meeting. So the agenda can be amended, and the GNSO council leadership is working to work out topics and also to prepare the material and so on.

Okay. Any question or comment on this one? Seeing none, okay. So, I think we covered most of the substantive topics in the agenda. What is left is Any Other Business. The first one is existing ICANN procedure for handling WHOIS conflicts with privacy law implementation advisory group. This was put on hold now for a while since we got all the efforts related to GDPR, [I mean we as the EPDP,] but we cannot keep this on hold for longer. so we'll have to think about the next steps in getting for a call for volunteers. So the council will make a decision here and try to schedule this in the near future.

The other topic is fiscal year 2020 draft operating plan and budget. I think today, there will be the public comment on the ICANN operating plan and budget, but here, this agenda item is more the council will task another GNSO committee, which is the Standing Committee on ICANN Budget and Operation, to work on GNSO comment and response to the public comment, and from a council perspective here, in particular with regard to the impact of the budget on all the gTLD policy efforts. So it's more like to task or to ensure that the standing committee will work on the public comment. So yeah, we have a few of our councilors in that committee, and so they will have to work on this draft response soon.

Okay. Any question or comment on this? Okay, so trying to see, there are several discussion in the chat. First question from Stephanie about the call for volunteers. I don't know. I think that that's why we put it on the agenda, so we have to decide, because I think a few months ago when we kind of initiated this effort and we voted for the motion, it was supposed to start in June or July if I'm not mistaken. So here, I think we will have to decide a final day to do the call for volunteers. So it depends on [the input. I don't think it's] really realistic to have this started.

Yes, Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks very much. I just wanted to note that I hear that there are ICANN enforcement actions coming out. Merry Christmas, everybody. And if I were a registrar, the only way I would respond to that would be a demand for WHOIS conflicts with law action, because of course, there is a difference remaining in interpretation of the law on several key points, as anybody in the EPDP knows. So as much as I hate the idea of reconstituting the WHOIS conflict procedure, we need that thing to work, in my opinion, because I'm not confident we will get a consensus policy that complies with the law out of the EPDP. Thanks. Just noting.

Now, nobody's got any time. I don't know about the rest of you, but EPDP is killing me, so I don't know who we're going to get to staff this, but it'll be very important. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks for the comment, Stephanie. It is something we have to, I think, consider it before in terms of the workload and does it even make sense to start when we have the EPDP? So that should be factored in our decision, and I think we'll use your input here and insight.

Also, I just saw a comment from Ayden. I just want to clarify, I don't think there is any action expected from the council regarding the implementation plan during the holidays, just checking the implementation plan. Most of the tasks are for the staff or the GNSO council leadership, and it's mostly for the council, it's mostly expected during the strategical meeting in January. So [inaudible] maybe we are expecting the council to get involved in the implementation of some of the recommendations.

Okay. So, the last item is about ICANN 64 planning. I think we have [inaudible] block scheduled for the GNSO. GNSO council leadership and staff had a call with all the PDP working group leadership to ask them about the schedule, what they want for Kobe meeting in terms of meeting for the working group, and so I think we are okay on that side, and [inaudible] also that there will be soon the request from the stakeholder groups and constituencies for meeting slots. So I expect also the NCSG and the constituencies will do that [inaudible].

Okay. And with that, we are done with the council agenda. I spoke for too long, I guess that's a fact. But I really hope that everyone who needs to ask questions or comments or clarification, I will be happy to answer and to spend time maybe to go into details or to explain the context and the background. Sometimes, the agenda can look dry, but it's kind of

the council has to cover several topics, and so this is opportunity maybe to have this idea of what's going on.

Anyway, let's move to the NCSG agenda. Maria, please. Okay, so please, a reminder, if you are not speaking, please mute yourself, because [that's what creates] noise and echo on the call. Thanks.

Okay, so going down now to the policy update, and we have several items, and we will start first with the EPDP discussion. So first, we have one maybe first action for the EPDP, is initial report public comments. The deadline is this Friday. We shared NCSG draft response in the list, and I think there were some comments already in the document, so please keep doing so, and if you want to ask a question. But with regard to the EPDP, I think maybe we should hear from our representative there if there is any update or anything they want to raise. Okay, Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes. Hi. Just a general observation that I think this graph that we have sent out for consultation is not complete enough, and it is very structured in a way that if you're not part of the committee, you're really [not likely] to be able to have informed views on the questions asked. I think there's a risk that we're going to get bad input and going to have a hard time dealing with it at our face-to-face meeting.

That's just me probably being negative, so take it with a grain of salt. There are many unresolved issues, as various commentators have noted, and I think that's a huge problem, because basically, the draft

report is going to be the final report with very few frills added. So we haven't solved the problems.

Next topic will be legal counsel. We have been arguing about getting independent legal counsel since I was on the small team drafting the charter, and there is now a group trying to come up with a formula for how we should go out and consult to get legal counsel. This, in my view, is nonsense, because we hired legal counsel independent to advise us during the RDS review team. They should have just pulled the SOW, the statement of work, and we should have had this months ago. Instead, we've had to endure listening to people who don't understand data protection law mangle and [inaudible] throughout the history of the EPDP.

So I'm not looking for great things here. We'll get legal counsel at the end of the process when we can no longer use them. But we soldier on playing the game. However, and this is the thing that I asked Rafik to add to the agenda, those who have not seen the Domain Incite article on the technical team that's being [struck,] we had a bit of a [inaudible] of this at the last meeting in that one of the representatives from SSAC, Benedict – I'm forgetting his last name, but he's the British former serious organized crime guy who runs Register of Last Resort. Somebody with a good memory help me out. Addis, thank you very much.

Benedict was trying to have a discussion about building a technical solution, and ICANN wasn't playing, wasn't talking, wouldn't answer any questions. Poor Benedict was in a bit of a spot. Now we find out, courtesy of Domain Incite, that ICANN is striking a technical committee to develop some kind of RDAP implementation to give access.

Honestly, I was at the point of saying, okay, right, [downing tools,] quitting everything, because I'm so tired of ICANN acting, in my view, in bad faith in the way it's conducting itself. We have been fighting off requests for managing the access engine throughout the EPDP, it was the camel's nose under the tent in the charter, and it has been, and now here we are with an interim report that, in my view, doesn't solve our basic premise questions, and yet we're moving ahead and ICANN's cooperating.

In the meantime, ICANN still has not come clean about what their role is, what they're taking accountability for as a controller or co-controller. I'm censoring my language, but it is backwards, folks. This is a [inaudible] primary question you have to ask and answer at the beginning to inform your purpose identification.

Anyway, thank you. Just saying, we need to figure out how we're going to respond to all of this, in my view.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Stephanie. I think you covered several topics at the same time. I think with regards to the legal counsel, yes, it took too much time. So the legal committee is going to follow the Work Stream 2 approach. I'm not saying it's a correct or not approach. I cannot really speak here because of my involvement. But anyway, that's what we've got for now, and we have to [inaudible].

I think also you raised about our draft comment. Yes. That's why we're expecting all the input and everyone to participate, and also, I think I expect our EPDP representative maybe to steer this effort and to help

our members to understand the position that we had and we have in the EPDP. So it's quite critical to do so now. we have a few days left, we don't have that much time, so we need to act right now and to maybe clarify or to share some updates on the list if needed.

With regard to the technical group, it's quite official, it's in the ICANN website, so you can find the announcement. And my understanding, the group had already a call last week, and the recording is available. So I think it will be worth it to listen to it. I didn't do that myself yet, but I think we should listen and see what they are thinking. And also, my understanding that their mailing list is public archived, so we can check the level of discussion there.

But yeah, having this group that's going to work on some technical solution is kind of really strange when there is policy discussion, so kind of trying to set a technical solution before we work out the requirements from policy perspective. So I'm not sure how to respond, but we need to think carefully here what should be our approach on the matter.

So I hope that clarifies, but yeah, we need to think here what we should act. There are concerns, but we need to think if we need to take action or not, and quite quickly, since yes, it's holiday, not just in the north hemisphere but also the south, so it can be winter or summer, but yeah, we should think about what should we do next. And I see Kathy is in the queue. Over to you, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Thank you, Rafik. Hello, everybody. Always beware the quiet of the holiday season and what ICANN throws into the mix then. I share Stephanie's concern, and with this group. Implementation in general, watch out, guys. I'm seeing it across the board, whether it's some of the new subsequent procedure plans, whether it's what happened to the original trademark domain name dispute rules and what was happening with the privacy proxy before they shut it down. We're seeing implementation rewrite policy, and compromises that were made are being struck down in implementation. This is a real problem, and this is consistent across the board. If they don't win in policy, they come back in implementation. But yeah, we don't have enough people to monitor everything, and we shouldn't have to monitor technical implementation, which should never [contravene] policy.

So I share Stephanie's – as soon as I saw the posting of this group, my hair stood on end too. But I want to go back to the comments, because I appreciate the call that went out to the community and I spent a lot of time with the comments yesterday, so I wanted to let you guys know there's a lot of new material in there. I did it all in the suggesting mode, so you can see what I was adding. Occasionally, I put in comments of why. But I tried to put a lot of explanation in.

First, I want to let you know that recommendation 14 is a trick question. Classic ICANN. So we've gone through the original comment and the early part of the comments and talked about purposes, and we struck down a lot of the purposes. We've edited some, we've recommended to delete them.

So then ICANN in recommendation number 14 uses this broad language, and I'll just read it because it's only two sentences and completely misleading. The EPDP team recommends that the policy includes the following data processing activities as well as responsible parties please reference the initial report beginning on page 63 for further details.

And they put back in all those original purposes, and we said yes, and the answer is no because we already struck down most of them or rewrote most of them. So I've edited that particular question extensively, because it's a trick question, and this is, again, classic ICANN. I strike these questions down in drafts whenever I see them, but this one got through.

I also want to let you know, Amr had asked me to look at anything that said URS and UDRP, which hi appreciate. So I looked at all that and put in appropriate comments, because we're concerned, not just about the collection and processing of personal data in a domain name dispute but the publication of that data and decisions. And when we go back and look at old decisions, we're often seeing there's no real consistency in it, but sometimes we're seeing, of course the name of the registrant, the attorney or the representative of the registrant, and often, contact information.

So this probably isn't appropriate in a post-GDPR era, so we need to think about that, both collection, processing and publication in the specific case of these decisions, these arbitration decisions coming down.

But I looked at something else too, and that's because it's within the scope of the rights protection mechanism working group, and it's the PDDRP, which is the post-delegation dispute policy, as well as the other dispute policy, which is a registry restrictions dispute policy. And the questions in the EPDP draft report treat all of these as if they were URS and UDRP and say we're going to disclose registrant data.

No, you can't do that. These aren't proceedings against the registrant. These are proceedings against the registry. And while the registry may also be a registrant, and there may be a pattern of bad faith, the registry may be registering a lot of bad stuff in their own domain name. You have to prove that. And you can't just release all the registrant data. You could have thousands or even millions of good faith registrants inside a TLD that's challenged, and this is something I pointed out many times in many different circumstances. But you have to treat PDDRP and RRDRP, which, again the questions even in the report are not really defined, so I put in the definitions of them and I've put in why this had nothing to do with the registrant. These are totally actions against the registry. And no, you cannot release the database of all the [inaudible] information of registrants if these proceedings are called and brought.

So you'll see a lot of new stuff in there, a lot of explanation so that if people go through, these aren't just acronyms but they're proceedings that have definitions and parties and from a legal perspective, you know who's involved so that you know whose data should be involved. I'll stop there, and I've written a background e-mail as well as, again, extensive comments. And again, I'll stop there. Thanks, Rafik. Back to you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Kathy, for the comment, and thanks for the edits in the Google doc. Much appreciated. So, okay, any question or comment regarding the EPDP?

I understand that we may have concerns regarding the technical group, but [seems to be] practical, pragmatic [here is just] thinking what kind of function or approach we should [inaudible]. So it's good to air our concerns, but also, there is time for action here to move forward. And I see Stephanie [and Kathy]. I thought Kathy was before, but okay, let's go with Stephanie first, and then Kathy.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks, Rafik. I don't want to sound cynical, I'm supposed to be the fearless leader here, not being cynical, being participate and all the rest of it, but I just survived the RDS review team meeting in Brussels [inaudible] as we went over the seven comments we received in response to the RDS review team, and therefore, I'm not actually optimistic that the comments are going to be dealt with any more seriously than our objections in the EPDP meetings have been.

I could give you a long list of things that I have brought up over the last five years that have been just ignored, and I'm almost at the point of saying to myself, "You should have taken Monica's excellent advice and just gone and sued and had a court case," because I'm not optimistic that anybody is to take serious objections to the illegality of policy on WHOIS seriously.

So I am running around trying to get other comments in, and I'm wondering if folks on the call have any idea how many comments we think are going to come in. As we discussed, the comment period was short, it's leading up to the holidays, people are busy, the matter is [obtuse,] it's very hard to follow the charter and the report and come up with the list of questions that we get fired at us in this Google doc template. So I'm not optimistic. But if anybody knows whether we think we've got a lot of comments coming in that might be on our side, I would like to hear that. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie. Kathy?

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Well, if anyone wants to respond to Stephanie, I'm happy to yield. Okay. Stephanie, I agree with you. I don't think you're going to get a lot of comments. I think this is a tough set of comments to respond to. I think way too many acronyms were used in it. I think it was written to only get a certain type of expert response, because it's just hard to parse. Even for those who have been in the field since the beginning, these are hard comments to parse.

On the other hand, I think you guys have done a great job, the EPDP, the NCSG EPDP. Clearly, you've held back a wave on this. This could have been much worse. And at least there's a clear [elaboration] of purposes, we can try to strike some of those purposes. It's clear a lot of work and a lot of compromise has gone into this. So, thank you. I think this is farther than anyone's ever gone, certainly much farther than the EWG

and the first WHOIS review team. And I don't know where the second WHOIS review team is now. So congratulations, and thank you. Untold numbers of hours to get to where we are.

I want to raise an issue for you guys, and that's the removal of the street address. I don't know if anybody wants to talk about it, but I did want to raise it. And that's my phone ringing, unfortunately, in the background. And here's what I want to raise, is I think where we're going to be going is unfortunately kind of almost automated requests where someone's going to do a pull-down screen and say, "I have an intellectual property infringement" or "I have a law enforcement request."

Even though I [wrote] extensive comment – I [wrote in] why that's not legal and why that's not legal and why that doesn't allow you to balance the registrants' rights versus the requestors' rights, that's where we seem to be heading. The safest thing we can do is remove the street address, which is where you can [inaudible]. Somebody's in the background.

And so I wanted to raise it, and I've written it into the comments. I know it's a hard thing to shoot for, but I thought it might give us something to shoot for that would be incredibly useful that would save the lives of journalists and dissenters, and might make this automated process a lot safer in the end by not pointing to the exact location. City, okay, state, okay, but not that exact location where a synagogue or a mosque or a church in a threatened area is located, or a girls' school in Pakistan. It's horrible to have to publish that address.

Anyway, just wanted to raise that issue, and again, my thanks for incredible work by our EPDP team. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Kathy. And thanks for the comment. Okay, so I don't see anyone in the queue. I think that, Kathy, that's an old hand. But anyway, [inaudible] to get more group to respond to the public comment if it's possible. They can use to some extent maybe our comment and try to elaborate more if they need. Indeed, there are several areas that it's quite specific, not easy for outsider. That's the reality we have to deal with. But we can try to have – we have short time to do so, but yeah, we can try to have.

Still as a group, we have to submit our own comments, and we continue to work on that, because the review of the public comment will be, to some extent – can be tricky, usually. It's not just specific to the EPDP. So, any comment or any extra comment, whatever the [inaudible] or the content, can be helpful. And it will help in particular for some issues that are still in the deliberation or there are two diverging positions.

Yeah, so let's continue the work, and we'll have to make comments. Everyone, it's not just the NCSG comment. Individual members, organization, we can encourage others to do so. So what we can offer is some help or to help them to navigate it. It's not the best time of the year for that, but we can do our best, so we can [focus] around that and see what can be done.

So, any other comment or question here? Okay, so I think we covered the EPDP team. I understand there is some discussion in the chat, but

that's okay. Then we move to the next item, which is the usual update from PDP and [other] review teams. So, we have the item, and we can go to the public comment stages.

In terms of PDP, we have currently – maybe we can start with RPM working group since we have Kathy here, and maybe she can give us some update, the latest update there or anything that we should be aware of. Kathy, sorry for putting you on the spot, [inaudible].

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Sure. Let me [inaudible]. Let's see. We've wrapped up our review of the uniform rapid suspension, at least for the moment, and figured out our draft policy recommendations, what we call operational fixes, what the policy says versus how it's been implemented. And there have been some discrepancies there.

So we've got about 34 recommendations that are going to be going out as part of our initial report, and now we've gone back to the trademark clearinghouse. We've put a hold on that work for, I don't know, about eight or nine months while the Analysis Group was engaged in a survey on our behalf, or while we were working on the survey and then putting it out.

So now we have data about whether people understood the trademark claims, how their pricing and sunrise, things like that. So now we have two subteams meeting, one looking at the trademark claims data and charter questions, and one looking at the sunrise period data and charter questions. And that's about it. if anyone wants to talk more in detail, happy to tell them. If anybody wants to join, we could certainly

use more noncommercial folks in the group. That's about it. Thanks, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Kathy. That's really helpful. Please let us know anytime there is a draft you need help or anything that maybe more people to join and so on. But just a question, Kathy. If I'm not mistaken – I'm not sure. There was initial report. I don't think there was initial report yet, but when it's scheduled for the [inaudible].

KATHY KLEIMAN: No, there's not an initial report yet because our initial report covers all of phase one, which is all the new gTLD trademark, domain name protection, which includes the trademark clearinghouse. So we talked about spring. It's probably more going to be summer, so the second ICANN meeting of the year is probably where we'll be wrapping that up and getting it out. Thanks for asking. I don't know if you heard that, [Rafik.]

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, that's really helpful in terms of planning. So that was for the rights protection mechanism. The other working group is the gTLD subsequent procedures. And definitely, there was some activity there. There is currently the public comment for the supplemental report and another public comment for work track five on geo names, and we are working on both. But let's ask those in the working group, active there,

if they want to share any update from the Subsequent Procedure working group.

Okay. Oh, Kathy, it's an old or new hand?

KATHY KLEIMAN: It's a new hand, unless somebody else wants to talk about Subsequent Procedures Working Group.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I don't see any. No, you can go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. I know I'm the last person you'd expect to talk about Subsequent Procedures Working Group, but I've been attending their meetings. Let me tell you what's going on and why we need to be there. Subsequent Procedures has now divided back into three subteams that are reviewing all the comments.

And they're trying hard. To be fair, they're trying hard. But they're reviewing all the comments to make sure they're properly incorporated. But you need to be there to monitor it, because I went to one of the subteam calls – and they divide up and they put out an agenda and one subteam's looking at objections and one subteam's looking at the new idea for a standing review team that will make kind of all policy and technical decisions as they come across, which they shouldn't be doing.

But especially with our comments, and maybe others too, but with our comments, I've noticed a kind of like, first, they don't include them and you have to fight for them to be included, and then I got in a call last week, I was coming in there, like, "Well, the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group comment is listed as being a divergent comment, being a disagreeing comment, but maybe that's not how it's meant."

And I'm looking at them, I finally raise my hand, I'm like, "The answer to the comment from the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group says no. We disagree. It says no. No means no." But if I hadn't been there, they would have re-catalogued that comment. If no one from noncommercial was there to kind of guard what we've written, there's a chance it won't be included.

So we could use more people to cover the three subteams. It's one hour a week, sometimes one and a half hours a week, but if anyone has a little extra time, you don't need to be an expert, you just need to see if they wrote our comment into the right place and into the right slots. Thanks. And other people's comments too, public interest groups, EFF filed, others filed. So we just have to monitor this stuff. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Kathy. Yeah, it's good opportunity to call for more people to participate those subgroups, in the three subgroups, and at least to observe and to monitor what's going on. So for those who are interested, just please feel free to reach me any time and so I can coordinate with those who are active in the working groups and to ensure that we all are on the same page. I think before, we used the

Skype channel, but that's dormant now for a long time, so we can find out how to coordinate to be effective. Unfortunately, I cannot participate myself, but I will be happy if others do so.

Okay, so that's for SubPro. Any other comment, anyone want to add more about the SubPro? I think there is the work track five and so on. Okay, so I think that's it in terms of PDPs. We already covered the EPDP, which is a kind of particular case. I don't think we are missing any other GNSO PDP, except maybe the Cross Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds, which is not a policy, and we submitted a few weeks ago – not few weeks ago, last week, I think, our comment on the auction proceeds initial report.

So I don't know who is active there from NCSG, but it's another group that we need more activity there to monitor and follow up, so [after] just now they had their initial report. And I see Stephanie's in the queue. Yes, Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes. I understand that it's not a policy committee, but the question arises as we see more and more of these cross-community working parties, where else are we going to discuss them other than at the [pol] committee? And that's a valid question.

I also think that there are an awful lot of policy implications tied up in [budget,] and so some of the budget decisions, for instance raiding the auction proceeds for \$30 million, has policy implications. So I just wanted to open up a discussion on that. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Stephanie. Okay, Stephanie, is that an old or a new hand? Do you want to add something? Okay, thanks. So, I think that's for GNSO. In terms of review teams, the ATRT3 will start hopefully next month. I think they are finalizing or they finalized [the slate.] I don't have visibility, really, about that, but at least we know that from the GNSO, we already appointed – we sent our representatives there.

I think for other review teams, we have the SSR. They shared some updates, I think, around Barcelona meeting, and they're trying to communicate more about their work through ICANN website after all the issues they had before.

I think we're [inaudible] now in terms of active review teams, and I see Stephanie just quickly jumped in before I even finished my sentence. It's about RDS review team, and I think Stephanie would like to share some update from that review team. Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Actually, no. Rafik, I was asking, what is the scope of Policy Committee? I think it's got to take in all of these other issues as well, or we need another meeting. And since people can barely make one meeting, I think that's kind of a [nonstarter.] So that was my point, and I'd like to know how people feel about this, because we need some vigorous discussion on some of these issues.

In terms of the RDS, well, I expressed my dissatisfaction with the RDS review team a few moments ago. I also am dismayed at the disparity in

budgets between the RDS review, which basically should have been put on hold because we are reviewing the 2010 report recommendations, many of which were aimed at accuracy, and there was just a refusal to recognize, other than a sort of sweeping, “There may be changes in the WHOIS due to the GDPR implementation,” but we went ahead as if we were going to continue checking the accuracy of phone numbers and address fields. It just blindly put its fingers in its ears and shut its eyes and went, “la la la, keep on going.”

We’re not getting substantive – well, we’re getting substantive comments from the registrars and registries. We had a bit of a comment in there, but there’s not enough pushback on these procedures, and quite frankly, I have heard a lot of noise, particularly coming from GAC representatives, that the policy, GAC and ALAC, that the policy process does not work at ICANN. So I think that given that we are a policy group supporting organization, i.e. part of the GNSO, that’s a very important criticism that we have to listen to. Either things become more meaningful or we may see some changes in ICANN. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie, for the comments. I'm not sure, [you were] suggesting in the beginning that we need another policy call? Stephanie, if you are speaking, we cannot hear you. Okay, it seems we have again the problem with Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Hello. Can you hear me now?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah. [inaudible].

STEPHANIE PERRIN: [inaudible] I don't know what that was. My recommendation – my question was really, how do we discuss some of these crosscutting issues [that's not a policy committee?] So budget may not be a policy issue, but it has a lot of policy implications, so we need to talk about it here with a broad group of people. The crosscutting CCWGs are not policy committees, but they need to be discussed here. So just loading more work on you, Rafik. That's all. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Stephanie. I think maybe because we call it NCSG policy call can be misleading, but it's kind of [just an] NCSG call. We focus on policy and we usually schedule it before the GNSO council meeting because that's the opportunity to [inaudible] agenda. But I also think we covered before many topics that are not nonpolicy topics, non-PDP topics, including the auction proceeds or the CCWG before for ICANN Accountability and IANA Stewardship Transition and so on. So I don't think we have any research on that matter. And at the end, in terms of position, it will come back to the NCSG Policy Committee to finalize it, so we have to cover it to some extent.

But I think for the budget, maybe the small changes, now we have more an active financial committee, so expect them to take the lead on the matter. But we can still discuss the topic here, and I'm planning, for

example, to [share] the call for volunteers for when the public comment is open. But just I think in terms of who will lead that is different. But at the end, we can use the call to cover any topic we think relevant for us. So I don't think there is any issue here. And thanks for putting more work on me. That's fine, I guess. But in terms of discussion, yes, we can use this, so no issue.

Okay, any comments or question here? Okay, so I think we covered all the review teams, all GNSO working group and cross-community working group, I don't think we are missing any. So I wanted to go through the public comments just to give an update about the status.

So we share first the link just so everyone can see the current open public comment, and [those we have to respond to quickly.] So we have the supplemental initial report in the new gTLD subsequent procedures. We have [a kind of group] working on the draft, but really, we need to get a draft shared quickly, because the deadline is the 21st of December. It was extended before, and so we need, I think, time for review and to get comment from NCSG member. I know that [we are] working hard on that, so hopefully, we can get the draft soon this week.

Are there comments? I think we covered it already. [It's the] initial report from the EPDP. Also, the deadline is the 21st December, this Friday, so it's quite a busy week in terms of public comment.

Next is the policy status report inter-registrar transfer policy. I have to confess I made a mistake for this one, because in fact, there is a survey which is targeting registrant and registrar to get their experience, but it seems the public comment is also asking if there is any comment from

anyone regarding the report. So I misunderstood the scope of the public comment. I apologize for that. I should have paid more attention. But I think since this is concerning a review of an existing policy and it will come back anyway to the council for reconsideration, so I think it's possible if we can get the draft quickly if someone wants to volunteer to go through the report to see if there is any – not issues, because this report is collecting data regarding the policy, and in terms of – it's not policy recommendation, it's not implementation, but it's really kind of report to review how the policy was implemented, and if those policy that were approved before were effective as expected or not. So I'm thinking [that we should] not be that concerned, but if someone wants to go through the report and see if there is anything, we should cover, please let me know.

Okay, so the next public comment, I don't think – in fact the two last public comments, one about [DRP] service provider and the other about root zone label generation rules. I don't think they are of high priority for us, so we are not covering them.

The last, I think it's quite critical, and it's also related to the new gTLD subsequent procedures. It's regarding geographic names at the top level, and we have an active drafting team working on this comment. So to summarize, we have one draft comment that is under review by an NCSG list, another one that should be shared soon, and there is the last one, the work track five that is also handled by drafting team, but the deadline for this one is the 22nd of January, so we still have time to cover it anyway.

Okay, sorry, any question or comment here? Okay, thanks. [Sounds like] no question, we can move to the next agenda item, and we are moving now to Any Other Business. The first is about the ICANN budget and operating plan. As I mentioned before, the public comment will be published today, and this is one that we have to cover and to respond, because I think the impact of the budget on our activity, but it's also regarding the resources affected or allocated to GNSO PDPs and so on are critical for us, so we have to pay attention to this, and as we did in last year in our comment.

So I think Stephanie [inaudible] question if we should cover this, so this is an opportunity, if you want, to raise any question or comment regarding the ICANN plan or budget. Okay, any comments or question here? Okay, so [inaudible] follow up anyway, and – oh, Stephanie. Please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks, Rafik. I hate to be the only one raising these issues, but quite frankly, the policy call is an NCSG-wide policy call, and it's kind of mandatory. If you are heading up, well, for instance the NPOC policy committee, then it's kind of required to shop up at this call.

I don't mean to pick on any particular group. It's the same with the finance committee, you can't discuss finances in a vacuum if you don't know what's going on with all the policy and other activities. So I'd like to encourage, if there are any reps on any of the other committees that meet, to please tell their members and chairs that they need to show up at the policy call. Participation is pretty good today, but we're still

missing a lot of key leaders who need to be informed about what's going on. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Stephanie, for raising this. Yeah, I think it's critical that we get more participation. I'm personally happy to go through the agenda and to give all this explanation and update, but to be honest, it's not easy for me. I expect really more interaction and others to participate and share their updates and so on. So I want to thank who did already today, but I expect more participation.

And I think here, we are trying also to [shape some of our position,] like for the GNSO council meeting, so yeah, we need to do better. I will see if we need to make some tweaking and changes, but at least attendance is expected. I know that some, they couldn't attend, participate today for other engagement.

Just regarding the date and time, maybe it's not convenient for everyone, but unfortunately, we have some restrictions here, constraints. We have the council meeting Thursday. Initially, we had our call on Tuesday, but now we have the EPDP call of two hours on Tuesday and it's not realistic to have another two hours call on the same day. Personally, I'm not going to handle that. So that's why we end up with this slot on Monday. Anyway, we'll see if we can improve [the call] for everyone to participate and to attend.

Okay. Thanks. So we'll follow up anyway with some of the items, because we have to discuss to get our position [made.] So, [under] Any Other Business, this is an opportunity for everyone to maybe suggest

any topic that they want that we discuss. So please, feel free to do so. I personally may miss something, but if there is anything or topic that you think we should cover, please do so.

Yes, Collin, please go ahead.

COLLIN KURRE: Can you hear me okay? I'm going to assume [inaudible].

RAFIK DAMMAK: [inaudible].

COLLIN KURRE: Okay, great. So I just wanted to follow up on – so the last call that we had, I raised the Any Other Business of potentially having a high-interest or other session about human rights impact assessments, or just about impact assessments in general. So [inaudible] give you guys an update and say that we've decided to just go ahead and make that one of the focal points of our CCWP session instead of going for a high-interest session due to the feedback that we got on last month's call.

So with [inaudible] who is my co-chair of the CCWP, we've reached out to a couple folks like the Public Safety Working Group and a couple other groups that are involved with various different kinds of rights, consumers' rights, children's rights, etc., so we're going to try to have a really engaged and interesting conversation during the latter half of the CCWP meeting. So I just wanted to give that little update. And we're going to start up some more work after the new year on [trial HIAA]

which I know a lot of you are already following the CCWP mailing list, so you've probably seen those updates, but just to let you know that we've got a small group that's been formed and we've got a little channel to exchange resources, and that work will start up in earnest soon, but probably not until after the holidays, because it's been a little bit trickier than expected trying to aggregate schedules and ensure that all volunteers can kind of think and review the information before diving into the work. Happy to answer any questions or anything. Just a small update. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Collin, for the update, and good luck with the impact assessment. I assume [that for the meeting request, that] it was already done. So please [inaudible] any help or support on the matter.

Okay. So, any other topic or anything you want to share? So this is a good opportunity to do so. Okay, I'm seeing none. At least I can give you back 13 minutes from today's call. I don't think we are going to spend the whole two hours.

So, thanks for everyone who attended the call. I know there are some newcomers, and so it may be sometimes intimidating just to see all the kind of topics we cover, but again, I'm repeating here, reiterating. Please feel free to ask any question in the Adobe Connect or intervening to be in the queue, or even sending me e-mail. I'm really happy to respond to a question to clarify what's going on in the GNSO council, because this is our role, and I'm happy to explain why it matters. Sometimes it's not that straightforward, it's not clear, but a lot of things

happening have a lot of impact. So please feel free to reach me any time, but I think also other members of the policy committee and councilor, and also Stephanie, as a chair, will be happy to answer your question.

Okay, so I think that's it [as] NCSG call for 2018. Hopefully, we'll meet soon in 2019. In the meantime, enjoy your holidays and have a good time. See you soon, and bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]