

ICANN

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
December 18, 2017
5:53 am CT**

Maryam Bakoshi: Welcome everybody to the monthly NCSG policy call on Monday, 18 of December 2017 at 1200 UGC. On the call today we have Abdul Saboo Malik, Juan Manuel Rojas, (Miro), Nick Shorey, Rafik Dammak, Tatiana Tropina. And on your audio bridge we have Farell Folly, Arsène Tungali, Elsa Saade. And from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

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

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Maryam. Thanks everyone for joining today call. So it's the NCSG policy call. It's held monthly, and usually we organize it a few days before the GNSO Council call. It's an opportunity to – certain members hear about policy issues, and we usually use the GNSO Council call agenda to steer the discussion and hear input from our members.

I know that we have said this week is the ICF and (unintelligible) event. So many people are there attending the conference. So it should be challenging,

but we have – we had to get this call since we have the council call this Thursday.

So let us start first with the agenda. As you can see, we'll go through the GNSO Council for preparation, and then we go to the policy update. For the council agenda, it's shorter than usual. I only have one motion, and it will be the last council call for this year. So thanks Maryam for showing it.

As usual the first agenda items are kind of administrative – a lot of administrative matters. And so we start with the viewing – the action items from prior calls and also the updates of the project leads. We are not going to go through that but I advise everyone to go through this document.

They are quite interesting, in particular the project leads since it summarize the status of all working group and policy efforts initiated by the GNSO. So you can get a snapshot of what's going on, usually a short description and update, and also with links to those related working groups. So I really advise you to (unintelligible) you can see it in (unintelligible).

Okay. So the first substantive agenda item is #4, and it's got council vote to adopt the charter for the GNSO Standing Committee on Budget and Operation on interim basis. So my ground is that with the NSO chief transition and the ICANN accountability mechanisms, we had in part community. And the GNSO is one of the decision of participant in this empowered community.

And one of the powers is related to the budget. So before, I mean in the last years, the GNSO didn't really intervene or issue the ICANN budget and operating plan. Maybe some of the stakeholder groups and constituency have such interest and follow that closely, but the GNSO as supporting organization didn't really pay attention.

But now it's changing, since we are in the – let's say part of the (unintelligible) community we have to follow that. Since we can – we have to vote on the budget, and it's possible to veto on it if some groups are not happy. For that the council is delegating here this work to extended community, formed mostly by councilor, and also have some members outside the council from the stakeholder groups and constituency.

And they usually – it's a three-subject matter expert. So the whole theory is about – I don't think the charter for this new standing committee. In fact there's no kind of new – I mean the idea is not new to have a standing committee. We have one for (unintelligible) standing committee – a standing selection committee. So it's kind of now that the council tried to delegate to more dedicated group of people to work on this specific area.

I went through the charter. I don't see any – the scope is quite limited. It's really about the budget for ICANN and operating plan, and also for the PTI. And before that there was the drafting team that worked on delivering this draft charter. And as the first activities they drafted two comments for public consultation regarding the PTI and IANA functions budget, and another one about the ICANN reserve fund level.

So it was for them a first kind of attempt or trial to see how it thinks we go. And so from that we are – from that we are learning from those experience and how it's kind of if a small group can handle this comment. So the standing committee if approved will help at first action to work on the ICANN budget for the next fiscal year – fiscal year 2019, and so to deliver kind of a recommendation to the council on how to act to that budget and (unintelligible).

So this was kind of a quick background explanation about why we are having this motion. But now it's time maybe for a question or a comment on this. So any question, or if you want more clarification about this? I don't see any comment.

Oh, that's here. I'm not sure if you can click on the links in Adobe Connect so you can go to the motion and also to the draft charter that's there. But I will share it in – also in Adobe Connect Chat if it's more easy to access. Okay.

Anyway, so from my side I think we can vote yes to this motion without problem unless we hear from other, maybe if they have any concern on the rights and comments regarding it. But I think at the end it's useful for the council to make it more easy to cover this area that we didn't really pay attention on before.

And also it will be – I mean it will be in interim phases. And the charter will be reviewed later, I think after the first work on the ICANN budget, so we can decide if we can continue with this structure or not. So we have that way to review the charter, to update it, make it – maybe to make some amendments if we think it didn't work well. Okay, any question?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Rafik, Poncelet (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thanks. Yes, Poncelet, please go ahead.

Poncelet Ileleji: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Sorry Poncelet, I'm having hard time to hear you. Poncelet, can you speak?

Maryam Bakoshi: Poncelet, will you try speaking again please? We can't hear you.

Poncelet Ileleji: I'm just wondering if you have any timelines on this review of the charter.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry Poncelet, I heard that you were asking if I have any idea about the timeline, but I'm not sure about which one you are talking about. Is it about ICANN budget?

Poncelet Ileleji: (Unintelligible). I'm just wondering Rafik if you have any timelines for this review of the charter.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Poncelet. So I'm going to share the link to the charter in the Adobe Connect Chat. I think – I'm not sure if it's timeline, but the cycles are really around the AGM. So I'll say we'll review – I think it will be similar to the standing selection committee since it can change every year with a new council and so on.

So that's kind of the cycle that this standing committee would have. But since it's really only focusing on the ICANN budget, most of its work will be done soon. I think they are in the cycle for that budget. It's around – it's really start soon, and things should be done at (unintelligible) because it's the ICANN board approval and then also the approval by the empowered community.

So I guess most of the work will be done really within the first six months or even shorter. I hope that did answer your question. I'm not sure if it was that or not. Any further comment or question?

Okay. So I guess we can move to the next agenda item, and it's – I think it's a little bit complicated. And this is stopping (unintelligible) many times to the

council. So it's update in the charter (unintelligible) to the next steps for the ICANN consider of handling WHOIS conflict with privacy.

So the topic regarding handling WHOIS conflict with national laws, it was a kind of topic for discussion I think for the last two years. And there was kind of – I'm not going to say an ad hoc group, but I think that's the way how we can describe it. It was the Implementation Advisory Group.

And they tried to work on different mechanisms to see how they can handle the WHOIS conflict with the privacy. And I think they proposed what they call the triggers. But when the time come for implementation, we find out that it's not really working. And when it's about implementation that's managed by I think a global domain name division, and they send a letter to the GNSO Council asking for guidance in how we should handle that.

So in this topic like was in for discussion for a while. And after that there was a decision within the council is that we need to find a way to move forward. And for that they – we proposed to create kind of a draft team to work on charter and to propose guidelines parameters around score deliverable membership and operating procedure to create a new group that will work on this issue and take in consideration that if it's bad, receive it in the public comment.

So there was a public comment I think around June or July that also – that NCAG participated in regarding the proposed triggers. And so the idea here is kind of taking – how say – the GNSO to take the lead here and try to work on that using the feedback and the input we got in the last public one – so maybe, just maybe to explain to people why we are handling this.

So we have the WHOIS, and I mean kind of the requirement is through ICANN policy. But what is required and what is kind of requested that provision in the domain – how to say – the important contract between the registrar and ICANN which is the registrar accreditation agreement. We found out that...

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Rafik, we lost you right there. Hi everyone. I think Rafik will join in a few minutes. He will rejoin in a few minutes. Thank you for your patience.

Hi Rafik, we still can't hear you.

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: Great, okay. Thank you. We can hear you now.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, sorry.

Maryam Bakoshi: We can hear you now Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. So what I was trying to explain is just to – yes, so I mean all this issue is related that we have an ICANN policy that what kind of request it was in contradiction with national for data protection. And this was the world's attempt to try to create what they call trigger and the way that either the registrar get – and if legal advice either from legal firm or also from the authorities that to get a waiver from applying this provision.

But it's clear that it's not a functioning or really implementable solution, and so here we're trying to rework on this area. And things can be – can get little bit complicated with the incoming GDBR. So basically this is not a topic for vote for now, but it's mostly a topic for discussion.

We supported the creation or the solution to have this new drafting team to kind of outline the setup for a new group to work on a way to move forward. And we have (Stephanie Valot) this, so we are supporting this effort. And the agenda item, it was just a (unintelligible) maybe to ask the council for guidance, and if there are any question, that the drafting team want to ask to the council to get maybe some input or advice.

I hope I was somehow clear. I know that this is not kind of straightforward topic – kind of an issue that is asking for why now? But what they can summarize is quite important for us, and we hope this will – this kind of new direction maybe to fix it. But we are hoping for that. Okay, any question or comment? Okay, I don't see any.

I guess we can move maybe to the next agenda item, which is about another topic for discussion which is an update on the progress for the reissue of all rights protection mechanism and all GTLD data request. So the review of all rights protection mechanism is one of the heavy policy working group that we have at GNSO currently.

And it's reviewing all – I mean maybe as I was saying, maybe the rights protection mechanism can be misleading. What means here it's all the mechanism that protect trademark rights, so like the ADRP and also what was added.

So for first time we are having a review of all those mechanism and see if they are really doing what they are supposed to do, if they are really effective and so on, but also to see the impact on the registrant and on the registrars. So why we are putting these as an agenda item is that the working group wanted, and they made a request to do – to get support for data collection.

So we have a process in GNSO that can be used by working group to do. We'll have a policy making with data driven – data driven policy making. And so this for the first time that was initiated. And so the idea is from that working group is to collect data and also to have a survey designed by professional and so on. So it was a long request with explaining what they want to collect as a data and how and so on.

So we are having that as an agenda item to get an update from the working group about the status of that request, and also to get update about their timeline. So why we are doing this and the GNSO council? So the GNSO Council is tasked to manage all the policy making process related to (unintelligible) claims.

And so here we are doing our oversight work to see if all the working groups are respecting their work plan and their timeline. So here we are trying to get an update from that working group to see the impact of this data request and to see if there is any impact on this timeline.

So basically we'll get an update from the working group co-chairs. And one of them is (Stephie Kleinman) who is also an NCACNNC member. So we will see there if there is any problem, and if everything is going well, and if they are going to speak to their timeline. Any question about this or comment?

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Yes Poncelet, please go ahead.

Poncelet Ileleji: Poncelet speaking for the record. I'm just finding out if the council is – the GNSO Council be looking at anything (unintelligible) with regards to what

the right protection mechanism is doing in terms of your oversight you mentioned. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Poncelet. In term of substance, not really. We are not requesting an update on that matter, or I mean or if they have any initial report. That is not planned for now anyway. But here it's mostly really to get an update about the progress and if there is any change to their timeline.

So one problem we are having I think lately is – it's not a problem. That's the reality of the work we have, is that many of the working group, they are covering so many things. I mean the scope is quite large. And even if you would take like the Registration Directory Service or WHOIS working group, it's even multi-phased – will be like Phase 1, 2 and 3.

So what we are trying to do here is really to do kind of more close project management and insure that the timeline are respected. If there is any problem that we are – that we should be aware at early stage because we are also managing resources. The resources like – it's the stuff, the ICANN stuff, and also to have in mind that the burnout of the community.

So we need to keep things like alive and in time. Otherwise we'll have a lot of problem to get output as expected. So here it's just really to get an update from the working group. And this is – was initiated by their own request – the data request.

So in the motion that approved the data request, there was a resolution that we should get an update one month after that. And so this is just kind of – this is kind of a schedule thing. So they are supposed to give an update anyway. I hope that's clear.

But yes, so I mean in term of substance again, the GNSO Council should not really get on that matter. We are supposed to manage the process. And what we are following here is what we call the working group model, where most of the policy discussion happen in working group following the policy development process, which kind of – it's a longer process that involves the board, the GNSO Council and the working group, and also includes several milestones like the different reports and also the public consultation.

So at the end, the GNSO Council is to really monitor the process. We try to avoid to get into substance because I mean that mean we're being (unintelligible) kind of overriding what the community or the (unintelligible) process delivered. I guess maybe if – I mean if there is no comment or question here, I guess we will move to the next agenda item.

So the next agenda item is kind of – well it's some administrative and somewhat – somehow, and it's about the planning for ICANN 61. I mean it's kind of strange but that's the recent ICANN, and just we finished it like a few weeks ago with ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi. But we are already preparing for the next meeting in, I think it's in San Juan in Puerto Rico.

So we – how say – how meeting planning happens. So different group like this supporting organization and adversity committee leaders they or the representative that help participate in meeting planning calls or meetings and the ICANN staff prepare an initial block schedule for the ICANN meeting. And usually it follows a different format. So two years ago I think we or last year we started with what we called format A, B and C. And so they – the main difference is like the number of the days and also the focus on outreach on policy.

So for this meeting it will be at usual format and so we got the block schedule. But from the GNSO side we also have our own schedule. We try to use that block schedule and start planning for our own session. What we mean by our own session it's the working group session so we try to allocate more and more session and timeslot for working group to have face to face meetings so as to help them to make progress.

Also the working session for the council itself and it's usually the Sunday and also some session within the week and the internal meetings for the stakeholder groups and constituency. So we kind of we started to have the GNSO schedule and we will start receiving I mean here the council and the GNSO leadership to receive the request from the different group to have the session. So we are putting here this block schedule for kind of to get input and comment. So as you can understand it's administrative but it matters I think to the community here, the GNSO because this is how we organize our participation in ICANN meetings and to try to be effective as much as possible.

Another not issue but another matter related to the planning is organizing what we call the cross community session so that's an ongoing process with getting a proposal from within the community to have cross community session. It always kind of not controversial but is not easy because we have always had that discussion what can be really common across community session that really interest all the community all parts of ICANN. So it's always kind of an ongoing discussion and people are maybe I'd say aren't happy about that. But so the process started and getting the different request for meetings. Okay any question or comment on this?

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes Rafik I have a question. This is Juan from (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Yes?

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes I was following the email list and we have our proposal about the two GNSO outreach. What do you know about this proposal and maybe can we also to do that?

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Juan. Yes this is a good question. So both the GNSO office and I understand correctly that was - and this is an idea from Farzaneh that instead of having like separate stakeholder group and constituency outreach events is to have only one for the GNSO as a whole. But the thing like GNSO Council usually it (unintelligible) from trying to organize such thing and we kind of the idea is to have the outreach is really done by the Stakeholder Group and Stakeholder Group and constituency. So I think it's still up but maybe it's more like if the Stakeholder Group and constituency organizing them among themselves and to not go through the GNSO Council because it's not really its role. So I think the idea is still up. It just needs to kind of to see how we can organize it and to maybe create the proposal and I mean here at the NCUC and how we can coordinate with other stakeholder group and constituency and see what can be the format.

So in term of outreach the slots available are in I think it's supposed to be on Saturday but another problem if they will be kind of clashing with many policy working group sessions. So it's not easy to avoid a clash and so it's a question of trade-off here. Is it - does this respond to your question? Okay yes Nick please go ahead.

Nick Shorey: Thank you Rafik. Can you hear me okay?

Rafik Dammak: Please go ahead.

Nick Shorey: Yes this is just another observation. I know this sort of stuff is always really, really difficult but I'm just mindful particularly for NCSG folks who are mostly civil society and will have sort of other day jobs and that that I can imagine a situation where on the Saturday people are still traveling and arriving. So if as we're considering how we can try and squeeze everything in just to make sure that we've also got that in the back of our minds that the Saturday, certainly early Saturday might be a struggle potentially for some folks because they'll still be under sort of due to their travels to Puerto Rico. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Nick. I hear you because myself usually I cannot really arrive earlier than Saturday and yes. So I mean it's not easy and it's the problem is how we can limit the clash. So I guess one problem is that now if the current kind of said that we have the first working group session in Saturday because the problem when we try to put them in the middle of the week they - that's kind of almost impossible and there are a lot of overlap. So yes guess we will see how things will go.

With regard to the outreach we may have some flexibility but it's kind of they are trying to fit so many session in a few days and this is kind of my - one of my personal opinion and I don't think it's shared by many but I think when we change the format I don't think we the community and all this many part they try to change or adapt to it. So we are still trying to put so the same number of session even if we have less days and even when we have like kind of constrained like having a cross community session that they are supposed to not have so many privatizations. So but the point's taken and we'll see if we can find a way to - I mean to make it kind of more accessible and that everyone can join. Okay?

Any question or comment on this? Okay so we are reaching I'm saying the end of the GNSO Council agenda. As you can see it's quite short. So the last items in any other business is the second Security, Stability and Resiliency Review Teams is to get an update on the progress the SO and AC chairs.

So I'm not sure if everyone is aware but usually I mean I (unintelligible) say the ICANN is mandated to have different review teams covering the different area. And one of them is about the security and stability. But what happened it's kind of first time but some groups expressed concerns about the review team and they reached the board and the board and that time thought that we may – we should pose that to the Review Team for a while and led the community to work out the issues. So the discussion here are happening at the supporting organization adversity committees leadership or chairs. So they are trying to discuss and the way to move forward.

So my understanding from the updates is that it seems that the different groups or the other groups that other than GNSO are kind of not going to see, not keen but they are not that pressured to resume the work of the review team. They are still trying to see what are the issues and to find a solution. It is not clear what - even what are the issues because there are so many hearsay.

So now they are trying maybe to doing the review of the scoping document, I mean the scope as proposed by the Review Team and the skills metrics which all the skills of the different member of that Review Team. So I mean it's kind of still unclear how things can go on but we will get an update from the GNSO chair on this matter and yes Nick please go ahead.

Nick Shorey: Thank you Rafik. So I was an observer on the SSR2. And so I was aware that the - that SSAC could raise some concerns regarding the scope and the

personal expertise on the Review Team. And the ICANN board decided in response to suspend the work of the group and sort of go back and look at it again.

It's - I think there was a general feeling and certainly from, you know, sort of the (unintelligible) were part of that Review Team that it was fairly poorly handled by ICANN. It was quite a knee-jerk reaction with very little information and poorly communicated I think was your main - the main thing so yes so there was a bit of concern there. But in terms of going forward have you been given any timeline yet by the GNSO for when - so when this review is going to - this review of the review is going to be agreed and when it's going to be confirmed and the process that we can then expect going forward or is that what this item is going to discuss?

Rafik Dammak: So for the GNSO I mean I think the kind of consensus that we should start soon. And if yes so I think that's kind of my feeling is we should start soon. The problem is really with the other groups. They are not kind of they don't seem really keen to resume the work of the Review Team that quickly and...

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: So I think you can understand like the SSAC they are not that kind of business. They don't seem really ready for that. So it seems we are kind of in a situation that we are not going to start soon where from the GNSO perspective we are - I think we are pushing. So how to say it all discussions really happening at the leadership level, I mean the SO and AC so it's kind this is their one problem they are still discussing. And my understanding their discussion is happening in a weekly basis.

So that to – this just highlight how much these issue's important. But I think maybe things will move on when you I'm not sure if everyone is aware but the US government through the Department of Commerce they sent a letter through the board regarding this issue. And they don't seem happy. I guess this maybe so yes that, you know, that may move – push things a little – to move quickly.

So regarding to the notes I guess maybe some of them are in the council list which is open, I mean a public list but I will try to find that. And I guess we will get better how to say more updates in the council call. So I will try to maybe to get some bullet points or yes I will try to (unintelligible) about the latest update from that. So but I think at the end from just about this – yes it's not just about this Review Team but it's really all about all this review process because prior to the transition they will manage it by the board and now it's by the community. And so it's the first time we have this problem and it's up to the community to figure out the solution. So we can complain about all things happen and we can maybe try to blame someone but the situation is and we need to fix this issue as soon as (unintelligible). Okay any question on this?

Arsène Tungali: Rafik this is (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Yes Arsène?

Arsène Tungali: Yes I might suggest let me say two things about the (unintelligible) team because I mean this language (unintelligible) from the GNSO we are trying to, you know, to discuss this issue and come up with position such as the (unintelligible) by the next council meeting. But the stage I think that the GNSO I think we have the same understanding or we kind of agree that this

group, these review teams should resume it's (unintelligible) but what we heard from the GNSO council chair with regard to a discussion that the other SO and AC chairs are having with regard to when they think this review team resume.

We have the impression like other SO and ACs are not sharing much of their work because it seems that they have a lot of worries. They're (unintelligible) about so many things. They have a lot of concerns about the (unintelligible) but they are not willing to share with the team or with the word about which we are taking very long because we would like to see this moving forward but they are not - they're still not willing to move the discussion forward because they're still not sharing also their concerns about the Review Team.

But overall I think from beginning to - we kind of had the same understanding or the agreement that this group should (quit) soon. And so I've been discussing that and we would still have the issue (unintelligible) soon from that small group of GNSO councilors and that segment will be shared soon by the council to see that we come to the same understanding and we can probably share our own views or our final (scope) about the meeting. And so it will be up to the other (unintelligible) people chairs to - also (unintelligible) their final words that means if we are perhaps we finally deliver the (unintelligible) somehow thinking.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Arsène. So for this topic I think we will get the latest update in the council call. So I want kind of that we don't - we cannot predict what words we get as an update but from my understanding this - the work is still going on and it really depends on how - what kind of concerns and common ground do we find with other SO and AC so we cannot be just with GNSO unfortunately that to push this forward.

Maybe another information regarding the SSR2, James Gannon who is also a CSG member and member of the Review Team had to resign for a different reason and that was also shared through the council lead. So now we're also having this issue is regarding we have enough people in this review team or not because the people some raise the concern about participation as one of the problems so that's now several issue here. So it's still unclear how things see you fix it but we will keep you updated on this matter. Okay.

So the next - and the last item is about an update on the GNSO strategy planning session in January 2018. So this would be the first strategic planning meeting for the GNSO Council. So there are a lot of expectations from this in term of kind of okay of really planning for the year in term of policy and activities but also to discuss about the role of GNSO and the council with regard to the empowered community and all the changes that happens because ICANN accountability mechanism. So it's I mean, it's kind of new first time to have this. So there are a lot of expectations for sure.

It's not clear what will be the outcome but I think that we make a lot of progress and probably we make it more easier for us. I mean the councilor to work for the rest of the year and have something kind of common understanding about the objectives and the goals for the council. So after that hopefully we can share the draft agenda for the meeting and see what maybe just to be – what are – what will be the topic to be discussed there.

Okay so I think we are done with the GNSO council agenda and we can move to the other part of our call. So it's basically about policy update. And the first is regarding the public comment.

We have several public comments going on or still open. So the challenge is that they learn for most of them are in early January and so we have kind of

let's say winter or summer holiday depending which hemisphere you are in the middle. So we really make it a little bit hard for to get the draft available and have I would say consultation with our members.

So (Maryam) can you please share the list of the public comment just so we can go through them quickly? Okay thanks. So we have the first the one about diversity. We get or we got already a draft that it's end of consultation and please review it and add your comments. I was myself a co-rapporteur of the diversity (some) group so I'm trying to not get involved with too closely but I would be happy to answer any questions about the recommendation and provide some explanation. So we got a draft for this and we need to finalize it as soon as possible so we can endorse it.

For the recommendation to improve ICANN office of (ops) and the recommendation of ICANN jurisdiction my understanding is that Tatiana Tropina and Farzaneh are volunteering to draft a comment and they will share that in the coming days.

We also have I think one of kind of really critical in the competition consumer trust and the consumer choice. So we need or we have some volunteers but I think we maybe need more and to get the draft soon. This is also I think important topic. It's critical, can be controversial because we have different this group I mean the MCSC will have a different region regarding the issue of – I mean regarding this I mean how – what we define as DNS abuse and so on.

Other comments is operating standards for ICANN (unintelligible) reviews. And this one becomes quite relevant with the issue that we just discussed regarding the security and stability review teams because here this is kind of proposal to have the kind of outline the different process like how to make a

call for a candidate selection and so on. So it's kind of critical because it will set for the next review teams the process to follow.

We have some volunteers but I should kind of ping them to see the status of the draft so another one we have the news the proposed incremental changes to the ICANN meeting strategy. So as I explained before there was this ICANN meeting strategy that was divided like two years ago and it was implemented. But for now they – the ICANN staff is proposing some amendments or changes to that strategy. I mean that was one of the changes but I think that can have for a lot of impact.

So if someone wants to volunteer for this please let me know. I think it can be and I won't say an easy one but I think it can be accessible one for newcomer because not really about policy but I mean I think it can be quite straightforward so just want to volunteer to draft this – I mean a comment for NCSG please let me know. Okay any questions about this?

Okay so this could quite quick update about going public, and so again if someone want to volunteer or join the other draft to (unintelligible) pen holder to work on the - one of these comments please let me know. With regard to policy update from working Group Review Teams and so on it really depends who's are involved with that. So I'm not sure who among the attendees is participating in any working group and want - wants to share some updates so...

Okay. I guess if there is no further comment or any suggestion for any other business if you have any suggestion or you want to discuss a topic I guess we can close the call for today. But before that I want to thank everyone for joining. Important to have kind of lower no participation for today but and

that's understandable because the timing. But I want to thank everyone for making effort to attend the call and to listen and participate.

So the council call will happen in next Thursday. And what we are trying to do as a councilor is to get a regular report from the council call that we can share with our membership. And for the next report it will be Tatiana who volunteer it to do so.

Okay so please let me know if you have any questions or comments. Again send me email off list and we'll be happy to answer it. So I think that will be our last call for this year. I can only wish you for those who celebrate it Merry Christmas and happy New Year, happy holidays and see you soon. Okay bye-bye.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much everyone for attending the call. (Gino) you may stop the recording and disconnect all lines. Thank you very much for your time today.

END