

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
February 20, 2018
5:36 am CT

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much (unintelligible). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCSG monthly policy call on Tuesday, 20th of February 2018.

On the call today we have Arsene Tungali, Collin Kurre, Farell Folly, GZ Kabir, Rafik Dammak, Tatiana Tropina. And from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and over to you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Maryam, and thanks to everyone who made it for today's call. So, hopefully we will have more people joining as - during the call, but let's just start.

As usual, we'll go through the GNSO Council call agenda. So, we have that call on Thursday and this is the preparation for the counsel and also an

opportunity to consult the membership and inform them about the topic for discussion and also the motion for a vote.

So, let's start with that. And the first agenda items are mainly administrative ones. So we don't need really to cover them. But usually we spend a fair time during the GNSCO Council to go through the action items and the projects, at least, to see the status of the different working groups and if there is any concern.

This first item or motion for a vote is the adoption of the charter related to next steps for the ICANN procedure of handling WHOIS conflict with privacy law.

So, this motion was deferred from last time and the topic has been, for a while in the Council agenda. So, we are suggesting here is to set up a new we call IAG, I think, it's the Implementation Advisory Group, to handle and implementation (use) regarding the WHOIS conflicts with privacy law and creating process that can help the registrar of the matter.

So there was previously a group. They produced a report and a recommendation and then there was public comment. So, this new group is tasked, if it's created, is tasked to cover that public comment and respond to it in some way.

So, as said, this motion was deferred from the last called because one of the concerns here is that we have several initiatives and efforts related to WHOIS, so, for example, we have the RDS working group.

We have the RDS (special team). And most importantly - important, is the - the GDBR discussion I think it's taking a lot (of money). So, we have kind of

a different part within the GNSO that are keen to help this group or team to start the work the coming months or weeks.

While some are raising concern about the bandwidth for the community to handle another - on another front, something related to WHOIS since we have all the GDPR discussion.

So, we have a motion, and the charter to vote on. I don't think the charter itself raise any concern in the term of scope are what you are expecting from this group. But it's really more a question of resourcing and timing in relation to all the dependency for the WHOIS.

So, the question for us is, I guess we vote is probably yes. That's my feeling for now. And also we are seeing the response from other groups in the Council, so I can understand maybe from the IPC, they are fine, at least for (the time), so from one person, they are fine to vote yes.

While - since the registrar, even if they vote yes, they are asking for small amendment in terms of one, we have a call for volunteers for this group. So I think from our perspective, it just we need to understand how we see this in.

Do we think that that we can handle? Does it make sense to have this in the coming months, should be depending on the outcome of the GDBR worker so? And I see that Tatiana is in the queue already. Yes, Tatiana, please go ahead.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you, Rafik. Hello, all. Tatiana Tropina is speaking for the record. Well, at the last GNSO Council meeting, it made sense to me completely all the arguments that there is no bandwidth, that there is uncertainty when these groups start from the previous motion, there was no starting date and it looked like it was set to start immediately.

But the last argument, the person who actually put this motion forward, one of the person's, Keith Drasek from VeriSign, he said, and this argument made lots of sense to me, that even the compliance models are with GDPR, whatever ICANN will choose, will not solve all the complex which can arise in the national jurisdictions with local law and WHOIS.

So, I do believe that we have to vote yes, as you said, but maybe it would be a good idea to support registrars in postponing the call for these groups due to low bandwidth and volunteers who have to deal with all these GDPR issues right now to (May).

So, maybe it does make sense to compromise here and say let's start this group, like, end of May, beginning of June and put into the motion or into the charter and then, yes.

But, I believe that I would probably vote yes in any case because this argument about this conflict that will arise anyway makes a lot of sense to me (unintelligible). Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes, thanks, Tatiana. I think that's an important point. So, even with all the discussion about GDPR, it's - whatever the model we will end up with, it's not going to fix all the issues we have with the WHOIS.

And, I think what (unintelligible) the Council meeting is called the dependency between RDS, GDPR and this issue with local (loads). So, yes, having that group, I mean, the scope of the group is quite limited, too.

I mean, it's - we work to review the public comment. I mean, it's - I don't think they are supposed to really work on any recommendations regarding the triggers that were proposed before.

But, having maybe that will be helpful really, I think, in the future maybe to try - to work solving other issues that may arise with the WHOIS and local data protection law.

So, I think we will continue the discussion regarding how we will solve this issue of dependency between RDS and the different initiatives, so no, we're not going to fix that during the Council call but I think it makes sense to delay, as you mentioned, to delay a call for volunteers.

I don't think that even our side we have - because different stakeholder groups, they are supposed to appoint members, so I don't think we have the kind of - I mean, the volunteers at the time if we start early to work on that.

So, delaying maybe it will help us in terms of planning and management. It - okay, so any comments or questions on this matter? Okay, seeing none, I just had moved to the next agenda item.

So, I think if there is - okay, so yes, it's (secure). That's good. So, the next agenda item, I think, will be a very straightforward one. It's to vote for the replacement of a GNSO member for this security, stability and resiliency of the (SSR2) review team.

So, maybe for the context, (Jen)'s gone, one of our members, resigned a few weeks ago from the review team and so, the Council tasked the standing committee - a standard (selection) committee to recommend a replacement candidate among the initial pool of candidates.

So, from the (unintelligible) process what we got, it was only two candidates, so - (the standard selection) committee reviewed their application and also took into consideration, and this important, the skill metrics as it was made by the SSR2 review team which described what are or what is the gap in terms of skill and what they need to feel in the review team, so to have a different expertise there.

So, the SSE did you review and is suggesting - let me see the name - (Navid Genrise), who was also an NCSG number, as a replacement for (Jen)'s - for that role.

So, the SSE is basically just I would say recommending the name and the expectation from the Council is to confirm that selection both for this motion, so unless there is kind of a surprise, it will be an anonymous vote because how the SSE is formed is we have representatives from all stakeholder groups.

And the selection is full consensus, so it means that we already get the support from the different stakeholder groups and GNSO regarding the candidate. So this is a quite straightforward one.

But, if you have any questions about the process or anything else, please feel free to do so. Okay, I see no comments or questions. Okay, we can (move to the next agenda).

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, who is speaking?

Arsene Tungali: This is Arsene.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes, Arsene, you can also use the Adobe Connect for the queue since you are there, too, but yes, please go ahead.

Arsene Tungali: My (unintelligible). Hi, everyone. This is Arsene Tungali for the record. Rafik, just maybe to ask you to restate, is the one that should be replacing (Jen Skeva)? I'm sorry, I didn't hear the name. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Oh, the replacement is now (Navid Genrise). He is one of our members, I think, I think, from Pakistan. And I think for (unintelligible) fellowship program, they may know him, so.

Arsene Tungali: Yes, Rafik, thank you very much. And so are we voting yes on that during the Council call or is there any background that you have about that (unintelligible) that we should (unintelligible) maybe for the members. I personally don't know the person, so do you know the person or do you have any background to share about him so that we have (a better idea) about why we should support him?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so I'll send you - we have three members represented from NCSG, including myself, I met review team - not review team, the standing selection committee, so we participated in the review and the selection.

And so we used the skill metric to assess what we have as candidates, so there were only two candidates. And one of the questions was, should we select someone with an academic background or someone more practitioner?

And in terms of diversity and also to add a different skill to the review team, so there was more like - most of the members were leaning to choose (Navid). And at the end, all of the members of the SSE agreed on that selection.

So, we have consensus. I'm not sure what kind of (issue may happen) or any concern, because if we had any concern, that should have risen during the reviews that the members of SSE have or the material including the resume and statement of interest from the candidate.

And also getting the input from the review team members regarding what they are expecting as skills, so I mean, the expectation really is that we (review for chairs) at the Council.

I mean, if there is no, it will be an awkward situation because the member of the SSE from NCSG did due diligence from their side in terms of review. And also, one important point, we are placing an NCSG number with someone from NCSG.

The other candidate was from the business - I mean, (he has created) - we asked endorsements from the business constituency, so.

Arsene Tungali: Thank you very much, Rafik. That was really useful. Thank you so much.

Rafik Dammak: I hope that I clarified the process and how it worked as an. I mean, the only thing that we had only two candidates had hoped that we don't have anyone from GNSO in the review team because we will really be in trouble in the future.

Okay, so the next agenda item that about - it's more an update. And this is an updated charter for the cross community working group on Internet governance.

So, the Council had that issue for a while on its agenda. I think last year. And we had a motion in August asking the working group to come with a proposal of a new vehicle to replace the cross community working group.

So, maybe has a background, the cross community working group has kind of a particular and specific meaning now in ICANN. It has a specific (chartering) process and (voter) expectation.

And there was kind of concern from some parts of the GNSO if we can't have a cross community working group structure or set up for something like Internet governance because there is some misunderstanding about why we need such groups to work on the Internet governance.

So, the working group spent some time to think about the possible replacement. What we did is really to move from the name cross community working group because what it kind of embeds as the meeting.

And we selected new structure which is an engagement group. I think it's more neutral in this. It doesn't mean that it has any kind of specific meaning in terms of deliverable outcome.

And also what we tried to do is go through the previous revised charter, to go through it again, and to try to elaborate and articulate more submission to clarify what we are trying to achieve in such structure.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Oh, so please, if you are not speaking, mute yourself. Okay, so - okay, what we are (trying) also is not just to articulate our outline what is the mission, but also to work on the reporting because when it was kind of maybe not clear for

everyone is - I mean, what people may be perceived, there is lack of accountability or reporting from the working group to the GNSO.

But I think it's - one problem was resources. We don't have a real, and let's say, a full staff support for that working group. And so, the reporting is really done on an ad hoc basis and when we get enough support to do so.

So we will try to push more on that matter and to have kind of expectations from the working group to reports, like, at least before and every ICANN meeting and maybe to provide will more updates and so on.

So, we will try to work out all those details. So, now it will be a matter for discussion for the Council. So, by the motion that was voted in August, so the GNSO Council will review the proposal.

And the GNSO will (withdraw) is a (charter) organization by the Puerto Rico meeting and then waiting when we have - they approve with other chartering organizations the new vehicle.

So, we will have kind of a transition phase when the GNSO is withdrawing from the cross community working group and then waiting if the GNSO will join the new vehicle, so then that will be, I think, different story may be having a new membership and so on.

But for now, we are putting this new proposal for discussion and consideration by the GNSO Council, so. Okay, so any question or comment on this? I mean I'm happy to clarify and expand what may happen.

Okay, and so I - I mean, personally speaking here, I have no idea what are the reactions so we sent (unintelligible) the proposal last week. Unfortunately, after the (unintelligible), but since it's not a motion, then that's okay.

I hope that the different group will have time to review the proposal and that we don't have a lot of pushback. I mean, if the Council has any kind of suggestions for changing the charter or, I mean, there is any revision, they can do so.

Just it will be a matter to coordinate with other chartering organizations, so they can approve the same final charter for a new vehicle. So I hope that with that, I hope that we can get kind of a new, fresh start for the cross community

I think after, like, now more over three or four years, it's sometimes time to kind of rejuvenate and to do a kind of new start, maybe to bring new members and so on. I mean, myself, I think it's time for me to withdraw.

So, getting the charter - I mean, consider it and hopefully approve it, will be my last test. So, okay. There is no question or comment, I guess I can move to the next agenda item.

Okay, so the next agenda item, I think that expect it will be - it will elicit comments and questions. And this is an update and discussion on the GNSO standing committee on (unintelligible) and operation.

Review of the draft, fiscal year '19, ICANN operating plan budget. And so, just a quick background. We have another standing committee in the GNSO Council that works on budget and shared by (agent). He's here.

And they submitted their first draft for the Council. It's the GNSO Council comment in the FY '19 budget. So maybe we can ask here, Ayden, probably he can elaborate more and give more updates regarding the comment and maybe also described the timeline and process to get this approved. Yes, Ayden, please go ahead.

Ayden Ferdeline: Sure, it would be my pleasure to, Rafik. Hi, everyone. This is Ayden Ferdeline. As Rafik just mentioned, we do have another steering committee, a standing committee on ICANN budget and operation.

The objective of this group is to coordinate and facilitate a dialogue to (put on) ICANN strategic and operational planning and budgetary processes, particularly as they relate to the GNSO Council.

And on the steering committee, we have strong representation from the NCSG but also from across the entire GNSO. We have subject matter experts along with appointed counselors here.

So, the committee scope of activities are both quite large and quite narrow because by trying to monitor the entire budget, we're trying to come up with a proposed position that is consistent with the (views) of the entire Council and the entire GNSO.

But inevitably, there is some tension there has to what a common position would be. And it's proving really difficult, actually, to draft a comment here. But what we have done over the past three weeks, has come up with a working draft.

We've not received consensus on all of the points, so we have, at least, a draft, now that we will put through to the Council for an initial review and short feedback.

I don't have the time in front of me but from memory, we're giving the Council at least one full week to be able to review the comment. We will then take it back to this standing committee and we will prepare a new draft and that will go back to the Council again for more extensive review.

And eventually, we will ask the council to submit it on our behalf if there is support. So, this main committee has not been delegated with the authority to submit this comment on behalf of the Council.

It will still be - we are only preparing the text. That will ultimately be submitted on behalf of the Council. So that aside, what are we actually going to be putting inside these comments?

So, there are a few areas where we have generally (unintelligible) an agreement that there is a need for action (unintelligible). Generally, we (see) the percentage of the budget that ICANN spends on personnel and professional services (it's too high).

Generally, we believe that the support that the - I shouldn't say generally we believe. I should say roughly half of the participants in the standing committee believes, and roughly have to not believe, so we do not have consensus here, but...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Ayden Ferdeline: Roughly half the participants would agree that the support for capacity building programs, which are funded through items like additional budgetary (reverse) process are important and should remain.

So, we still have a lot of tension (resulted). It's early days. If you ask me in two weeks' time where we'll be at, we'll - it will be a very different answer that I have to give you because at the moment, we're - we have that inevitable tension between the contracted parties and the non-contracted parties house.

We have the contracted parties who believe they (pay for everything. And so, the question is constantly is, is that a core item that should be in the budget or is that just a nice to have?

And we have very different views on the answer to that. And we have different views, as well, as to who's money is really at play here. I do not think that the contracted parties are paying for this.

I believe - I'm speaking for myself here - I believe that it is the domain name registrants are paying here. And I think it's important, because when we're looking to be funding things like registrant educational activities, because I believe very strongly that is the (unintelligible) paying, that 25 cents per domain registration to ICANN.

I think that really (has to) influence the direction the comment takes. Anyway, I'm starting to get a little too granular as to (did we have) a standing committee and reaching consensus.

But rest assured, we are making progress. We are slowly heading in the direction that I think we'll all be happy with. We do have a degree of common

ground and we're highly involved. The NCSG is really the (lead discussions here).

I'm happy to take any questions. Otherwise, this is (unintelligible) on the next call that we have - the next policy committee call that we have since this is a really fast-moving area.

The standing committee was only initiated roughly - well, we did have meetings last year but really we've only been working on this issue for the past four weeks. The budget was published on the 19th of January. We have 17 days until the public comment process ends and we have been working diligently and tirelessly the entire time in the standing committee trying to understand what is in this project. How does it impact the GNSO?

All of the constituencies, not just in stakeholder groups, not just ourselves. What is the impact across the (unintelligible)? Did it cross the (unintelligible)? What is the equivalent of whatever (unintelligible) relative (unintelligible). Again getting too granular here. But happy to take any questions if you have any. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Ayden. That's quite a detailed briefing. So yes - I mean I am just an observer in that standing committee and seeing the (unintelligible). I mean it's always, kind of, complicated to find a consensus on those matters because we - the different sides of the GNSO has different view - have different view on what - I mean the matter. So I guess, maybe what we try to find out is what are the kind of the common ground here. What are the really the issues that we all agree on? And I think what broadly we have to ask every time. What is the relation of any budget concern and what is he relation of that budget to the policy development process?

I think that's what we have to our goal. I mean it's not easy, sort of always straightforward, but that's, I think, our approach. And yes, let's see how things will go. So I think we got only our, the first draft so it's expected that we get maybe strong comments. We will work out, I guess, the details and we will find acceptable language for everyone.

With regard to NCSG comment will cover that later on. So here just about the Council comments. So it's probably different perspective and focus. And so that's why there is some - probably some overlap but also maybe some difference in term of the comments between the Council and the NCAG one.

Okay so okay, any question or comments on this?

Maybe last point before moving. I think we are improving in some way because the Council didn't really cover that closely the budget before what happened. Just the - we made comment quickly at the last minute. And, but this time I think we are putting more effort and this is, I think, makes sense with the new context for time of transition and the empowered community. So that changing on responsibility and the role for the GNSO and the Council itself in term of covering the budget. I think it's also the same case for us. I think yes, I do believe this is the first time for NCAG also to cover the ICANN budget. Yes Ayden, you want to add something?

Ayden Ferdeline: Yes, I just wanted to sort of expand upon what you're saying there. Because I agree. And I was trying to, in the chat, keep sort of end it on a positive note that we will reach consensus. We will get there. Because at a high level, we had agreement. So as an example, where we have an agreement across the entire GNSO, we agreed that the fund was depleted. And we believe that ICANN has to replenish the reserve fund. That's all we had agreement.

Where we don't have agreement is how do you replenish the fund? Where does money come from to do this? If you ask some, you can simply call any capacity building program anything to do with (unintelligible) those (unintelligible) voices in. That is (unintelligible) to fund, the reserve fund. Whereas we might have a different perspective on that and we might say that well, perhaps we need to be making sure cuts are taken across the organization. And maybe we could even identify some areas.

And indeed we did just in a call when we were asked by (unintelligible) from staff. If we were to say where would we find the money. And too, it is a rather provocative question, but where would we find the money to support it? And we have ideas. I don't really want to get into them now other than to say that we'll get there.

There is probably not going to be any recommendation in the letter that the Council puts forward to the standing committee - sorry, the standing committee puts forward the Council. We'll have to keep them rather high level which is a pity because at the stakeholder group the constituency level, I'm sure many of us do have ideas. We'll just have to put them into our comments. But at a high level, we can get that, sort of, broad agreement that we can (unintelligible) a problem. We're just not going to (unintelligible) solutions to the comment, if that makes sense.

And agreeing with you in the chat, Rafik. No money comes from the registrar forever. I have with regard with what the contracted parties believe. They are their customers. It is ultimately the registrant who is paying for this domain.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Ayden. I mean with all the regions trying to (unintelligible) in one big system. That's quite clear. Okay, I guess we can move to the next agenda item. I'm sorry Ayden. That's the all hands or? Okay. So, please if you have any

comments or questions, do so. I mean this is supposed to be more an interactive session.

Okay, so the next agenda item is also again discussion item. And this about the trust post implementation review framework. So we do discuss a lot of time about policy development process and this is like the focus of the GNSO and also GCAG, we work and I mean we join working groups to participate in that process that with expected outcome to have a recommendation on policy recommendation that would be voted and approved as consensus policy to be implemented by the contracted party. But the implementation itself is not really handled by the community. It's done by now by the GDD, means ICANN staff.

With the involvement of the community, of course, we - and what we call the implementation review team. So it's different that from the usual working group. What we have, we have the whole process describing the policy making and then the implementation. But we also added in that remark a review of the consensus policy, so we implement the policy and then at some time we need to review if it was effective to really work. Did it achieve what is expected and so on?

But what we find out is, we don't have really a lot of the specifics or details about that review process. And it's supposed - for several consensus policies, it's supposed to start, I think, this year. I'm not sure which (unintelligible). But it's supposed to start. And so we are, kind of, getting question here from the staff in term we need to discuss and maybe elaborate more in term of the review. There are several question is when - how to trigger that review in first place? Who would trigger it and so on?

So we have several questions to respond. And so we are starting here that data. It was supposed to be covered during the strategical council meeting and last month. But we didn't have time for that. So this is, kind of, follow up. And so we get some proposal and question from the staff. And so we will work on because we have to think about whole process. It's not just you make recommendation. They also like you work in implementation. That's it. We have to think about the whole lifecycle of the policy. And so we get to go on that part that is what - I mean it's something new to be honest.

I mean we didn't review really previous concerns as policy. And it's we are just starting. So for example, even in term of working group like it what it's done at the right protection. The committees are reviewing many consensus policies that were like decided like over 10 or even 20 years ago. So it's, kind of, changed. We need to do a review of existing policy and to assess the effectiveness and are they really achieving what they were supposed to do?

So this is, kind of, that. I think you can access to the link for the consensus policy implementation framework. So you can find the document that made by GDD describing the process regarding the implementation and so on.

So yes, so we will have more presentation and hopefully we can follow up with the members later on on this. Okay, any question or inquiry on this issue? Any comment?

Okay, and one reminder everyone. So when we - if you can see in the agenda you always find, kind of, brief background. It's really useful because this explain. It set up the context of why we are discussing that item or the motion. And give all the links and details. So please feel free to check it and go through the material and also you can find the question under this.

For example, under Item 8 you will find the sum of the question we are supposed to discuss. So okay, I know that's quite dense, but it's a way to understand what's going on in the Council. So it's the body to manage the policy. So we are that level, so we are managing the process mostly. It's not really - we just - we don't discuss policy per se, but we discuss the process that lead to policy. We are managing it. The policy itself is done within the working groups by the model chosen by the GNSO in the last, very structuring.

The next agenda item is quite (unintelligible). An update about the planning for ICANN 61. I think that the schedule for the meeting was published today. So you can access to the full schedule for the ICANN meeting. And also from the GNSO side, we have our own schedule within that with all the sessions. So we are located several slot for working groups. So several - many of them, they will have like even like three or four hour on top of meeting on Saturday. Even, I think, on Sunday and Wednesday. So there are allotting enough time for working groups to focus on their deliberation.

And also as issue, we have the GNSO weekend basically Sunday. And also our Council meeting on Wednesday. For the Sunday meeting, I cannot share details yet. But it will be shared during the Council call. What I can say, there is some changes in the format. So we are still working on that. And I think it will be interesting in many fronts because we - it will be much more, I think, for that in term of discussion and outcome. It won't be just usual working group updates on Sunday, what we have. It's the different working groups come and try give us like presentation of what they did since last meeting. But this time there is a change in the format.

And so more details on Thursday hopefully if I'm not mistaken. Okay, so yes. So we will get more details regarding the (unintelligible) meeting is physically

unless I'm not mistaken, less than three weeks. We are quite close and it's time to prepare.

Regarding the NCSG and SCN for schedule, I don't have the details. I think Maryam maybe can share that. And so yes, so we can find what we are scheduling for (unintelligible). And again, you can join either you are there. You can join physically or you can join virtually and more information will be shared later. Okay. Any question or comment on this?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Hi Rafik. (Unintelligible) can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Okay, I just wanted to briefly update on (unintelligible) session. We will have some working group briefing on our constituency date. Our outreach day is the same day as PDP. So mostly our working group briefings will be on constituency day which is the 13th of March. And many (unintelligible) and CAG members will be giving these briefings. And the idea is to recruit newcomers to come to working groups. So I would specifically ask for hopes or cliffhangers or issues that are going on in these working groups that could possibly be a way for newcomers to find them identifiable and come and join. Thank you. That was just it.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Renata. I expect more details to be shared on the mailing list when we are close to the meeting. There are so many to go between the GNSO. I really encourage for everyone who is in ICANN meeting to attend GNSO (unintelligible) session part of GNSO Council meetings and also PDP working group if you have time. And also the NCAG and (unintelligible) session. So all details will be shared soon.

Okay, the next agenda item is recurring also purely administrative. If the (unintelligible) of Council lives on. So really as background, the Council has liaison to all the working groups it creates. And the liaison has a specific role in term of reporting and to, kind of, I'm not going to say to monitor. But really to follow that's going on in the different working group and to inform the Council. Since we are responsible in term of managing those processes and the working groups.

And the role of the liaisons are really different from the cochairs. So that's why one of the reason we cannot have the cochairs to be the liaison, the liaison to be a cochair at the same time. And also we have the GNSO liaison to the GAC. But that's - he is appointed by different process, because we had, kind of, I'm not going to say (unintelligible) but discussion for why was the GAC about - what is the expectation or how we can get them engaged more in the policy development process?

And so one idea to have the GNSO liaison to inform and update them. And we also have the liaison to the CCNSO. But basically, for this agenda item, we will since that's, kind of, the usual. Every year we have to be able to appoint or confirm the liaison to all the PDP working group in particular. That were created by the Council. And one formation that's important, the liaison has to be a Councilor. So it's a liaison from the Council. It cannot be any other member of the working group. So it will be, kind of, volunteering from the Council, among the Councilor to be the liaison of those working groups.

So I'm here trying to give more explanation even if it's, kind of, administrative task. So any question or comment on this?

Okay, so the last agenda item is there any other business? And it's about discussion of GNSO Council strategic planning session report. As you may

know, we, the Council, had strategic meeting at the end of January. It was a three-day meeting. It was the first time we have such meeting. It was, kind of, really to have really to do really planning ahead for the whole year. And also it was important to understand responsibility and the role of the GNSO Council. And since we have new - I mean members on the Council. So to have that common understanding. What are the expectation? What we are supposed to do?

And also trying to understand like what I the role of the GNSO Council as policy manager for gTLD. And so we have, kind of, really frank discussion and I think it's the first time - maybe not the first time. Let's say the, kind of, first time to have more systematic way to do the planning with regard to the activities and managing the processes for this year. And it was (unintelligible) for example to see a planning document and see how much - how many activities we have in parallel. And so we can have more understanding how much burden and workload we are putting on ourself and on the community and the staff to cove so many area. And so, it's question for us. How to manage that?

But coming back to that agenda item. So we will discuss the report of that meeting. We have now a draft, but we are still - now we are getting the input from the Councilor just if they have any suggestion for change or edicts. And after that, the report will be available for the community. So for now, it's just in draft and still under review. But it will be shared soon in the coming days. So, okay.

Any question here or any comment?

Okay. We don't have that many comments today. Maybe it's the starting of the week. Anyway, so let's move on to our main agenda and to discuss mostly

about policy. But this more from NCSG perspective. So Maryam please move on to the - I shared the meeting agenda.

Okay, so a visual we tried to get policy update. One thing we start to see what we have, let's say, what we have as ongoing comment or what we have as public consultation or comment that we need to cover in the coming weeks. So if you go to the link, we have several public comments open. We are not covering all of them. In particular, those related to (unintelligible) only generation rules. We tend to not cover them. Because they are, kind of, really let's say more technical and they are quite narrow. So but if anyone in particular having technical background of interest on this matter, he can cover them.

So one like is related to rules for Korean. So I think it's really for someone Korean speak, a native speaker maybe who he or she want to cover that. So that related the (unintelligible) here, NGR. But we have, really, three main comments you are covering. One it's already under discussion. Is the one on the budget and we got first draft by Ayden. I think it was shared in the (unintelligible) if I'm not mistaken. And so people can comment and we will work on responding to the comment and solving any issue.

The second one is to plan to start the route key signing key, over process. I shared the call (unintelligible) is a few days ago. And I think we got some of the - some people volunteering. I don't want to put anyone on the spot. But I think (Lou) has volunteered to do so. So we are expecting hopefully a draft comment soon.

Okay, so okay, oh let's see also (unintelligible) you are interested to work on that. So please, okay and I can follow up later and try. So let's see how we can coordinate our efforts and cove this comment.

So the next one is the draft (unintelligible) CNDC change request. And I think that Councilor took the lead and already worked on some initial drafts. So we are still working on that, but we got something we need to start with. I encourage everyone if you have any interest to join this effort, you can ping me of list and I will put you in touch with other members who volunteered. So we have those three main public comments. And I hope that we will remain for a while, because it's already - it can be challenging to cover more than three public comments at the same time.

Okay. So yes, any question or comment on this? I mean it's good for community to join the effort. Okay.

Sorry. Okay, so I see several discussions in the Adobe Connect. And yes, so yes, you can follow up on this latter on if you want. If you want to volunteer, just tell me.

Okay so moving to the next agenda item. It's for to get the updates from any review team working groups or any structure. So it really depends on if you are active in any working group and if you want to share any updates or you want to raise any concern that we have to follow up. So or also if there is any working group that is going to deliver its initial report soon. So we should plan for that. So please if you have any comment or briefing or updates you want to share, please do so.

Okay yes, we'll talk about the budget quite soon, just after this. So this is opportunity to give updates about policy for those who are active in working groups. So I cannot, myself, really give updates on that. I only have what I see like comes as updates to the Council and because my role now as vice chair I focus more on the process and any issue that drives in term of timeline

and so on. But and not following closely in term of substance. So, okay, yes (unintelligible), go ahead.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks, Rafik. I thought - this while it came to mind. I could give a quick update on the RDS working group. I won't take too much of your time, but just to let you know what this working group has been discussing late. We've been discussing purpose for processing data. And one (unintelligible) has been around was the naming certification is a legitimate purpose for processing registration data based upon a (unintelligible) definition that has been put forward. And the position that we in the NCSG has been advancing is that we oppose this in general.

And the idea here is that ICANN is not a domain name certification party. So ICANN should not be requiring or facilitating the collection of data for this. And this is quite important for it to switch back again just because there is definitely movement in some parts of the community to rethink what was ICANN's mission? And what should ICANN be doing? And this might be a very small area where if we lost the (unintelligible), it would not have any significance, if we're honest here. It would not have a significant implication for most registrants.

However, it's the principle, right? That if we allow terms to be hijacked and redefined, that can be really problematic down the line especially in areas that (unintelligible) for us quite closely to do with content control. And whether ICANN should be becoming, I think, some of our colleagues in upper parts of the community would like ICANN to be taking a stronger role in removing say domain names that supposedly facilitate the transfer of content that they claim is stolen or masquerading as a fake online pharmacy, etc.

So that's where at in the RDS at the moment. And I share this for one other reason, that you can join us. And you can really make a difference. So in this working group, a great deal of importance is placed on the weekly poles. And the weekly poles are open for all members to complete. They're generally multiple choice. And we do have a small group of members who will sometimes discuss how we will be responding to these (unintelligible). And we'd be happy to see you in there if you like.

Now they're not a binding referendum. We are always told that just because it's an (unintelligible) majority of response, it does not mean that it is the result that will be advanced. But in practice that is what happens. And so, if we could get more NCSG members participating in (unintelligible) every week, it would be great. Because in this week's pole for instance - well the pole that we did last week, but the results were published yesterday. We had in total respondents of which 4 were from the NCSG and 17 were (unintelligible). So there's a bit of - and they vote as a block, I should note. They always, the 17 are saying the one thing.

So it would be really great if we could try to increase the number of NCSG members that we have respond to these poles because it would have a different - it would make an impact. You would have a different - you'd be really making a difference, and it would only be taking a few minutes of your time every week to do. Please feel free to contact me if you'd like to talk over about this. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Ayden for these updates from RDS. I mean it's a quite interesting working group. And yes, I mean I understand that you - that working group quite uses the polling quite heavily which is also unusual than any other working group. It's not common approach. And sometimes it can rise concerns in term of how you interpret that because some people say that - but I'm here

and digressing. But yes, so if we are using that method, I think it's important to get everyone who is already (unintelligible). I don't think many are already in the RDS mailing list and so they just need to be, kind of, active. And there is a way that you and other like Stephanie and (Kathy) you can coordinate those (unintelligible) and how we can influence the outcome of that working group.

Yes. So okay. Any update from other working group? So my understanding for the subsequent procedure, the (unintelligible) of things procedure. They are working on their - they are preparing for the initial report. And my understanding they have document with their deliberation now from the different work track one to four. The Work Track 5 is not included since they just started and my understanding, they agreed on that term of reference. And start the proper working and they had, I think, (unintelligible) maybe to give kind of history about this policy. So let's - it's a separate, the Work Track 5 it's about your names. But that's my impression.

I'm not involved in that working group, but if someone from - who is actively participating there, he can - he or she can give some updates. Would be really helpful. I'm not trying to put someone on the spot. But it's better if you volunteer. Okay.

Okay so no comment here. For RPM, I don't know. Oh, I see Bruna is in the queue. Yes Bruna please go ahead. Okay Bruna, I mean you (unintelligible) to him, but okay. I mean, yes. You can go ahead.

Bruna Santos: Hi everyone. This is Bruna. I was just having trouble with my mic. I just wrote in the chat also that a (unintelligible) like all the (unintelligible). The Work Track 5 is the review of existing (unintelligible). And there's a call

tomorrow, so the (unintelligible). And also like (unintelligible) was just replace at (unintelligible). (Javier) from Puerto Rico, so this is all, thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thanks Bruna yes. Please keep us updated about that and particular your names. I know that they are just starting the main work and there are several (unintelligible). So for those interests, there's still time to join. I think it's a good time to join. Okay, so yes.

Any question or comment on this? Okay, no one. And it think that's a fold hand Bruna unless you want to try something. Okay.

So regarding RPM, I don't see if already someone who is active in RPM working group and in the call today. But so what I understand the RPM, they initiated process to collect data from ICANN but also to design a survey. And there is a call for request for proposal now. So that's what they started. And I think one other important item is more like in term of planning is that the RPM and the initiative is (unintelligible) the working group they have to coordinate their timeline. Because there are dependency between the two working group.

But in term of substance, I cannot really speak further than that. Particular, there is no one from the RPM working group today. That hopefully if we can get more updates, we will share that in the mailing list.

Okay, oh I see Louise. Yes, Louise please go ahead.

Louise Marie Hurel: Hi, everyone. Sorry, I was disconnecting my mic. But I am involved in the RPM working group. Unfortunately, I haven't been able to follow up as closely as I wish, but in the past meetings, what we have been discussing a bit more is - well was something that was raised also during intersessional, the

need to establish a more strict methodology of how we are gathering data. Since one of the main issues we have been facing is a quite intense divergence from members of the working group. When we started talking about which kind of data we need to go after. They just completely go out of the purpose and start talking about how preposterous it is to have - how preposterous it is to gather data.

So it's kind of a stalemate, but still in terms of progress in a structured way, we are just now there is a call for sub-teams. Right now, I don't have the whole list. But there are different teams to gather these data, so we're tackling different aspects. And it closes today, these calls. So if you're a non-active, an observer, in the RPM's working group and you feel you might want to pop in and see how the discussions are going, they're a bit intense. But still I would very much encourage you to do so. Because we do need more volunteers in the RPM. So if you have any questions, if I can help in any way, just feel free to reach out. I know (Dana) is also - has been following these past few calls. So yes, this is perhaps a quick, sorry, a quick update on the status of what have been doing that the RPMs. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Louise for this briefing. Yes, I mean having working team or subgroups is always challenging because it means that we need more volunteers to join each working team or subgroup to monitor what's going on. Because there is, kind of, more delegation to the work team and not really to have the full discussion in the working group. So yes, if someone want to join, please do so. And please, Louise please share any information on how to join. And if there is any challenge for discussion or coordination.

So okay, yes please go ahead.

Louise Marie Hurel: Yes, just I opened the call here. So we have a sub-team for - so now we're reviewing the uniform rapid extension and URS. And there are three sub-teams and there's a sub-team for URS practitioners, URS docs, and URS providers. If you want more information, just let me know and I'll pass it to you. And right now we have a lot of people. We have more people in URS (unintelligible) so it's to review the actually the documentation of some of the cases and the decisions. But we have less people in the URS providers and practitioners. So yes, let me know if you're interested and we can discuss this offline. Yes, just wanted to add that.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks Louise. So yes, and those what you just shared the project list, I think is maybe it's kind of (unintelligible) estimated document, but it's I think the reference document where you can find all information about any activities initiated by (unintelligible) whatever is a PDP or non-PDP working group, implementation and review team, cross community working group and so on. Because there you can find the link to the specific space for that working group. And so you can find the information and then how to join the working group.

But I expect the members of the working group, the RPM working group to share more details and to support those who want to volunteer there. Thanks again Louise for the update. And thanks (unintelligible) for all details you are giving in the Adobe Connect here.

Okay. I think we covered the three main working group. For review team, at this level I don't think there is really anything to share. Because the current situation with SSO2 it's so there are not really - they are not making progress, I think, even for the case of RDS review team. So we can move now from that. If there is anything we can share, we can share the mailing list.

So let's move to any other business. In fact, we have several items there to cover. So it's more than other business. If I am, please share the agenda again. Okay so under any other business, we have the different like, kind of, important discussion items. The first one I put is the (unintelligible) compliance model. So there was - wait, I cannot call that media consultation or public comment, but we submitted comment as quickly as we can. But the discussion is still going on regarding which model to be selected by ICANN. And there was a webinar, I think, two weeks ago to review what was received by the ICANN as a comment. And they tried to do what they call non-paper to summarize the comments and to show or highlight what they think is the model supported by most - by the community.

So it's still under discussion and I think we still have a lot to do on the matter to influence the process. So if someone want to comment or share some thought on this issue, please yes. This is good time for to do so. Yes Tatiana, please go ahead.

Tatiana Tropina: Yes, hi everyone. (Unintelligible) speaking. Well I feel a bit compelled as someone who chaired the session on the (unintelligible) compliance, the intersessional to provide this brief update. I believe that if we took the ICANN model, you know, graph or diagram, it's not really a true representation of the understanding of all these proposed models and alternative models which were proposed by the (unintelligible) of the community. I believe that what we for now is that any model chosen by the ICANN will have some kind of (unintelligible). But how this will work and according to different rumors, I mean, there might be preferences to I don't know GAC models on whatever and all we know right now is just rumors. And we do have to wait for ICANN.

What really worries me now is that the date which was announced for choosing the models is postponed further and further. Which means that whatever model ICANN chooses, we will not have much time to react as a community. But then again, okay, it's about modernization. So all we can do right now is just to wait for ICANN to do (unintelligible), so top down manner. And then we will have to marry it with what community thinks in the RDS working group.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Tatiana. Yes, I mean I think how the discussion is framed by the ICANN call organization (unintelligible), in particular the CAO and the staff it's a matter for the organization to let them to decide. So they are - they say they are seeking for input. I mean whatever it's supposing should be kind of entering model. Because there is still work - a lot of work to be done on this matter. And we are discovering that we have to work on this. And this is, again, related to all this effort and RDS review team, RDS working group and so on. And how to fix this issue once for.

Okay. Everyone want to further comment on this? Oh, I think Stephanie just joined us. Or she was here from the beginning. I didn't notice. Stephanie you want to add something? And also I see comments from Ayden about work on Artic and 29 working (unintelligible) letter. Okay, yes this is one thing that we have to cover too. But you want to comment or to add something? Stephanie, Ayden, Ayden, Stephanie whoever want to. Oh, okay. If there is an audio issue maybe volume can help for that. Meantime, anyone want to add something?

Stephanie Perrin: Can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, we can hear you Stephanie. Please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Came back, thank you. Yes, I'm sorry I was late. I messed up the time. And I won't talk much because I'm still coughing. But apologize for being late on the Article 29 letter. I've just been pouring over everything that we need to get into it and get it done today. That's all I have to contribute there.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Stephanie. Sorry, can you repeat the last sentence? I had problem to hear from my side, so.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin again. I've been compiling a lot we need in the Article 29 letter. And I'll click the Google Doc today and get it done.

Rafik Dammak: Oh.

Stephanie Perrin: And I apologize, my voice. If that's what you (unintelligible) is there anything else?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thanks Stephanie. Yes, I couldn't hear that so yes, thanks. No that's wonderful. So you are working on this, so we wait for the document. And I'm sorry for some reason I didn't listen in the beginning for the - saw some issue here. But now, yes, I did. Thanks again.

Okay so we got some action for related to GDPR so let's see how we will respond to the Article 29 working party. And we will wait for the draft hopefully to be shared as soon as possible. But I think we have to all the work and I expect there will be a lot of discussion in Puerto Rico meeting. And if I'm not mistaken, there is even a cross community session on the matter. But I need to check again. So for those who have the schedule, maybe they can find out.

Okay, no further comment on this or question? Okay, so let's move to the budget comment. And this is more the NCAG own comment on the budget. So it may differ from the Council one. Okay Ayden since you were the pen holder for that draft, maybe you can give a briefing and explanation about the content. So please go ahead.

Ayden Ferdeline: It will be my pleasure. Thanks Rafik. Hi everyone, Ayden Ferdeline for the record. And yes, been waiting patient to explain this one to you because there are significant implications for us in this budget. So as you might know, one of the most important public comment opportunity that we have every year is our chance to comment on ICANN's budget and operation. This is our only chance, community to ask for different (unintelligible) priorities to be made. To question aspects ICANN's operations and to express our views on the functioning of ICANN, the organization.

And we (unintelligible) the material that ICANN has published. The implications for us are atrocious. Now we do need to give finance credit for giving us so much granularity this year. There is a lot more information that was published last year. Hundreds and hundreds of pages more detail, and it was also published five weeks earlier than last year. So we've been given more time to review it. We've been more information which we asked for. So credit to finance for that. That is appreciated. And the finance team has been very responsive to questions. When I've asked questions, I've received responses the same day. So cannot fault them there.

But the content of the budget are not great for us. Now one - for the material, we of course, need to look at our own activities and what resources we're getting. Are they appropriate? Are they sufficient? Are they insufficient? So we also have to be bit more critical and we need to look across the entire organization to see where the patterns of spending are. Where are resources

going? And in the comment that I sent to the list (unintelligible), there are a few key points that I've raised. One is to do with personnel costs and professional services. This is just too large a proportion of the budget. Sort of the comment to get a gist for it. I'm going to update this comment as well today, and I will resend it to the mailing list. Because there have been a few new developments.

So we don't have in the budget - it doesn't easily tell us what has gone. What has changed or what is new. What it tells us, you can see, what will be funded in FY '19? So in addition to the materials that have recently been published, we need to compare it with the projects that we're running in FY '18 and we need to do that, sort of, cross reference ourselves to see if we can find anything that is different. When I did that, that was when I discovered a (unintelligible) was not in the budget. But I've also discovered that the community program is under the budget. Among other resources that we rely on.

Now this is not to say that we cannot support them being the right size. That we cannot support if there - we still need to be critical and perhaps we want to support the continuation of the budget program. But at the same time, the only cuts that are coming in the budget are coming at the community. We also had the additional budgetary express envelope that has been halved. That is what we use to fund our policy writing course for instance. This isn't right. This is not appropriate.

There's some really interesting conversations that have happened on the NPSG policy committee list recently. One of them was from Stephanie. And Stephanie was, sort of, putting out a provocative question which I think was a very good provocative question. Which was saying, if the organization is proposing to cut crop funding, how do they (unintelligible) of the complexity of ICANN policy issues and ensue that - and continue to contribute effectively

to the (unintelligible) they called a model on which ICANN depends and on which gives ICANN a (unintelligible).

And Stephanie was suggesting that we could (unintelligible) back and forth discussion over whether or not that's appropriate. But regardless of what forum we take that critique to. It is - I think it is something we need to touch upon in our comments. And so that will be one of the new edits that I make to the comment is adding from where does ICANN draw its legitimacy? And how do all of these cuts to the services that we depend on harm noncommercial use and comes of the domain name system?

Now if we look at how ICANN has grown significantly, I mean it's initial budgeting in 1999 was \$3.4 million. Last year the budget was \$143 million. But what has been climbing steadily had really just been personnel costs, office space, and professional services like (unintelligible) consultants and attorney. And where is the perception? And (unintelligible) that there are ICANN staff. This (unintelligible) really like a very overly simplistic statement. There is a perception that I have and I think that others have that a lot of people at ICANN made (unintelligible) package doesn't present to the community for consideration. And there's a really good example of this, is the (unintelligible) consultation.

So in the budget that was published on the 19th of January, it proposed a 50% cut to fellowship program. On the 31st of January, ICANN opened up the community consultation to determine the future of the fellowship. That is an obvious disconnect here. Clearly - and perhaps this is the right decision to be made. But clearly the organization decided well before - it's (unintelligible) what we think. They decided that this is going to be cut in half. So when the organization continues to be growing and size (unintelligible) and consultants, that really concerns me. This year the budget is growing by 10% in personnel

cost. We can't - this can't keep continuing to happen. This is not to say that staff don't work hard. They do work hard. And I fully acknowledge that. That's not the issue.

The concern is that ICANN staff increasingly holding the pen when it comes to drafting recommendations. When it comes to creating working groups proposing new reports. And importantly, the implementation details behind community vision. It is staff to get to determine whether or not to speak at some working groups. It is staff who set the internal timelines that the organization is budgeted for a working group to complete its work. And with the removal of (unintelligible), now there will only be GSC. ICANN staff and not community personnel, community members who have the resources to be able to attend regional (unintelligible) and to be the voice of ICANN. Again, not a criticism of the very good work that ICANN staff do. They work very hard.

But it is a flaw, in my mind, (unintelligible) structure and policy development and implementation process. And so what I see when I look at this budget, attempts to stifle noncommercial participation of ICANN activities. Now I'm not alleging that this is intentional. I just think it is the inevitable consequence of the proposed budget that is being adopted as it is.

So what are we talking about here? We're talking about (unintelligible), nearly no money for additional budget requests that we depend on, less travel support for communities, reduced number of fellowships, no community onboarding program, which will see us lose four NCSG travel slots there. These are drastic cuts but why are they unbecoming to the very (unintelligible) small sliver of the budget that is allocated to us in the first place.

How, in good conscience, can this organization put forward a budget that sees personnel (unintelligible) like (unintelligible) when it's broke. That's not going to change. These are huge structural issues. I'm happy to acknowledge that cuts have to be made across the board. They do, but why are they only affecting us?

And I'm going to bring in a conspiracy theory that I heard, but it was to (Javier) but it concerns a few people so I think it's true. One of the theories behind this is that divisions were given -- were told that they had to make cuts, they had to identify what projects were not critical given ICANN's precarious financial state. It seems at least in the case of GSC that they looked (unintelligible) only looked at what could be cut and decided to protect their staff and to cut the community support. That's really problematic in my opinion.

Anyway, I am speaking a little too much. This is a really important issue for us. We really need people to be reviewing this budget critically. There is a lot of information. When I initially submitted documents to the mailing list, there were 255 pages of material. There's now more. There are also Excel spreadsheets (unintelligible) outlining the projects. We need to be going through those very quickly and very diligently to understand what is in there, what is going to hurt us.

I'm sure there are things critical that escapes me so I really appreciate your assistance in reviewing the budget as comprehensively as we can. I'm going to make, as I said before, some substantial edits to the document today. There are some decisions that between when I made this initial draft and sent it to the list and now that I notice that I think (unintelligible). And there's also one thing that I'm going to remove because I've come to believe that maybe it's not relevant.

So if there are any questions regarding the budget process, how to get involved, the (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Ayden. That was quite detailed. Okay, so a few comments from me here. First, I encourage everyone really to go through the documents and material. There are several material related to the budget like the spread, also (unintelligible). So there are several material to cover and to go through. So having more people to do so will help us maybe to find out if there is anything that we missed or we didn't notice. There are so many high level of details in the documents. So we need to be sure that we are covering and so that will help you in reviewing the NCSG draft comments so you can really make how do you say an opinion about that by reviewing the material first.

With the whole discussion about the cuts, yes, it seems that the community is getting most of the cuts because it's a fact. All the division they got target in term of how they need to cut. And so sometimes it's impacting us directly. But I think -- okay, so there is another issue is that not all divisions are impacting -- sorry Maryam, can you hear me? I'm not sure. I am hearing Ayden many times. Hello? Can you hear me guys?

Yes, we can. Okay. So yes, I heard Ayden several times saying the same thing. That's kind of funny. Okay. So yes, not all divisions are impacted at the same time and I do believe for the policy division and in particular the GNSO, they are making a lot of efforts to keep the same level of support. And so we need to be careful to not see it, not all the divisions are -- how do you say -- the staff that we work directly with are doing a lot of efforts to not impacting, to not cutting anything related to our work.

So that was said. So we need to have a holistic view of the budget and not just to focusing in terms of what we see as community support. We need to also...

((Crosstalk))

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Sorry, I'm on the road. I'm just going to (unintelligible) give an update on the onboarding intervention. Again, there is a (unintelligible) connection between onboarding program demands that we had from the beginning of the year, which related to sustainability and long-term planning of the program. We did a full selection process. (Dina) was appointed and now there's news that the program is out of the budget. It just seems that there is no communication going on between departments in ICANN. So on that effort of reading the documents critically, I would like to note that internal processes of our calls and our preparation for those programs is also being completely disregarded.

So that should be noted in our observation of budget. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Renata. I'm sorry, I was (unintelligible). So to respond to both the onboarding, the response we got I think he said it was -- I mean I think the program was limited in time so it's not an ongoing program. But if people feel that we need to add a comment on that, I think that's fine. I think it's much really of communication because things seems disappearing and not highlighted.

So we don't know when -- if something is removed from the budget and that's why I really ask that we have to read carefully the material and check if there is anything missing so to not be surprised later on because it will be really late. So this is the time to do so.

Okay. I think I missed my train of thought, but anyway. Okay. So I see Ayden, you want to be add in the queue. Please go ahead.

Ayden Ferdeline: Thanks, Rafik. Hopefully you can hear me. Adobe Connect is a little strange for me at the moment. I'm going to pretend you can...

Rafik Dammak: Ayden, can you speak?

Ayden Ferdeline: ... hear me.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I'm not sure. It seems we have -- Ayden has some audio issues. So I didn't hear him. Maryam, can you please try to work out the audio issue for Ayden? I don't think it just seems everyone couldn't hear Ayden speaking. Okay. In the meantime, is there any other comment or question on this?

Ayden Ferdeline: So to Renata's point about initial -- its initial goal was that it was going to wrap up, up to 12 months. Actually, it was going to wrap up (unintelligible) travel resource attached. But I think internally, we got to the stage where it kept being extended until we came to depend on it and we started seeing it as a resource that we were able to use to be able to...

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Ayden. Sorry, it seems that you were (unintelligible). So if you want maybe to respond in the Adobe Connect Chat, that will be really helpful. I'm sorry for this technical glitch but it happens sometimes. Okay, is there any questions or comment on this? So we have now the draft and it's a good time to add comments, or edits, or suggestion. And we will try to resolve them and with views that have consensus within NCSG.

Okay. Yes, Stephanie. Please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. I was on the budget call on Monday and I made the point that a lot of the cuts were made without any attention to goals and metrics. Now, I understand that sometimes I'm talking using words that a lot of people are not familiar with because I have had a bit of pushback on what I'm saying about some of our -- about some of the programs that are being cut.

I am demanding metrics because that is the world that this organization is now operating in even though their metrics are terrible. We do not have our own metrics that measures the success of our outreach and volunteer programs. So it's up to us to generate those metrics and (unintelligible) -- I don't know who's got their microphone (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Stephanie, sorry to interrupt you. We have -- your voice is fading. It's quite unstable. Can you please speak close to the mic? Because I think most of us have (unintelligible).

Stephanie Perrin: Is this better now?

Rafik Dammak: Slightly better, yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay. So what I was saying was the onus on us to generate our own metrics and justify the resources that are spent -- I typed a big long note in the chat -- following up on (Dina)'s comments about ALAC. I mean it is my view and it may be a very cynical one, but I've been on now five years and I have watched ICANN somewhat intermittently before that. I think it serves ICANN the organization's purposes to have (unintelligible) people who actually do not have in depth knowledge representing the end user.

We have had lots of people over in NCUC and NCSG over the past couple of decades who have tons of in depth knowledge. I mean two of the people that left Council when I came on were (Maria Farrell) who used to be staff and knew where the bodies were buried, and (Winn Shelter) who bloody well started (unintelligible) of facts and who really is an expert.

So it's a daunting task. Those are big shoes to fill in terms of what we bring here. We need to make sure that the people we bring into ICANN that are contributing are also at the level where they can fight off guys like (Steve McCallus) who have been here for 20 bloody years -- longer than that because he was here when ICANN was thought about.

This is the challenge that we're up against. So how do we recruit people, and train them, and mentor them to get them to that level. If we have those metrics in place in terms of the fellowship program, in other words how many people after six meetings are actively contributing to PDP working groups and helping us write comments. Those are the metrics we need and then we can say, look, you can't cut us. Because otherwise, ICANN's metrics -- as Ayden pointed out, and this is why they're so angry with him -- ICANN's metrics are fill the seats. And if it's a brand new person who doesn't actually understand - - when I say fill the seats, I mean fill the fellowship, and next gen, and all of those programs -- if the person doesn't actually understand what ICANN does, that doesn't matter to them.

So we can complain about the cuts all we like but I've worked in government where cuts are -- the annual budget exercise is an exercise in fighting off cuts, keeping your staff, keeping your travel budgets. And trust me, misusing our travel budgets, blown money, bringing people time after time that nobody has ever spotted contributing meaningfully to the discussion, we are a huge, big, fat target and that's the world we're operating in.

So I certainly want the fellowship to continue, the fellowship program. And I think people think I'm crapping on the fellowship program. No, let's get some metrics that's proving it's working and if it isn't working, if we've got people who aren't showing up at the meetings, who are going on tourism because ALAC literally had a problem a few years ago, and I think it still continues, where people would show up at the meeting, come for the parties and do tourism the rest of the time. And I don't mean to pick on ALAC because I suspect that we've got some folks that have been doing the same thing.

So this is the cancer that is eating away at any of these outreach programs and some of our best people have come from fellowship programs. So we need to champion those as our example and all we've got examples because we have no metrics -- systematic metrics.

Okay. I think I've ranted enough but I sense that some people are saying I'm just being an old far and an old meanie because I didn't go through the fellowship program. No, I'm a veteran of 35 years of budget cut exercises and some people aren't. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Stephanie. Point taken here. We need -- I think as is today in other discussion, we need data not anecdotes if we want to make a good argument here. It's not just about fellowship but any other program. I think the reason (unintelligible) we want to keep them. We cannot keep them as it is now so there is a need to restructure, to make changes if people want to make them sustainable.

Otherwise, maybe you can save them this year but there is no guarantee that will be done in a few years. I think we can develop metrics and it's always an issue how we can bring more people to have the knowledge and expertise to

get involved with because there is somewhat of an expectation to when participating in this environment. So a lot of challenge. So thanks, Stephanie, for those points.

Okay, I'm not sure, Stephanie, if it's an old hand or you wanted to add another comment? Okay. It's an old hand. Okay. So yes, so we have this I think it will be a matter for discussion for a while but for now, for the budget we have really to think. So it's not just about the cuts. It's not just about specific support here and there but we need to have a holistic view about this issue and to think how we can make things sustainable.

Another point that's really a personal view I shared with some few privately. We need to be careful how we not depend a lot on ICANN resources. We have to be careful. We need to avoid dependency. I know that's (unintelligible) but this is my own experience when I joined NCUC and NCSG at the beginning. We didn't have such (unintelligible) and we did still do a lot of work.

So when you have a dependency that also creates some -- we become complacent and we forget that how we should do things. So it's just food for thought for now but this is discussion we can have. It's more strategical (unintelligible) discussion. It's (unintelligible) policy but it's also how we can resource and (unintelligible) now a sign that we can cover about the policy.

We have to share the burden and the work and not just be the few people who are active to handle everything because there is no expectation that everyone will stay or last forever in this space. So a lot of issues to cover. And we have six minutes left in the call. And we have a few items to cover.

So but before moving that, any other further comment on the budget, or question, or any inquiry on this matter? Okay. No. So the next one is more like reporting and just an update. So it's about non-contracted party house intersessional and the council strategical meeting. So for the council strategical meeting, I think we give somehow some updates and what you can expect is coming soon is the report. It's quite exhaustive and it's with high level of notes or summary of what we discussed there and also a lot of action items and follow-up.

And it's really setting up roadmap for the council for the coming months to cover several area. And again, it's about the PDP. We are really coming back to our coronation as GNSO Council to focus on PDP and how we can support that, how we can manage that, and how all those PDP can deliver. Because we have an issue that different working groups taking more and more time and there is a risk that they don't deliver at the end.

Okay. So for the intersessional, it was just after the strategical meeting, but with slight different attendance and it was between the NCSG and the CSG, the commercial stakeholder group. It's different in the format so we have in the beginning presentation but we tried also to have common topics between the two group that we can discuss in particular the GDPR, about the review issues like including the SSR2. I don't recall all the topics we discussed was just within two days.

But it's kind of meeting that we have every year. We are trying to work with our counterpart, this commercial stakeholder group since we are living under the same roof. It means how we can get together and try to work together and an area where we acknowledge that we have difference in point of view.

So is there anyone from (unintelligible) who attended the intersessional who want to add something regarding that? I think there will be some notes or summary from the intersessional but I'm not following that closely. But my expectation that will be coming soon too. Anyone want to give -- maybe add something about the intersessional meeting?

Yes, Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Good morning, Sam for the record. Can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, can hear you.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. The one thing was made in passing at the intersessional and I've had several discussions with people who seem to know what's going on but (unintelligible) very much and that's that there's a view I think within ICANN staff, probably CEO and Board, that the PDP working group process has been working very badly for the last couple of years in terms of progress, in terms of focus, in terms of dynamics. And something is being mulled over inside ICANN about that.

Now, I don't know what it is but I think that we have to take seriously that there may be some (unintelligible) coming down the road for significantly different ways of doing things. I have no idea what that might be but I'm just raising that flag as something to think about and so if we can whatever due diligence we can to figure out what's -- we know what's wrong. We can see what hasn't worked well in the working group for the last couple of years.

What we don't have is an idea of thoughts about how to include that. I just wanted to register that, that did come up when I raised the question at the intersessional. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Sam. I'm not sure it's the right, really, say right to hear or appropriate to hear from the CEO here. What he thinks about the PDPs because he has different (unintelligible) but however. So regarding to that issue and the perception about some PDP, if we can name them like (unintelligible) and so on.

We have that discussion in the strategical council meeting and Ayden just shared that. There was kind of staff paper. It's kind of -- I'm not going to say position but it was a document from the staff that we can start the discussion. And so one action from the strategical meeting that we will work on our own white paper within the council and something that we -- to initiate dialogue. So more details coming soon. And we had a long discussion on that matter in the strategical meeting. Because we are observing that some -- several PDPs are taking much more time. They are not delivering and this is compared to previous PDP.

But I think also the context changed and that's what maybe are missing because we are initiating more and more policy work that was not the case before. So before we were really focusing on a few items. Now, we have three AV policy development working group really heavy in new GTLD, on rights protection mechanism, on RDS. That was not wise decision but some of them like the RDS was initiated by the Board itself.

So we are acknowledging this kind of issue within the GNSO Council and starting the discussion. So we will work on the white paper and documents and to try to help set the scene for the dialogue. And also from the council side, we are trying to see how we can manage in planning better. So we will try to help more working groups and to liaise with their leadership and the way to work on those matters.

I will also -- the dynamics within working groups are changing. We have more and more people that are joining the working groups and it's slightly different from before. And also, we have much more kind of different interests. And I think for those in RDS working group, they are observing that. So it's hard sometimes to reach any consensus and that's why it's taking time and you are opening the same topics over and over again.

So we have a knowledge of this issue and it will be discussed. I hope that the community to take the lead on this and the council will work on that. It's not really a matter for the staff or the CEO to tell us how we should fix it. It's really a matter for us to work on that. Any comments or question on this?

Okay. We already passed the two hours for our call. It was quite lively one and we tried to cover so many things. Before joining the call, I note that some you send question or in your email with (unintelligible) to the mailing list. You wanted to get feedback. Unfortunately, I think we don't have time today to do so but I think everyone can comment on that on the mailing list.

And we already covered somehow about the budget and give us I think some aid or guidance in what areas that they view you should cover. So I'm not preempting anything here, but something probably should be followed up later on and this is maybe for the long-term. If you want to add something, comment on this.

Okay. So I'm tempted to say let's adjourn the call. I think we covered all the matter we wanted and I will try to follow-up for the several items on the mailing list because we don't have everyone on the call and if we need to keep -- give justice to all this topic, we should continue discussion on the mailing list. So we can elaborate more and try maybe to articulate some solution. It's

okay to rant but also important to try to solve for proposed solution and way to move forward.

But it's important to listen to any concern and issue. So we have to cope with that and try to fix. Okay, that said any comment or anything else? Otherwise, I will adjourn the call for today. Okay, thanks all. Bye-bye and see you soon.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you everyone. Nancy, you may disconnect all lines. Thank you very much for your time today. Bye-bye.

END