ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
April 18, 2017
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recordings have been started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Maryam. Thank you very – thank you very much Franz. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCSG Open Policy call on Tuesday 18 April 2017 at 16:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Malisa Richards, Stephanie Perrin, Rafik Dammak, Patrick Lenihan, Bruno Santos, Juan Manuel Rojas, Mathias Houngbo, Poncelet Illeleji, Louise Marie Hurel, Joan Kerr, Dorothy Gordon, Avri Doria, Tapani Tarvainen, Ahmed Almarwani, Matthew Shears, James Gannon, Sam Lanfranco, Nadira Alaraj, Andreea Lusso, Arshad Mohammed 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. Thank you very much. Over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Maryam and thanks for everyone for joining today call. So I see several new members joining the calls so I would like to welcome them again, and also maybe to explain a little bit about the background of this call.

So NCSG usually has a monthly call and it usually is scheduled before the GNSO Council call, which happens in Thursday. So we try to have the call before so we can discuss the motion that they – that will be voted in the Council call.

And so we try to go through that agenda to see if there is any concern or issue that your representative, which means the Councilor, may arise in that call. And also it's an opportunity to give a briefing about policy discussion and ask for input.

So we will start first with the GNSO agenda. Maryam can you please share it in the Adobe Connect? And quite long one. There are several motion for a vote in the meeting.

Okay so you can scroll in the screen and in the first agenda item after the administrative matters is the confirmed agenda, which means that, you know, there is no objection.

Just we will vote it and we go to the other items. So for the consensus agenda we have the confirmation of Council Liaison appointment, and what we have is that there are for several working group usually the GNSO Council appoint a liaison to those working group so – to give guidance to the chair to report if there is any concerns and to help the working group.

So we got some volunteers to this working group but also to the drafting teams, and I do think this is quite straightforward. It's a agenda item so I

don't see any specific issue but I would like to ask other councilor who are joining the call if they have any comment or – and if they want to add further comments here.

Okay I assume that no issue for this one. We can move to the next agenda item, which is the Council vote to approve the review from GNSO Council of the GAC communiqué from Copenhagen.

For every ICANN meeting the GAC issue a communiqué about several issues and some of them concern the GNSO, and for the last meetings the GNSO Council tended to respond to the communiqué and try to clarify any question there.

And I think for this motion Stephanie was the person who submitted it and she participated in the small drafting team, which worked on writing the response from the GNSO Council.

And I guess maybe she can give a briefing about what was covered there and if there is any item that she want to highlight and to – that we can discuss. Stephanie can you hear me?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes thanks. We – can you – Rafik can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes?

Rafik Dammak: I can hear you. Yes. Please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Very good. Okay Stephanie Perrin for the record.

Rafik Dammak: Please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Regrettably we're a little late in pulling this Council response together. I think folks were getting ready for Easter, so when I tabled the draft basically it wasn't finished and I haven't seen any traffic on the small list.

There are two things that have caused considerable grief on that response. One of them is the IGO/INGO never-ending saga. This is of the, you know, country names and that's gone back and forth and back and forth, and it is Phil Corwin who has been providing the most fulsome comments on that because he is a Co-Chair of that committee that's looking at that and drafted the original – the response letter back.

And the other one was abuse and the abuse issue is kind of also a never-ending saga between the registrars and registries and the GAC. So Michele Neylon had provided the latest response on that, so that's kind of all I know at this point.

The meeting obviously is on Thursday and I don't think that thing is ready to be approved. We put the motion in as a placeholder only so that's about it. And I'm just going to answer this call. I apologize – timing's terrible.

Rafik Dammak: Great. And thanks Stephanie for the explanation. Okay so it's tabled for discussion and if I understand you correctly it may be deferred since we – there was no discussion either on the mailing list and it will be really just to do it during the call.

Okay I'm trying to find out the right link to the response because the one in the agenda seems not working so please bear with me for – okay. Okay so

please – okay so you can find in the link the attachment to the Excel file. Okay Stephanie are you still in the call?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes I am. Sorry about that. I got rid of the call.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. So you think that – do you think that – but sorry for the echo. So if folks will begin to discuss within the GNSO Council and the mailing list and to do that through the holidays, you believe that we cannot really vote for the response in the call this Thursday? Are we expecting a deferral from any councilor? Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: I would be surprised if we don't defer it until the next meeting or decide to work on it and do a vote on it offline, you know, on the list because I don't think there's been enough discussion about it for anybody to defend it.

Folks were just not really – couple of fairly serious issues there, not ones I have to say – not ones that I feel particularly strongly about so I wouldn't hold it up.

I mean, these are battles in which I'm not sure that we've ever expressed strong views but, you know, if people have very strong views on the INGO response now is the time to talk about it.

I could be wrong. Could we pull it up on the screen because, you know, there's a quite a lot to look at? It's a complex spreadsheet. That's another thing that slowed us down.

My only contribution was to make a little more diplomatic the language that (Tom McCready) had submitted on one of the sections. If we could pull it up

it would make it easier I think especially for folks who can't get into Google Docs.

Rafik Dammak: Okay I think that's possible. It may take one – just one minute. Maryam can you share the Excel in the Adobe Connect? Okay in the meantime while we're trying to – sorry.

In the meantime while we are trying to share the Excel file is there any question or comment or if you want any clarification about this motion?

Stephanie Perrin: Rafik it's Stephanie again. Maybe it would be – given that we have so many calls for comments open that we really need to get to discuss maybe we could leave this till the end if there's a technical problem getting it up.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. We can do so. It's – okay. We can move to the next…

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: …and come back to this later. Okay. So the next one is about initiation of GNSO process for amending GNSO policy recommendation relating to certain Red Cross movement names.

And I think this is related to also in general to the IGO/NGO discussion. So here is this – the motion. Here's the response I think to the Board request so the GNSO initiate a process as outlined in the Policy Development Process manual.

And that to – if you can go to the motion as explained there - is that we initiated that process to amend the recommendation and so to add the list of Red – several Red Cross name.

Okay. So for a context this discussion was really okay for many years within the GNSO I think even since 2010 or 2011, and even after issuing a recommendation on that matter we have the advice for – from the GAC, the one – or that's in cappy and they are asking the Board to add.

And so the Board just coming back here to the GNSO and base it - and the Policy Development Process manual. There is a similarity here for GNSO Council to initiate the process and to ask for amendment here if I'm not mistaking.

Okay so we really here need someone kind of more familiar with IGO/NGO discussion, so in term here we have two things: the issue itself, right. We had kind of concerns before in term of procedure but here also about the process.

And I think that's how to say - is moving in the process as described and just they are coming back I guess to the working group to work again. So the idea is to convene the working group for consultation and also to have a public comment in the proposed amendments.

So looking here for kind of comments or feedback in how and what should be our reaction to this. So maybe if - here I think one of the issue we had is that including more than all the list and of the Red Cross, but also the variance that was a concern for us because that's an extended list.

And if I can volunteer here – well I don't want to put someone on the spot but I think (Robin) was involved within this discussion from the beginning and maybe if she has maybe some comments, right, but if you, I mean, trying to volunteer here people. (Robin) can you a – hear me?

Okay doesn't seem the case. Okay. Okay so except if we have either a substantive concern about what this proposal and its amendments or with regard to the process, I'm not sure what can be our kind of position here or if we want kind of to vote against this or kind of here I don't see anything of concern.

But would prefer really to hear from those involved in this working group if they have any comment, but unfortunately it doesn't seem the case that the folks who were actively participating in the working group and this discussion are – they are not in the call so okay.

Is there any question or comment? Okay. So I guess we can move to the next agenda item and this is about the GNSO Council comments and the proposed ICANN budget for financial year.

So we have a public comment about the budget and operating plan for fiscal year 2018, and in fact there is two element here – is that as NCSG we should submit a comment here if we have any concern or anything we wanted to highlight regarding the ICANN budget.

And for this motion the GNSO Council drafted a response which is not, I mean, it's how to say – it means, I mean, it's not how to say – it's not – doesn't mean that other stakeholder group or constituency cannot make their own comment but just the focus is about really the GNSO as a policy body.

And so in the – in that response they highlighted I think several concerns. One of them is the budget allocated for the GNSO for policy development and this is regarding I think enough resources.

And so what was – that allocation was conferred to the stakeholder engagement division and so that's - the headcount and the budget is increasing their wide and the one for the policy development is not.

So that what was highlighted and I think this is an area for interest for us because we kind of – it's – as we are participating in the GNSO policy development we do need to get more support in term of staff and so on to make progress on several processes going on.

I cannot see the comments from GNSO Council in the link. I'm trying to find that but in meantime any question or comment and so if you want any clarification or - please do so. I really happy to give more information.

Okay so we'll ask Stephanie as she's also on the GNSO Council if she has any thought about the response drafted by the GNSO Council in order to be more accurate by drafting team. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Hi. Sorry, what was your question again Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: We are discussing about the GNSO Council…

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: For the budget.

Rafik Dammak: ICANN budget and if you have any thoughts or comments about that.

Stephanie Perrin: Well actually – because that was the – Ed was looking after that so I didn't pay any attention to it to be honest. I figured that was his bailiwick so I'm sorry.

I'll just have to go along with the vote here. We don't know what our particular views are on the matter. I know that at one time Ed was talking about voting it down but I haven't had an update in the last while, and there was a budget meeting about a week ago.

So obviously I'll have to check the tape of that budget meeting a week ago and find out what was said and get ready for the meeting tomorrow. So as I think the chat has indicated we're not really well prepared and this is a very, very full meeting tomorrow so it's difficult.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. No problem Stephanie. So in term of – let's say the term of the response from the GNSO Council is not that long on itself. There were some general comments that we are, I mean, GNSO Council is asking for more kind of - I'll say we made a comment for the last fiscal year and it didn't seem that they were reviewed or responded.

And so here just to highlight again that with – because we have now the empowered community that should be taken more in consideration. But as I said before wanted to express it - is really about the resource allocation and staffing here, the - comparing what the, I mean, the GNSO is getting in terms of supporting policy development compared to the global engagement.

Myself here I don't want to put this kind of comparison but I would like – I think it's okay to highlight that we need more resources but also think that we need to be kind of clear what we are asking for.

It's not just about like raising headcount and so on but is really what are the areas that we need to cover? On the other hand I'm - just kind of feel a little

bit maybe not concerned but this is kind of – I find it a little bit strange is with regard of the new gTLD transaction fees.

They are just here asking that - we are asking that the ICANN finance staff consults with the GNSO Contracted Party. I understand this is kind of maybe position from the Contracted Party but I'm not sure.

Is this something for the GNSO Council as whole to support or not so this is that kind of comment. I really wanted to – if we – to discuss this with - Ed unfortunately is not here.

With regard to the response from NCSG to the ICANN budget my understanding is that Financial Committee cannot draft these for some reason, and so maybe it will end up with the Policy Committee to handle that.

So if we have a volunteer - and I see that Martin is volunteering so we – if we can get the group of volunteers to work on that because the deadline for the public comments is the 28th of April, which mean just not mistaking in ten days.

So we can get all the volunteers so I see on the list and to start drafting as soon as possible so we can get time to endorse it by the Policy Committee. Okay is there any question or comment on this?

And I really encourage if we want to – just to raise your hand if you have any question. Okay. So I guess if there is nobody in the queue – but I see maybe some question in the Adobe Connect.

So what I can see – I'm not sure. I mean, I see for example Tapani say that it was not discussed in the Financial Committee and also I got the heads up from Ed that they – it was not possible for him to organize that.

So I got the understanding that the Policy Committee has to cover anyway for that part, and also we have several public comments anyways to cover so we'll see how we can handle them.

So we will have to share the workload anyway and probably to prioritize so we – okay. Well so I can respond Tapani. We didn't get any input from the Financial Committee anyway so okay.

So if we can move to the next agenda items it's about the approval of GNSO nominee for the registration directory service review team, and those names were sent by a selection – Standing Selection Committee, which was set a few weeks ago and we have – we are supposedly having three representatives there.

I think at least we have one of the representatives in the call who is Poncelet. Maybe he can give us some briefing or update about the process and how they reached the conclusion about the slate of the names for this review team. Poncelet? Can you hear me?

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes. Good afternoon Rafik. Good afternoon. Good morning. Good evening wherever you are. Poncelet Illeleji for the record. Yes the review team have been – the SSC team have been going on well.

We had – there was kind of two service options that were separated by Marika for us to choose on the update, and we have done the selection on criteria and

we all went for option one which was very straightforward, and questionnaire that we had to rate the candidate did by experience and stuff like that.

And four top candidates and – came up in the initial review which I passed on the names within the RPC policy group in the (unintelligible) Susan Kawaguchi, Erika Mann, Stephanie Perrin, and can't remember the last name now, but they were all women, all of them.

And later on yesterday there was a meeting. Someone wants (Frederick) – one of the constituencies one has technical (unintelligible) knowledge to be on the committee. So they are trying to make this top three instead of top four. And I'm personally insisting that we should stay as top four. That's the (voted) (unintelligible) process, so why should be (unintelligible) and especially (unintelligible) the top four happen to be women.

And now because one constituency so I insisted, I said we have to keep to the top four and people between five and seven position will go into the second round. So that's what we are still talking on, on whether it should (unintelligible) the top three.

But I'm still insisting on the top four as I communicated to you all. So so far that (unintelligible) and we might have another meeting tomorrow to find how to consensus on that. And then (Renata) who is also on the (unintelligible). Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Poncelet for the explanation. So okay, I saw that Stephanie is already in the queue. Yes Stephanie, please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. I just wanted to signal that it would be very unusual given what's in the WHOIS review – this is Stephanie Perrin for the record – for the registrars

and registries – i.e., the contracted parties -- not to have someone on that review team because a lot of the requirements of that WHOIS review were information verification and update requirements and, you know, there are implications in that WHOIS review for actual actions that the registrars have to take.

So I would assume that they want to - they want a position on that group. When you say technical – people with technical expertise -- it's really a representative of the constituency that has to spend the money.

So I expect that one's not going to go away. How many meetings does Poncelet think you're going to have on this? And is there any way we could include the next runner-up who I think Volker Greimann is a runner-up. He would be representing the registrars. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Stephanie.

Poncelet Ileleji: Yes Poncelet speaking for the record. Thanks Stephanie. Yes Volker is... Thank you Rafik. Thanks Stephanie. Poncelet speaking for the record. Yes the next person on the list is Volker. I totally agree with someone from the data committee but he was fifth on the list.

And then what I was saying is I think five to seven, someone has to - people have (unintelligible) to be selected based on the rankings. We should do that (unintelligible) but (unintelligible) insisting on going through and by the back door and trying to justify that okay he has got this technical; he has to be there when the voting has taken place to me was not fair because (unintelligible) easily and talk to people and say okay appoint Volker, someone on the - you have to place (unintelligible) someone should come from the technical committee.

I thought we agreed on the first consensus. They came back later to say okay no, we have to change it. Volker has to be there. And I said no I got some e-mails (unintelligible) what you think I said. No I'm still going to insist on the top four. I mean, he's within the top seven, so he's going to fit into the second round.

And I think that is fair enough. He is going to comment while we are there that one of the (unintelligible), he is one of them. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Poncelet. Stephanie, is it an old or a new hand?

Stephanie Perrin: Sorry, old hand. If he's around for the second round, that would be great as long as there's no risk that he's falling off because we do need a registrar there.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks Stephanie. I see a question from Avri. Maybe Poncelet can clarify because if consensus based means that if someone disagree and it just needs full - let's say full consensus here. Maybe Poncelet can you clarify a little bit about the process here, how the standing committee (unintelligible) matter? And I see Avri is in the queue. Okay Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes let me explain my question. I thought that the decision coming out of the group had to be a consensus decision. How you got to it whether you voted to get rankings or not probably doesn't matter, although it seems very voting intensive.

But I thought that once you had a list of people that there would have to be consensus among all of you. So I guess I have two questions.

One, is that an active or a passive consensus? In other words, does everyone have to agree? Did the registrars have to agree to a slate that included no registrars? And if they did, well then, you know, you do have a consensus.

Or is it a passive consensus where they didn't answer in 24 hours and therefore it can be assumed that the registrars have agreed to a slate without a registrar? So I just want to make sure I understand that this was still consensus based. Was there a consensus and what form of consensus based is it? Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Avri. Poncelet?

Poncelet Ileleji: Poncelet speaking for the record. Yes thank you Avri. Poncelet speaking for the record. It was consensus based. We had a consensus on the top four to be selected. And then five, six, and seven were also (unintelligible) and discussions was going to go further on how we can have a (unintelligible) arrangement either through the SOs for them to be selected.

While we're told to report to our (unintelligible) (Frederick) came back and said no, that's okay, (unintelligible) wants (unintelligible) with us someone from (unintelligible) someone can be swapped from maybe the (unintelligible) and Volker (unintelligible).

No, that it should be like we agreed one to four. Now we are coming (unintelligible). At the time we made the consensus we could have held those (unintelligible) constituency. So that's where we had these other call and e-mails went out (unintelligible) somebody (unintelligible) I was e-mailed whether if I'll be satisfied with six and Stephanie Perrin was (unintelligible) on the list (unintelligible).

And if I would agree then Susan Kawaguchi with Klaus and replaced by Stephanie to go for top three and putting Volker there. I like that (unintelligible) to be top four. I'm not saying anybody should be dropped or not. And we should stick to the top four what we agreed on on the consensus and between five to seven.

And we should decide on (unintelligible) which is Volker which I understand it (unintelligible) will likely (unintelligible). So that was going to a consensus. It wasn't really passive when the consensus was agreed. People had to go back to their constituency, and I think pressure was put on us why we are having to be (unintelligible), why it would be sorted out (unintelligible). Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Poncelet. Avri, did you want to comment? Okay so thanks Poncelet. If I understand correctly, there was no objection and so it was kind of explicit consensus, clear one. Okay.

Okay so seems that the process was correctly conducted. However, as Stephanie highlighted, there is an issue about the presence of those maybe who are kind of impacted by any WHOIS change.

But so at the end it's up to the GNSO Council to approve or not the slate of candidates. Okay. Is there any further comment or question here? And yes thanks to Poncelet and (unintelligible) for the work in the standing committee. I think there are still more appointment coming soon, so thanks for the work done there.

Dorothy Gordon: Sorry to interrupt. This is Dorothy Gordon. Rafik I'm not clear. After hearing Stephanie and Poncelet, what is the slate we are actually taking forward?

Rafik Dammak: Okay so we get from the standing committee – the selection standing committee – the three kind of let's say – each SO, I mean, supporting organization advisory committee can nominate up to seven candidates.

The first three preferred candidates are being guaranteed a spot. So those are Susan, Erika, and Stephanie. So we are sure that they will get selected. We have other - the other names we added. So they may be selected or not.

So what I think my understanding from Poncelet and Stephanie is that we have like the one of the registrar induce (unintelligible) from four to seven candidate and so it's possible that for him to be selected. But yet (unintelligible) it's not necessarily the case.

Dorothy Gordon: So we actually don't know if the three top ones will be selected. And so…

Rafik Dammak: No we don't.

Dorothy Gordon: …that was what we were discussing.

Rafik Dammak: No, no, the top three one will be selected. They are guaranteed…

Dorothy Gordon: Guaranteed.

Rafik Dammak: …a slot. Also…

Dorothy Gordon: Guaranteed, and it could be that the registrar is added because that constituency needs to be represented. It could be.

Rafik Dammak: It could be but it's not guaranteed, so it's – yeah.

Dorothy Gordon: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks Dorothy. So we are kind of experimenting with the new process with the selection committee and also that as community we have now much more involvement in term of nomination and selection. So it's all kind of exploratory process.

And I guess we'll have to discuss with regard to the outcome and the process and the next call is not just about being rubber stamp for what came from the standing committee. So I think all these points will be rised (sic).

Okay so maybe I missed something. I see that there was some proposal from Avri in the Adobe Connect? Okay.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I did not make a proposal. I just proposed a comment for a future comment on this whole process, that's all. I put a place marker in for a future comment.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks Avri. I understand this is about someone from - okay understand the committee being himself a candidate and how that should be handled, okay.

Okay I think we can rise (sic) this and as we approve it and, how say, forming the standing committee and by its charter we had - we stated that the GNSO Council should review and maybe we need to (adjourn) the charter based on the experience of seeing what area we have to improve. Okay.

Is there any question or other comment on this issue? So moving to the next agenda time, which is just discussion item. And this to discuss the amended

charter for the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. So the working group sent to the GNSO Council an amended charter and for Copenhagen meeting but because it was sent quite close to the meeting, there was no enough time to review and to have a proper discussion.

So it was kind of postponed for this call. So basically you may be kind of wearing the hat of the co-chair for the cross-community working group. In Hyderabad meeting, we got kind of - we heard the concerns from the GNSO Council about the structure and that for the working group in that maybe that working group is not aligned with the newly approved framework cross-community working group.

And so the working group was tasked to review the current charter and to propose amendments and to propose a new structure that maybe feed its – how say – its mission. So we worked on making changes in the charter. And that basics in the template from the uniform framework for cross-community working group.

And we found out that there is not so much difference but we used that opportunity to adjust maybe to the same language and to align it when it's needed. And we proposed that for the GNSO Council but also for other charting organization for review.

So we will have that discussion GNSO Council. I didn't hear any - I didn't see any question or comment yet. So we will see what will be the reaction in the next call but there was no - I don't think there was any concern last time in the Copenhagen meeting but let's see what can be the question anyway. Okay, is there any question or comment on this or any clarification?

Okay the next agenda item, which is the planning for the next meeting, which is in Johannesburg. So we got kind of a block - draft block schedule. It is in a four-day policy forum, so it's more shorter than like the other meeting. And it's centered on policy discussion.

So the draft block schedule really is about – how say – allocating most of the time slot for policy discussion and in particular the working groups and so on. And so for the GNSO Council, we will try to see if there is any concern or issues.

But I think this is maybe just to highlight that maybe for Tapani and Farzaneh that they are also - Klaus as they are the chair of NCSG, NCUC and NPOC. If they have anything they want to share and so we try to coordinate in term of the stakeholder group and constituency meeting request.

I think there are not so many time slots available for the groups, but we should coordinate anyway. Tapani, any update on this or something that you can share with regarding to the scheduling? In the meantime I see that Avri raised her hand. Yes Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes this is Avri speaking. I have a question. In terms of these plannings, so I guess that Klaus, Farzi, and Tapani are participating in the group that is organizing all the sessions and doing the scheduling not only of the constituency and stakeholder type things but also of the policy and the outreach.

And I wonder how - if they can tell us how that process is going as someone who has put in application for a working group meeting, and we're also talking about this conversation. It seems sort of black boxish. And so I'm

wondering if one of the three can sort of explain how that whole process is working and etcetera. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Avri. I think I can respond just for the first question. All the chair are participating I think in the planning group and they have a regular call. And I think at the GNSO Council it was shared that your working group and new gTLDs subsequent procedure made two requests for a meeting.

But yes definitely I think Tapani can clarify more on what's going on in term of the process. But it seems that he can only respond on chat, so if you can ask him on the Adobe Connect. Okay yes Stephanie, please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes hi. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Just a little update on privacy. As was discussed at the Copenhagen meeting, we are going to try to keep up the attendance of data commissioners at the meeting in Johannesburg. So Peter Kimpian is a little (unintelligible) but he says he has broached the matter with some of the African GPAs and they are interested.

So I am going to the International Working Group on Data Protection and Telecommunications meeting next Sunday in Washington. So I will try and get some interest among the African commissioners that show up at that meeting. And there aren't very many that - well, of course, who know? They might come to Washington whereas maybe not Europe.

But I know the Marrakesh one, the Moroccan one is certainly very active. They hosted the meeting a year ago, so we'll see what happens. Thanks. And the RDS group is having a lengthy public meeting there, so…

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Stephanie. You mean that - you were talking about having kind of
                  (BBN) meeting or the (DBA) are coming or attending the ICANN meeting in
                  Johannesburg?

Stephanie Perrin: It is not clear what kind of a presence they would have quite frankly. I'm
                   waiting for Peter to get back to me on that because this is the short policy
                   meeting. But it was very effective last time to have the UN special rapporteur
                   come to the RDS meeting in (unintelligible). So that might be the approach
                   that one would take to this one is to bring some of the (DPAs) to the RDS
                   meeting because there is going to be a fairly lengthy discussion of the PDP
                   this time. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Stephanie. Avri please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes thanks. Avri speaking again. Seem to be doing that too much today.
                  One of the things I wanted to mention now that we're talking about some of
                  the content and some of it was proved - and it was mentioned - you mentioned
                  that the new gTLD subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group had applied
                  for two sessions.

                  And yeah, and I basically, you know, want to basically explain that a little,
                  though people may have already heard and also appeal for NCSG support on -
                  and counsel on a schedule that includes that.

                  This is the thing that we've been planning since the last meeting in terms of
                  trying to get everybody into a discussion on geographical names at the top
                  level.

                  It's something that there have been many different working groups and
                  drafting groups in GAC, in ALAC, in GNSO and who knows where else and

across-community working groups working on it. And it's something that needs to be resolved before there could be any other, you know, application period for new gTLDs

So trying to get a community discussion on it, we have two Webinars next week, and I sent out reminders, but I'll send them out again to sort of - I think there's like 11 or 12 different positions being presented on the geographical names at the top level issue.

And then the two meetings are meant - one at the beginning of the week to hash out the issues and trying to bring in perhaps a neutral, you know, facilitator as well as Jeff and I to lead the discussions and moderate them and then to try and over the course of the week and at the week if not come up with a solution come up with really a solid process of what we're going to do because remembering that we're starting at a place where the new gTLD recommendations last time did not include all of these lists of prohibited geographical names.

They included just basically the connections and other processes. And the application guidebook, the AGB, put in a whole bunch of other things and put in lists and etcetera. And so we're at a point now where we either have to change the policy from before, we have to accept the AGB as policy, or we could add proposals for many, many things including a list of names that's similar to the trademark clearinghouse type of operation.

Those are the proposals that are on the table, so that's what we're trying to do with all these meetings is make something understandable out of this whole complex at the moment. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Avri. I think in term of community or high interest topic, my understanding the selection or the ranking is done within that planning group. And so our chairs should be I'd say to support this before - if we ask them I guess.

For now I guess we can rise that during the GNSO Council, and see how we can help to get that scheduled. And thanks for reminder about the Webinars. My understanding that it will be held on the 25th of April, which means next week.

But also I guess that people - do people need registration before or they just - we can share the link and they can join that or be connected?

Avri Doria: This is Avri again just butting in. No, they can just participate and so we'll send out links. The reason we wanted reservations is because we needed to know what kind of size room to get for the Adobe Connect and there you can arrange little ones, medium ones, big ones and so we needed reservations to give us a clue. But no it'll be open to just come in.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. So we will share the link prior to the Webinar. Okay so we'll try to response during the GNSO call and see how also hopefully we can get an update from Tapani with regard to the progress on the scheduling for Johannesburg. We are done with the GNSO agenda and we can go now with the public comments. And we have a long list that should be covered. Maryam can you please share that in the Adobe Connect so we can go through the list? Okay as you can see here we have a long list of ongoing public comments. Some of them are really, really close and so I'm not sure that we can cover them but at least we can try.

So the first one is interim paper Cross Community Working Group and the use of names and countries and territories as top level domains. And I do think this is related to what Avri was talking about the new gTLD and all these discussions about geo names. The deadline is just this week. I'm not sure if anybody was following or was planning to make a comment but if at least if there is any volunteers so we can try and see if we can at least even make short comment about one or two important things that we want to highlight. I mean we just - we don't just need one individual, one person to do that if a group of people can participate in draft something. So please if you want to volunteer just try to help.

Okay so the other public comment it is about enhancing the accountability guidelines for good faith. And this is one of the report from the Cross Community Working Group and the Accountability Subgroups. And maybe those who are involved with on that subgroups maybe can give more details or some briefing. Robin as you are our representative on the Cross Community Working group do – are you aware who is participating from NCSG and that subgroup who can take the lead on to respond to this?

Robin Gross: Can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes we can hear you.

Robin Gross: Can you hear me okay?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Robin Gross: Okay. Take me a second to get my audio connected there. So you were asking about the CCWG accountability and which - I'm sorry I'm not quite sure what you're asking about the CCWG accountability?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes since we are talking about the CCWG in fact we have two public
comments from two subgroups from the CCWG. The first one is about
enhancing accountability guidelines for good faith and I think that's quite
closed deadline just next week and the other one just the new public comment
which is a recommendation to improve SO AC accountability. So we are
trying here to see if we have any NCSG members participating in both
subgroups and if we can get a volunteer to work on even the short statement
from NCSG.

Robin Gross: Yes that's a great idea. I think Avri was one of the rapporteurs of the SO AC -
no, maybe that was Farzi SO AC accountability. And I think it would be
helpful if we put in a comment that supported these recommendations that the
group has come up with. Yes with Farzi that was the rapporteur of that group.
So I think it would, you know, I think that is definitely something we want to
do.

On the other one on good faith for standards for board removal again I think
that was another set of recommendations that came out fairly well. Lori
Schulman was the rapporteur of that group and I think it would be fine if
NCSG put in comments in support of those recommendations as well. There's
going to be, you know, at least nine of these different reports. I'm not sure that
we necessarily need to do comments on each and every one of the subgroups.
Some of – I think it's more important we make sure we've got people that are
on board for the groups, the subgroups that we really care about like the
transparency issues and the human rights subgroup and the jurisdictional
issues.

I think that, you know, those are – it's more important to focus on those but I
don't want to discourage anyone from doing comments on the other

subgroups as well, quite the opposite. But I just want to sort of draw people's attentions to I don't think every subgroup should be given sort of, you know, equal time on the NCSG docket because some of them are just not going to be quite as important or quite as controversial or quite need quite the amount of support in order to get the recommendations past. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Robin. Well I mean I think this is all the kind of issue reports so maybe we can comment for the next version. But if anybody is interested why not? I mean it's kind of good exercise to go through the report and to draft a statement. It doesn't need to be long one just short really highlighting a viewpoint that we deem important. Okay so the next one is about competition consumer trust and consumer choice Review Team Draft Report, the recommendation for new gTLDs. And my understanding is that Poncelet volunteered this one. So Poncelet when are you planning to share with us a draft for review?

Poncelet Ileleji: Yes I'm doing it this week. I'm doing it on Thursday and I will share it by Thursday. Poncelet speaking for the record.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Poncelet. That's great to hear. So if you share it by Thursday please do it in the NCSG resource so the - please also the Policy Committee should start reviewing in that time and to endorse it by the deadline. Okay the next public comment and we talk about it a little bit during the GNSO agenda which is about fiscal year 2018 operating plan and budget and the five-year operating plan. So we had some discussion on the Adobe Connect who kind of should handle this but at the end of the day the Policy Committee will have to endorse the draft.

So we need a group of volunteers to work on this. And my understanding that we have Martin and Stephanie or just so we can have a group of people and

try to work on quickly on the NCSG response. Okay and Sam okay we have three people. That's good. Good, we have a short time so we should kind of start the discussion quickly.

Okay so the next public comment which is the GNSO community comment too on new gTLD subsequent procedure policy development process. And maybe Avri as the co-chair can you just describe why about this, I mean what means exactly the community comment because it's not kind of maybe something usual and also if there is possibility for extension. I saw that in the working group and seems that something that may happen. Yes Avri please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Sure thing, this is Avri speaking again. So on this one a community comment is actually something quite old. It used to be called constituency comment and is a fixed part of every policy development process PDP Working Group. So it's just that what – since these days we're going beyond just the constituencies at least the constituencies when formally defined in PDP we call the community comment. And now we decided that on this one in this PDP we decided to do two of them. We did one earlier which was the six overarching issues. We talked about that a bunch in NCSG but never got to a consensus comment on it.

And by the way I totally endorse what you said. People just first of all sent in their own comments. If you read it and you've got just one two sentence comment to make both send it in as your own comment to the comment period and send it to, you know, the PC or it's drive document and input it as part of that. Getting your comment in both directly and as part of a consensus comment is kind of a useful thing to do.

But anyhow getting back to this one. So now we've got the second and this is on all the specific issues that the various sub teams have been working on. We have four sub teams. We've had 30 plus some issues. So this is a very long list of questions specifically – specific questions about aspects of the new gTLD process from, you know, geographical names as we talked about and contract issues and public interest comments and, you know, regulated industries -- just about anything community questions on all these things all the way through. Now no one is expected to have an answer to all of them but a lot of groups do have opinions and positions on several of them. So we're asking people to go through an answer the ones that matter to them.

Yes there's been a request from the GAC for an extension. They asked for a month. We can't pull off a month because of our need to have something to deliver to the Johannesburg meeting and document deadlines and everything else but the probability is that we will extend it by two weeks but we are - but we're taking that decision at our next meeting. So that's a probability but not a definite and I wouldn't recommend waiting until the current deadline of the 1st of May to start looking at the questions because there's lots of them. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Avri for this. And we need volunteers to draft this. So we cannot volunteer Avri since she is the co-chair and this is an opportunity for others to champion and to participate. I mean the new gTLD (unintelligible) program is one of the main policy of the development. And the last years and I mean it's good time to participate and this is good opportunity to start. Any volunteer for this? I really encourage many people to kind of to participate so we can share the workload and can be more easier to participate.

Yet so yes Avri. I've been reading the document. It's a really good start I mean the best way to understand what's going on and to make your own

opinion on the issues. The next public comment is about internationalize the domain name implementation deadlines. And I think this topic matter is for all. Those who are speaking a language that they are not using Latin scripts so that's also is important as a matter of diversity. So for those who are I mean speaking this language they may be interested to go through the guidelines and see if there's anything interesting there. I mean at least even in term of reading it's interesting. You can see if there is any possibility to make a comment.

Okay jumping in for your comment Avri. I will be happy to create the Google Doc for all those public comments and help the volunteers to start. I mean that I think it's quite easy way to start and to encourage everyone to jump in. Okay we can - I do that, okay. The next public comment which is the - about the African domain name system market study commissioned by ICANN and I think this is really of interest for those from Africa to see if this study was exhaustive. It did cover issues that are of interest for us and he is speaking as for African. So I do really encourage those from Africa to volunteer for this one because probably it's more close to our concerns and issue we have. So anybody want to jump in and participate for this one?

Dorothy Gordon: This is Dorothy Gordon. I will volunteer for that one.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Dorothy okay, writing your name for that okay. Okay anybody else? And please if you can also put for the - which public comment you want to volunteer so we can take note and follow-up later. Yes Stephanie please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes hi, Stephanie Perrin for the record. I don't know whether I am jumping ahead here Rafik. If so you can bat me back and I'll wait. But the next, the two items there on the proposed fundamental bylaws changes to move the

Board Governance committee reconsideration process responsibility toward committee and the deferral of country code code names supporting organization review these are kind of important from a structural and procedural point of view. There was a discussion on the list of about the deferral of the ccTLD review. As folks may or may not know we have a lot of these kind of structural reviews that come every three years, five years or whatever it is and the ccTLDs want to defer theirs.

There are views on either side. I think that folks have been extremely busy so I can understand the desire to postpone something. We had this debate over the review of the Whois findings because we're in the middle of a PDP that is starting from scratch on all the Whois stuff. So it seems a little crazy to do a review of the last Whois study group but nevertheless we are going forward with it.

So I would really like members too, you know, give us their views on how they feel about this. Should we do these wretched things on time whether or not we have the bandwidth and whether or not it's appropriate or should we allow people to defer? The risk of course being once you start not respecting timelines there is a risk that things are going to slide for years and not happening.

So I think this is kind of boring procedural stuff but it's an important point. Thanks. The other one on in terms of the board there are a lot of subcommittees being formed at the board level and one wonders how that's working.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Stephanie okay. So for the time being we are trying to get people to volunteer for those. Okay so for the proposed fundamental bylaw change to move the board Governance Committee consideration process responsibilities

I think this is quite important, you know, just about structural. With regard to reconciliation process and we know how much the kind of issue that we are having with that one. Okay so anybody want to volunteer for this one? Can you hear me? There's silence. Hello?

Woman: We can hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Oh okay thanks. I was wondering if I was disconnected. Okay so we have Matt for the board change and okay and for the deferral for the country codes I think this is really I say this - expands my Stephanie procedural but I think it's also a good opportunity to join. I mean should not be a long statement just to maybe state some reason if we agree or disagree with the difference. So a good opportunity for a newcomer to join and he will find or she will find help from those maybe more experienced so no worry on that. So who want to kind of get this task?

Okay and so I think we've covered most of the public comments. Please send an Adobe Connect if you want to volunteer for any public comments. It's still open for participation. And we will send again the list of public comments to the mailing list to ask people if they want to volunteer.

And I will start to create a Google Doc for each one just kind of to key calls and to move forward. Okay I think we went through all the public comments. Now before moving to any other business also we have the opportunity to if anyone want to share any policy update or (pleading) on any matter in particular. For those who are participating in working groups if they want to write something - if you want to write or to share something with us or we - that we should participate or comment or this is an opportunity for that.

Okay I understand that most of you are tired after the long Easter weekend enjoying chocolate but okay and so if there is no - if nothing to share we can move maybe to the next agenda item which is any other business? You want to raise an issue or you want to put any topic for discussion?

Okay it seems that we are reaching almost the close of this call but before adjourning I want to thank everyone for attending. And I just want to maybe say sorry for the new comer if sometime the discussion was not enough clear really we have the participation of all the GNSO council so we can give more updates about what's going on in terms of policy and to explain better about the motion we have on table.

But we will try to follow-up in the NCSG list and share more details because these calls are an opportunity for us to share and to give some briefings. But most important is to get your input and your question and comments.

I know that maybe it's not always easy to raise your hand and to ask question but please do so. I mean there is no question it is quite important that you participate. And you will request a clarification and inquire for more details because at the end we have to represent you and we need all the diversity of opinion and point of view. So if you have any questions or comment please feel free to ask me or other any time. And it's is not just let's say it's really genuine request for me. If you want to ask for clarification please do so. You can just send me email directly or to any other councilor or member of the Policy Committee and we are happy to respond to you. It's our role to give you all what the - is needed as information.

Okay, Matt so what I know is that for the budget comment we have Martin, Sam and Stephanie. For the African DNS (unintelligible) we have Dorothy. And for the board bylaw change and the SO, AC accountability we have Matt.

And for the defer of the ccNSO review we have (Akram) and (Manaroni). So that one – the name I have for now I'm not sure if I'm missing someone in the Adobe Connect.

And also sorry, also we had Poncelet for the consumer choice and trust comment. And okay so thanks Matt. Thanks James. I will add you too.

Okay, okay thanks Bruno. I will put you for the - yes thanks. So I will send later out the mailing list the list of public comments. I tried to create a Google Doc for each and put also the names for who has volunteered and ask for those who are still missing volunteers. So okay thanks again for participating and looking for more enforcement from your side guys. Thanks again and see you soon. Bye-bye.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you for attending the meeting everyone. Franz you may stop the recording and disconnect all lines. Thank you for much for your time today. Goodbye.

END