ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
January 24, 2018
6:00 am CT

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much Mark. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCSG Monthly Policy call on Wednesday 24th of January 2018 at 1200 UTC. On the call today we have Ayden Férdeline, Farell Folly, Gandadhar Panday, Martin Silva, Monica Prichard, Pascal bekono, Rafik Dammak, Shahul Hammed, Stephanie Perrin, Tatiana Tropina, Tomslin Samme-Nlar. And on the audio bridge we have Vernatius Ezeama, Gabdibé GAB-HINGONNÉ. And from staff we have myself Maryam Bakoshi. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Maryam and thanks everyone for joining. So my name is Rafik and today we have the NCSG Monthly Policy call. Usually we held it – we hold this just like a few days before the council call. But due that we have a strategic meeting next week we needed to make it a little bit earlier than usual. So the purpose is to go through the agenda of the council call since we have motion to vote and several topics to discuss and then we can get input and discuss that – discuss those items with our members.

And the second part of the call agenda we will go more through policy topics to get some update (unintelligible) and in any other business. We have several items that we are report and then we need to talk about or to give update. So without waiting we should start with the first agenda item which is about the council call. Maryam please put the council agenda on the Adobe Connect. So we will go through the GNSO Council agenda. There are several items in the beginning who are of more like administrative matters and some – (the view of) project list. We are not going to go through them.

Also we - if there – the consent agenda it's empty so we can move to first (new) agenda item which is a council vote regarding the adoption of the revisions to GNSO operating procedure and a recommendation for amendment to ICANN bylaws. So as you may read in the kind of the background about this motion is that after the (Ara Duetsche) transition and in particular the new accountability mechanism coming with the empowered community we have at the GNSO to update our operating procedure to reflect those changes. And so we had a drafting team I think in 2016 to do the review and to suggest or recommend any changes in – on the GNSO operating procedure. And they delivered that and it went through public comments and so on. So there was a process to get input about the changes.

So now it's time to approve those revisions so they can be reflected in the operating procedure for the GNSO and also to make recommendation for amendments to ICANN bylaws. So that's to – we are not going to approve the bylaws change. That's not our role but to make suggestion to the board. And that also need I think involvement of the (empower) committee. They're not (unintelligible).

So from our side the NCSG in the time when there was public comment we supported the changes and we had several of our members participating in the

drafting team. So from our side I think we have no specific concerns with what was suggested as changes. And this is kind of I think overdue because we need to have in particular the new voting threshold in regard to the different kind of (empowered) community decision that we have to make. So this is kind of quick briefing. I think that - I know that's maybe it's too condensed but I would really recommend for any agenda items to go through explanation or the background since it tend to the different material and give better context.

Okay so let's maybe now take some question or clarification if there is anyone in the queue? Okay I don't see any, don't want to put anybody on the spot but if – any comments from a GNSO counselor regarding this motion and how they will vote on it in the next GNSO Council next week? Okay since this is kind of straight forward motion which is not bad hopefully it can be done quickly.

Okay if there is no comment or question I will move to the next agenda item. So I'm giving time to people to - if they want to jump in. So let's move to the next agenda item. Maryam can you scroll down please? I don't have the - okay thanks. Okay the next motion tabled for this agenda is regarding the adoption of the charter related to the next steps of the ICANN procedure of handling who is completes the privacy law.

So this is - this was topic for discussion for a while and as a group we participated in in the public comment regarding I think the recommendation from the Implementation Advisory Group. I think that was in July. And by discussions in the last GNSO Council call in December there was agreement that we should maybe initiate a new report from the GNSO with - to have a new kind of not going to call it working group but maybe I'd say that to work

on the public comment and to see how I'd say kind of to see how we can accommodate.

So we created in that time a drafting team with some counselor from the GNSO to propose a charter for this new group. And so the motion here is to approve this charter. I think we had Stephanie as a member in the drafting team and so probably she can give some briefing about the discussion there and if there was any concern or something that she want to highlight.

Reading the charter I don't see any something alarming except maybe something - only one point that is still pending is who will chair that team or that group since it's kind of same implementation. So we don't have necessarily a clear path here who should still – who should chair this group. So Stephanie can you maybe give some briefing about the what discussed and if you have any concern about the current charter?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much Rafik. There are a couple of things that worry me about the charter and the first problem of course in revising the Whois procedure is Whois contract procedure that the policy that actually precedes the procedure is not really a policy. So the agreement way back - and it's good that we have Avri on the call because of course she was around four this compromise deal way back in 2006.

The agreement that after the second Whois task force I think it was that ICANN acknowledged that there was such a thing as data protection law and the GNSO empowered the group to draft the procedure. And so this procedure was drafted I believe by legal mostly and we're kind of stuck with it. So it has remained largely unchanged. We added a new trigger in the last IRT group or it wasn't really. It was the IAG the, implementation Advisory Group. And it still didn't make any sense and it still didn't work and yet it went all the way

to council. I'm giving you the long gory history here folks. And we passed it recently but it was acknowledged by everybody that it wasn't working. So this strikes me as a costly waste of our time.

Now we are reconstituting that group but we still have a stupid policy. And in particular I would draw your attention to the fact that this policy allows a registrar to apply for a series of waivers acknowledging that the Whois policy such as it is, in other words the RAA because it assigns them to collect, (choose) and dispose the data does not - or conflicts with local law. Now the thing about local law is that it gives rights to end users. End users have no rights under this policy and procedure.

So I have a fundamental problem with that. I raised it. Michele agrees that I have a point but as he says they desperately need a procedure that works. The current procedures do not work.

I - I'm at a loss as to why we should go ahead and spend more time drafting a procedure that allows registrars to get out of their contract but does nothing for end user rights. So I shouldn't say it does nothing for end users rights. It acknowledged the data protection law that has been in existence but it doesn't allow any rights at ICANN to end users. You know, we're still ignoring the fact end users don't actually have rights under any of the previous arrangements. So that's basically my principal objection to this. It's two. It's dumb to do this again and we're not doing – we're not improving the rights for end users. Thanks, happy to answer any questions.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Stephanie. Well so I think when the – we ask the drafting team to work on this and now leading I say, leading the chart in particular the mission and the scope I think one important kind of sentence here is that the Whois procedure IG is not asking to redo the work of the previous IAG? So it's more

like here asking that to refute the input that we get in the public comment but not trying to redo the work.

So what I'm kind of hearing it's a great area how we can do it. So we know that the trigger are not working. That was raised many times. And that's why it's - this item works for discussion I think in several council call. And the idea of two kind of create this new advisory group and having more like the GNSO to steer it in some ways trying to fix that. So trying to understand what you are saying Stephanie. Are you going – do you think that we should vote against this or that's kind of let's say we accept it as the least worst solution for now?

Stephanie Perrin: Well I think there's no point at this point -- Stephanie Perrin for the record -- I think there's no in voting against it because there is a very strong desire on the part of registrars to move this forward. I don't to be honest understand how they've been acting on the entire matter. You may recall what when the Whois the results of the last group came before council I recommended a motion to talk it out and revisit the policy. That got zero support and basically it was scuttled.

And so we went ahead and approved the policy, at least a procedure that didn't make any sense. I never did get a decent explanation for why we did that. They – Marika assured us that we would revisit and start a new group in the fall. In fact that group did not get going. We – we're still working on the charter and its January because of the work that we're doing on the GDPR.

So honestly my question was why are we doing this if we know that the procedures isn't going to work this time either? I cannot imagine a trigger that we did not bring up the last time that's going to work this time. And I was just typing in the chat so forgive me for bringing this up again but I'll just – I'll

put it in the chat. The scope had pointed out that we would be examining the comments from – to the last procedure were therefore constrained by the comments that came in in July of 2017.

So that's not very good because in the light of all of the work that people have been doing on GDPR A, they're getting educated about data protection law and how it works and B there is a lot more will to actually solve the problem at ICANN. So constraining us to look at the public – at the comments -- and there we're very few -- is too limiting. So I'm not sure whether I've answered your question Rafik. We could I suppose all rise and vote against it but it would still pass correct?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Stephanie. And I see Nick in the queue. Yes Nick go ahead.

Nick Shorey: Hi Rafik thank you. Thank you Stephanie for your explanation on all of this. It seems to me that - and I think as you – as Stephanie just mentioned we've probably kind of moved beyond this procedure as a community in our understanding of the intersection of data protection and privacy and all those factors. And so whilst that is the requirement undoubtedly for some kind of procedure in this case what we've got is - what we're left with is simply outdated. And I don't think we should be afraid of that. I think it's just – it's the nature of things.

So maybe if there is a way that we can raise this and highlight this so that it doesn't forgotten maybe either a communication to the board or some kind of company in communication in alongside our votes wherever that may be might just be a - sort of a something a bit more that we can do that doesn't sort of completely run contrary to our overall views on this but makes a point.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Nick. So okay thanks Stephanie for the explanation regarding what you're not - we should vote for this motion. We know that the GDDR is changing the whole context here. So I think what I'd say the feeling is that we needed to move somehow with this item because it was in the council agenda for a long time and it was kind of say feeling that we need to do something to act because it's – we are getting – we got the letter from the GDDR asking for guidance and we didn't. So their kind of intent and last council call is that the GNSO here take the lead and try to propose I'd say a way forward. I'm not sure if we can ask for say for more discussion or do we have any way to change the charter? I - we are asking for amendments if we are – we don't think we are – it's okay for now. So I'm not sure what can be the way to move forward in this situation. Yes Stephanie please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: I think that the registrar wants something that works because they have only been given a temporary stay of execution from the enforcement of the contract while ICANN comes up with a workaround for the Whois. So I believe that they felt they had to come up with something. The only problem is nobody has indicated how they can come up with anything.

And for those of us who are already up our neck – to our necks in Whois and RDS work I think we're going, "Why on earth would we jump into this process again if there is no answer?" And the only hope is that the IPC will not be as obstinate this time as they were last time. So I don't know. I don't think it would be viewed well by our colleagues if we failed to pass this this vote.

Rafik Dammak: I'm sorry Stephanie I'm not sure trying to understand your last sentence. Can you just please repeat?

Stephanie Perrin: Well I guess what you're hearing for me is I'm kind of giving up on this issue. It doesn't make any sense. It's been surpassed by other events. Nevertheless ICANN has only given the registrar a short window of non-enforcement of their contracts. So the complexity of this issue would prevent us coming up with another trigger in my view according to this procedure unless somebody knows something that I don't know and they've – and they just haven't shared it yet. But I don't think there's any way to fix this. I tried in the drafting group.

I don't think that the charter is broad enough to allow us to revisit the policy. That was not the intent. So it looks like yet another IAG that is not going to solve the problem. That's all. And I mean if we want to continue to vote against that's fine but I just don't think it will be well viewed in the particular environment. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Stephanie. That's crystal clear. And to respond to Nick I say at least from the council I'd say we don't get yet any reaction. So the motion just was submitted this (unintelligible). I mean most of the discussion about the charter has been the drafting team so we didn't kind of have a discussion about it and the council so it's hard to know what the – I mean it's hard to state what the other groups will vote. They are still probably in consulting for membership. So regarding the abstention at the end it – I mean even we - if abstain it it will count as voting against. And the only difference is that in abstention you have to give the rational about – for it. So okay it's tricky, still probably have some time to make decision depending of what we hear from others or maybe we can – we may change our position. Stephanie is it an old or a new hand?

Stephanie Perrin: Old hand sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so okay I'm not sure that we will reach a closure or kind of conclusion for this topic today. So this is still need to more discussion and to hear how do I say yes we need to get more feedback. So Nick yes I mean if you - if we abstain how to say because we have three short for voting. So if we don't vote for it will be I would say somehow against because we need to reach we the three (short).

And in this case I'm not sure about the three (short) if it's a simple majority for each house. That's usually it's – yes simple majority. So the other side of the house the CSG and say NomCom appointee for TS so it will – and the other house also they vote yes to pass. Right I think the abstention is just how to say just if we want to share our position here.

So okay anyway so is there any comment or question about this one? Okay we can move to the next. So after this so we don't have any motion to vote but it's more kind of topic for discussion or update. And the first one is on the potential fiscal year 2018 GNSO additional budget request. So as a context or background there is usually what we called the additional budget request process where there is a budget for the community support where the different SO AC stakeholder group and so on puts a request to get support for different activities that's not necessarily covered by existing budget. And as you may know there is already I think a NCSG and NCUC list request for input to make several additional budget request. For this one it's just for the GNSO council and we have, I think, the proposal. They are just like a continuation of what we had last year. And so, asking here if someone wants to give an update, and I guess, maybe and you, Ayden want to talk more about this. Ayden?

Ayden Férdeline: So, thank you Rafik. Hi, everyone. Ayden Férdeline for the record. I apologize for the noise that might be in the background as I speak. I hope it's

not too bothersome. As Rafik just mentioned, the Council has three additional budgetary requests on the agenda for consideration. Of the three, I think two are very reasonable, and one, in my opinion, deserves some more scrutiny, but I'll get to that in a moment. And I would like to hear your thoughts there.

So, the first of the three is the GNSO council strategic planning session. For those who don't know, the Council is meeting in Los Angeles next week for such a strategic planning session where the objective is for it to flesh out a work plan for the coming fourth month. This is a new meeting type for us. It has an ambitious agenda, and it's something that I'm extremely supportive of continuing. If we, as a council, are going to be strategic and productive, we need a space where we can meet, disconnect, download information, exchange thoughts, set expectations. So, I support this.

The second request is the continuation of PDP leadership support which is essentially providing modest travel support to allow once participant per working group to attend an ICANN meeting. That could be the Chair. That could be the Vice Chair. It is up to the working group's leadership itself, from what I understand, to speed, to, sort of drive, the dissemination there. As to who is most - I have no issues with this. If anything, I think it is too minimal and we should go a step further and ask them what's what. Because when people are donating so much of their time to shape policy at ICANN, we should be helping to enable their participation and widening the pull of those who are able to participate in the first place.

But the third is one where I have some hesitation and I'd really like to hear what you think about it. So, the third additional budgetary request is for a working group enrollment tour. So, from how it has been described by ICANN staff, the onboarding of participants to policy develop process working group is handled by the GNSO secretary through a Google sign up

form. Then an individual email is sent to the participant asking that they complete a statement of interest form. And in the budget request, it's described as a slow de-sensualized in the administratively heavy process to staff.

And instead they ask for an automated signup tool which would allow for a clear and centralized portal to working group onboarding and signup. I'm just not sure why we would submit this. I don't oppose it. I think it's a good idea. I just think why is this something that the community has to fund? All it does is reduce the workload of staff. I don't want that to sound really blasé. It's important that we reduce the workload of staff. I just think it's something that staff should be pushing for themselves.

When the budget for community requests has been cut 50% in the coming fiscal year, this seems not to be something that I could support unless we receive some form of assurance that this is not a project that would be funded from resources that would otherwise be going to the community. I appreciate that this is a rather pretentious issue and as such, not wrong by the way. There is a perception that staff supports community's work, and some staff do support the community's work. But equally, I think that this is an administrative function that if this is such a huge burden on staff, they need to be pushing for ICANN to find an alternative budgetary line, and not from the very limited support that is available to support the capacity building of the community.

But I would really like to hear what everyone else thinks about this. Of course, I will go with the consensus of the group, and if we think that such a working group enrollment tool is something that would be very valuable, I would be happy to support it. I leave my comments here for now. Happy to take any questions. I hope this has been a useful summary of the three-

different additional budgetary requests that are before the council later this month. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak   Thanks, Ayden. And I think I can respond to, about the third. So, I think maybe we need to remind first that GNSO council has the role to manage the process for policies. Have open process and go through the working group. So, I think it's important for us to support anything that can help to make it more functional and more easy. And in particular to help the tools that we can attract the enforcement of working numbers and so on. So, the intent of having this request is not really to get the budget from the community resources here. But just to, kind of, to make the point to support them in going activities and to show that priority.

So, I think we shared in the mailing list and probably many heard about the proposed throughout budget for the next fiscal year. ICANN is discussing in a different area the budget. And one of them is the, kind of, the allocation for the community support. So, this request is not going through. It's unlikely to get any, I'd say to be approved end of that. But it's, people are, kind of, it's, I would say a tool or a need to show that we are seeing this project working group enrollment as a priority. So, that's why we are using additional budget requests. We are not expecting that it will be taken from the community budget, per se. Say, kind of, strategical way to do so, and it happens even for our case before us in CAG.

Previously, we made several - I had to call myself when I was Chair. I met like a budget request to get admin support even if we - it was not, I would say - it was pilot project, but it was a way to show that we need it. And so, to speculate in the future and the way to make it more sustainable. So, it's, kind of, I'd say, in a strategical manner or approach to show where we see a priority. So, from, I think council has standpoint that can be a useful tool. I

hope that this make it maybe more clear. And basically, from the council which we have really few budget requests, we are limited here. So, for strategical meeting because we see there is a value to have this. We will have the first instance this year, just next week. And for also, for supporting the PDP working group to achieve. I think it's important to ensure that those leadership we spend a lot of time and leading those enforced to be at least attending one of the ICANN meetings, so they can conduct their work.

Okay, so any question or comment on this? Okay, I see some discussion in the chat, but I'm not sure if anyone want to ask something currently. So, I'm leaving time. Yeah, so. Okay, well I don't think anybody is in the queue. Probably we can move to the next agenda item.

Okay, so the next agenda item is about - oh, okay, I see. So, the hand is appeared and disappeared quickly. Dina, you wanted to ask something? Dina? Okay, I'm not sure. Dina you want to ask or we just, we can move to the next agenda item? Okay.

Okay, in the meantime, let's go with Nick. Nick please go ahead.

Nick Shorey: Thank you Rafik. And, thank you Ayden for those items. As I mentioned in the chat, sounds like a good idea. Makes sense. Sounds like core business, and I think you, Rafik, your explanation was helpful. So as long as your explanation is also communicated clearly in the proposal, i.e. that we think this is necessary. We see this as an ICANN core business element. Then I wouldn't have a problem with it.

My concern would come with the knowledge that ICANN is looking very closely at its budgets in general, and its expenditure. And is looking to cut costs in different places. If we someone introduce a precedent whereby what

we perceive to be core business services are actually coming out of community budgets, then that could, whilst this is a useful thing, it could set a dangerous precedent in the future that we might find more challenging. So, that would be my concern that we express clearly where we think it should be funded from.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Nick, I think that we can make the point to ensure that it's not coming from the community budget. So, I shared, and I put it in the Adobe connect, how say, the explanation from, I'd say, the request. And so, if they - what I think may be to highlight here is what they are saying. The GNSO council is aware that the working group around enrollment tool is a part of the ICANN it budget, but we wish to see active development in the matter. So, I think we clearly here just giving, say a nudge, that we are supporting this activity. So, but anyway, I guess we can ask for more clarity. That should not be taken in any way from the community budget. Okay?

So, I guess we can move to the next agenda item. And it's the, how say, yeah. So, it's also discussion about the GNSO council public comment to the proposal incremental change to the ICANN meeting strategy. So, as you may know, there is a public comment on that incremental change for the current ICANN meeting strategy including, I think how say, adding additional day and so on. So, group of councilors addressed it, a comment. So, this is still under discussion. And I think we may have some comments about, some concerns and what is included.

And I think that Ayden already made the comment in the council list. He may want to elaborate about them here. So, to share with the other.

Ayden Férdeline: Sure, hi everyone. Ayden Férdeline for the record. I can't raise my hand (unintelligible) for some reason. So, I'm just going to take this opportunity to

speak. So, the first thing, I'm very grateful to the drafting team that did prepare this comment on behalf of the council. But what I would say - my one concern that I raised on the list is that it goes above and beyond what has been - what we've been asked to respond to.

So, the public comment itself is we've been asked to respond to some proposed incremental changes to the meeting strategy. They're very minor. They really just concern how long should meetings be. How many days? What should be on the agenda in terms blocks and scheduling? Not content, nothing like that and I think that's all we should be responding to. However, the drafting team has prepared some high-level comments that go further than that. And I don't think the comments that - The comments I'd be very reluctant to support.

So, among the suggestions are that we should review the requirement to have meetings recorded, transcribed and translated. I do not think that is a very significant cost to record a meeting. I think that transcribing meetings is very useful. Translation? Well, we can assess - we might need to assess that whether it is worth it or feasible. Or what do we need to do more translation or less translation? But this is not the comment to put that in here.

There is also the suggestion that maybe we should reassess whether we have three major ICANN meetings a year. Maybe they can be, sort of, piggybacked onto other meetings where we can't participate. The suggestion, for instance, was the GDD summit which we, aside from the fact that we won't have the resources to participate in that forum, it's not even open to non-contracted parties. So, I think that, for the purposes of this comment, the council should be submitting something that is fair to all of the stakeholder groups in both the contracted and uncontracted parties. And keep our recommendations very

narrow and simply addressing what community leaders and representatives have been asked to address in the comment by ICANN staff.

Which is one, meeting durations the community forum, policy forum, and in general meeting. And how we block out time. So those were the comments that I submitted to the council's mailing list. Happy to hear different perspectives there or if there is the desire to tackle some of these high-level issues, I would like to hear rationale for that too. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Ayden for the explanation. To return to the comment, I think, in general, I guess what we can support is what's about the substance here and the core question. In fact, we don't change the community forum duration, but we also have an outreach day doing proposed forum that something we at NCHE, I think, we realize it several times a concern. The outreach table user it for other purpose and defeating what it's about. Also, for keeping the annual general meeting as it is for now.

But regarding the kind of say high-level comments. I do agree with you that states really want the purpose or the scope of this public comment, but I can see us maybe working to discuss them. But probably we cannot have an agreement for now with the way it's proposed. Because it's, kind of, let's say it really can change from what we have now. It's worth it to discuss then. I think for maybe for the future. I mean it's good to question. It's important to question what might we need. Do we still need three ICANN meetings or not? But for this public comment, I think we should drop it because we don't have either the time or it's not really the scope to talk this - I mean to talk this high-level comment. So, I think we can support dropping the high-level comment. It's unlikely that we can find common ground in such short time about that.

Okay, see Ayden raising hand in Adobe Connect. Yes?

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks, Rafik. Ayden Férdeline again. You reminded me of something was that I didn't actually comment on what I do like in the comment. So, I'll get to that. But I first just wanted to say that I think it's important that we're consistent, and in the reserve on comment that the council dropped it, some of the same people that dropped it, this comment, were very insistent that we should only keep our comments within a very narrow scope. And so, I took that feedback to heart when it came in, and I think we should be holding them to the same standard now. And for them to - When we were trying to save the organization money, last month we received pushback against that. Saying that it was not our place to put this recommendation forward. So, I don't see now why when the same voices are saying that we should save money by cutting, you know, streamlining or cutting the support that actually impact our community? I don't see why we would support that.

But in terms of what I do support about these comments, I think that the comments about the community forum which is first meeting of the year. That making sure that we have the policy forum format for the first meeting of the year. I think that's worth, really worth considering. One additional day being dedicated to outreach being added as well to the midyear policy forum so that it becomes a five-day meeting. That may make perfect sense.

Similarly, for the annual general meeting, keeping it at seven days, but reorganizing work either so that do have Day 7 free for us to hold our own internal working meeting and wrap up session. I think that's a good idea as well. I just wanted to put that out there. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, to be a (unintelligible) here with regard to this comment, it will be too late if we want to make a mention during the GNSO council call. So, I think what we should do is to make (unintelligible) in the coming days to that

comment. Just, I think, we (unintelligible) the first (unintelligible). So, we can see we won't have that much - I mean we should really make suggestions in coming days and asking clearly that we want to drop this and this. And we suggest adding this and that.

So, this is what I would propose and if we can drop maybe something. We can make a day to the document and send it to the mailing list. On the other hand, since we are talking about this topic. This public comment is for all groups including our here So, I think we have this urgent task is to address an NCAG comment on the matter. I mean it should not be too long. It's just to express if we are or not supporting the proposal change. I think can be straightforward. And so, we can work on that quickly. But just I wanted to put it here and put it on the table, and then to throw it out for everyone that we should voice our position on the matter since it's, I mean, how the meetings are organized that leave impact in a way or another our work. Any other comment or question here?

Okay, I don't see any. So, moving to the next agenda item, and this is another public comment regarding the operating standards for ICANN specific review. So, there was, how say, a proposal, I think, from staff regarding all the process related to the review teams. And this public comment took more, I'd say, I won't say more levels. But it become more critical to respond with what happened for the case of SSR2. When we find out several issues that have the community have to deal with review teams. Since it's their responsibility, somehow, to manage it become community one.

So, currently, we have the comment drafted by the council. I think we made some comments, initial comments about it. I think it make interesting point. I think we may support it at the end, so we still need to work maybe to propose

some amendment. But I'm not sure if any other councilor want to wait in here or to stay to think about the current draft. I don't see any comment.

So, what we tried to do. We continue reviewing the comment in the same way for the previous one. We can suggest some amendments on the council list. Probably we try to resend agenda and highlight those items, so people can have a chance to review them. I'm not sure that everyone could like support them. But anyway, so another hand, since it's a public comment. For this one we have the draft. It's under concertation, I think, on the mailing list if I'm not mistaken. It's still need some work, and we have to review it quickly.

So, I ask everyone to review the NCAG comments. I will try to find the link or if someone can find it quickly. Yeah, (unintelligible), I think it's quite important. Because we need to read it if you want us to have as a proposing as a way to move forward with regard to the review teams. And I know the community is responsible for the (unintelligible). And the experience, okay. The SSR2 showed that yeah, that we need to do a lot of work. That it's not done, because it's the first time we are doing it.

Yeah, so regarding the removal of participants, yeah, I think that needs more, much more work. In the GNSO council commentary, we are only proposing some point of contact, but we are not proposing clear flow or how the (unintelligible) intervene and we don't have an appeal process. It seems what this proposal and operating standard is quite ready. That we can remove members quit, it's quite easy. So, we need to add more safeguard here. So, it's something maybe we can put clear such - It seems that the drafting team didn't, kind of, find out a clear idea. But we can propose.

And my - I tried to express in comment, and the council list, I don't think that the complaint officer should be a point of contact, because he or she was - is

not asked to handle complaints against the community and somehow. It's the complaint against or related to the organization, I think. We should make that point clear. Okay, do please bear with me. I'm trying to find the NCSG comment to write. Okay here we go. Oh we (unintelligible) was quick. Oh yes so please review it. We have very few days to get this reviewed, edited and approved and it's quite important for us to participate. Okay any further question or comment on this matter?

Okay I see none so we can move to the next agenda item and it's still related well somehow to what all discussing. And but this is regarding security, stability and resiliency (unintelligible) so which was (posed) just for doing the ICANN meetings in Abu Dhabi. And since then the supporting organization advisory committee leadership were in discussion on how to deal with this issue to understand what are the problem and also to hear from the review teams remember what are their concerns to figure out how we can move forward.

So it took really long time. It doesn't seem that all the SO ACs are kind of – they're – in having sharing say in the same position or the same direction. So maybe some of them are reticent to kind of resume the work of that review team until they fix all or solve all the issues related. So what we are trying to do here in this item is that the GNSO would send a letter to the other SO and AC leadership to explain its position with regard to I would say to resume as soon as possible the review team and also to if needed to add more members to fill if any gap regarding the skills.

So we have the skills metrics and also the evaluation of the scope of the review. So from our side I think from the councilor are trying to express our willingness to restart the work as soon as possible. Okay so any question or comment on this one?

Okay. I don't think we have any concern with the current letter. And it's good that we suggest that they can kind of a positive point here that we are trying to boost that - the review to resume its work. And there is a concern that the more we – it's kind of stay in limbo we lose more and more members because some of the members of the review team are resigning. So we need to kind of insure that it conducts its work in - as soon as possible.

Okay if there is no comment here or question be sure I want just really that we finish (fixing) with any other business we can go to other agenda items and our own agenda item for the call. Okay.

So in just in – and or other business we have the planning for ICANN 61 and just to give an update about the GNSO schedule. So there is no big change compared to other meetings. But maybe I can highlight that we'd be very - it seems more session of the PDP working groups on Saturday mostly but also I think for some and Sunday and Wednesday. So and also I think we will get update about the cross community session. There will be a fall session and one of them is about surprise from (unintelligible) GDPR. So this is I think what we will get as main update during the call.

Okay so let's go back to main NCSG agenda. Yes please Maryam yes put the other agenda in the Adobe Connect. Okay so the second part of the agenda is about the policy update. And I think somehow we cover the first one regarding the public comment so we talk about the operating procedure and the incremental change for meetings.

So one we have to work quickly on drafting a short comment. And the other one we need to do the review. So I don't think we have any other public comments that we have to deal with as soon as possible except we have new

that just published this week which is – no just last Friday that we – they occurred last Friday which is the ICANN draft fiscal year 2019 operating plan and budget and five year operating plan update. So this is the new one and there is a call for volunteers in the mailing list so if someone want to join this effort please do so.

Okay any question about this? Okay so let's go forward to policy topics. So here we are trying to get updates from working groups, review teams and so on. If someone wants to share any briefing or updates please feel free to do so. I don't want to put anyone on the spot here. Okay so is there any comment from the RDS Working Group or the subsequent procedure in new gTLD or the rights protection mechanism? Those are the three (unintelligible) policy development process we have now. I see that people are still discussing what SSR2 so yes Kathy please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi Rafik. Hello everyone. Can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. This is Kathy. I actually had a question for the RDS because a lot of material came out of the late-night meeting last night, at least late night North America time. And so I was wondering, you know, what the people who are participating in that meeting think of some of the purposes that are coming out of the RDS and whether we support them or not? Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Stephanie want to respond yes. Please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. We had an interesting call last night on the RDS. Basically they are trying to stack up criteria for

determining what's an acceptable purpose and then listing acceptable purposes. And I have grave concerns that I've raised repeatedly on the matter of how we are tackling these purposes. Why because there is an effort among many players who wish to maintain the Whois in their status quo situation to broaden the purpose of the RDS so broadly that it meets all of the secondary purposes.

Now for those who are not immersed in the details of data protection law there is some vagueness in the way the European law is constructed in that you want to have a valid purpose for processing personal data. And if that purpose is not originally stated then you cannot process it without, you know, extraneous like further attorney protection laws and all the other possibilities, law enforcement accessing of course one. But there is some confusion as to whether your purpose for collecting the information is the same as the purpose for using and disclosing.

So the example that is I like to point out is if you collect information for the purpose of granting someone a registration and maintaining the operability of the RDS that does not mean that somebody comes along and wants it for academic research. They might have a valid reason and they might submit a research protocol and they might get access to all of that personal data about who is getting a registration in the DNS. But that doesn't mean that you collected that data for the purpose of academic research.

And I use this because it's a live example. So there is a definite push. And if you've read all of the different comments on the RDS Web site that ICANN has set up now, the GDPR Web site you will see that particularly our colleagues in the intellectual property constituency and in the Law-enforcement Public Safety Working Group want that purpose broadened to

include all manner of things that are actually releases of data under legitimate circumstances to legitimate actors for a legitimate purpose.

So the way we keep framing this in the RDS discussions is it continues to conflate the purpose of selecting which should be narrowly constructed around ICANN's remit -- and there's plenty of scope to go wrong just right there -- and not going into every single subsequent use. But unfortunately even GDPR is not crystal clear on this. So there's a lot of high-priced lawyers making some arguments on this. And I think it's, you know, Kathy would agree that is a good lawyer you can figure out how to coin a purpose for RDS that will allow all kinds of secondary uses.

So if that helps last night was yet another frustrating experience where this thing is being sold as a preliminary community agreement, you know, group agreement. But there is still a lack of clarity on what we're agreeing on in my view. And we kept saying how about a footnote, how about an addendum to this to clarify that this doesn't apply here and there but in the footnote never comes. I've been asking for footnotes and abstentions and I can't remember the word that we used in international securities when you abstain from something. You take a reservation or a - that's not the right word but you get the idea. But, you know, that never shows up in the language. So it was a bit frustrating and I think we have to watch this very carefully. I hope that helps.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Stephanie for this short response. I think Kathy will want to intervene here. I'm not sure if it's old or new hand but I assume that she wanted to intervene. Yes...

Kathy Kleiman: It's a new hand Rafik, thanks. Stephanie thank you for the fight that you're doing on this. Let me ask you a question. It looks like the proposed working group agreement is the kitchen sink. It – they're throwing everything into

purpose as you indicated. But it says it's to be confirmed by poll. Ayden in - month Skype list recently said we may have up to 50 people who are – who claim to - who, you know, put – not claim to be but who are NCSG members in the RDS. Do we want to activate them on responding to this poll and give some guidance it says no this is not, you know, consistent with the GDPR? We may need to give them the guidance because they haven't been involved in the active discussions but they should have every right to respond to the poll.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Kathy. So maybe Stephanie wants to respond to that and then we go to Nick. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: It's - yes Stephanie Perrin for the record. I think that, that, you know, we had discussed this a while ago about mustering people to respond to the polls. As Ayden says they're having a difficulty getting a high rate of engagement. And by the time I'm on the call at 3 o'clock in the morning and trying to get ready for the 7 o'clock in the morning call that is the policy meeting this morning, you know, somebody has to make a synopsis of why we're asking you to vote when the Doodle poll shows up. So I think it's a good idea but for those of us who are engaged it's one more task, you know? So all hands on deck would be nice. Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: Who were the active participants in the RDS right now? Like who's attending every call, just wondering who else might be able to help with this?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So we (unintelligible) here. I know that Stephanie wants to respond but let's go with Nick first and then go back to Stephanie. Yes Nick please go ahead.

Nick Shorey: Thank you Rafik. So for my part I'm a passive participant at the moment. Unfortunately the conference calls for the RDS clash with regular other calls that I am – I have to attend that as a priority. I've been tracking some of the recent conversations on the mailing list around the purposes and agree with Stephanie there that people are looking to add in all the different elements and justify them as a primary purpose. It seems to me in doing so that certain parties – I'll take law enforcement as one example – that in doing so they're slightly misrepresenting actual processes, legal processes and options that they have within law that enabled them to do such things. And kind of don't think that element within the sort of the RDS.

                  So just a really quick example. If a law enforcement agency wants to find out the person who has registered a domain name they have a legal in most - pretty much in most countries they will have a legal mechanism to do so by a court order as we all understand. And the information that they can request is numerous from name, address, contact telephone numbers, email addresses, et cetera, all the way through to financial information. And they will have the facility to do that in law through court orders and they get a direct request to a company whether it's in their own country or whether it's in a second country.

                  The presence of information in the RDS has no impact on their ability to do that however the RDS as it currently is makes it a little bit easier because that information is or a lot of that information is public. And due to the sort of global nature of the DNS and location of registries and registrars that's a quicker, easier and cheaper option than making a formal legal request.

And it seemed to me that the GDPR makes quite clearly that there needs to be an overriding justification for publishing such information publicly. The override certainly is (some) fundamental human rights and that this would not justify that because there are separate mechanisms, legal processes through which to achieve things. And the - again in this law-enforcement case, you know, the ultimate solution to all of this is actually updating multilateral laws around and procedures around these sort of the quick function of mutual legal assistance requests.

And we're dumping in something that isn't really relevant and this is here and trying to make it so I think those are the things that we need to also consider. What are the other options the BC will have on the table and why might they not be pursuing those in precedents against trying to get things in the RDS and I think we probably need to bring that to the table because I don't see that others are. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Nick. Okay Stephanie you want to respond to this?

Stephanie Perrin: Well on two points. I raised my hand -- Stephanie Perrin for the record -- initially to respond to the whole business of who's on the call regularly. I think – I'm sure that there's a large constituency in RDS working group who would like me to go away and take a vacation somewhere for a couple of years because I am the noisiest on the group.

I appreciate all the support of folks on the call but I think we should measure participation not by who's listening but by who's actually fighting the good fight in there. And I welcome every time somebody raises their voice and says something because it's very difficult if there's only one person taking them by the throat every week and repeating the same arguments. So that's that point. And I do understand that lots of people are listening and trying to get up to

speed. And I've encouraged everybody to do that. But boy we need some more engaged folks fighting them off.

Secondly to Nick's point about the failure of law enforcement to pony up and figure out how they can expedite their process yes for those of us worked on the cybercrime treaty now known as the Budapest Treaty it seemed like that was to be the answer and yet there's been very little progress made at the international level in getting a speedy method for takedown of sites and getting access to data. So when we see law enforcement and the GAC communiqué from Abu Dhabi they are still sawing away at the same, you know, anti-terrorism and human trafficking, you know, come on. And don't forget is some human trafficking have all kinds of legal means to get the data. They should not be messing around with Whois. They should be going straight to either the ISP or the registrar. You know, this is, you know, a - I would say a ridiculous argument but I'm a little long in the tooth.

Anyway the real problem that we have is that cybercrime continues to be fought by private sector actors who have no delegated legal authority in most cases to do that and that law enforcement is using commercial products brought up by people like companies like Domain Tool so that they are taking advantage of bulk data acquisition that only can function through either access to zone files or access to deep data in Whois. So that's a problem that I really think we should address. We should call them on it. I have been going through all of comments while preparing our comments to NCSG. And, you know, the law – the intellectual property lawyers basically want self-certification to get access to any data in a tiered system. I don't think so certification is acceptable anymore. For those who purport to be investigating legal issues, cybercrime they should get accreditation through an international standard.

So I have a standards project that I'm trying to find funding for and I would like to have a workshop at the Barcelona meeting. I know that the – none of these people agree or want to come to such a workshop but frankly this is a human rights and due process issue and there is no way we should be permitting so certification to get deeper access again. Thanks. I realize that's a bit of a tangent but I think it's worthwhile introducing that topic now. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Stephanie. I don't see anyone in the queue and so I assume that okay there is no further comment. Well I guess the discussion is still going on and thanks for summarizing the concerns here from RDS and also still there is still discussion on how we can get more people involved and engaged in the working group. To be honest I have no idea what can be the response or the solution.

Joining working group it's kind of a long journey and it needs some commitment from the people who do that. So I guess we can support as much as possible but yes it needs some commitment and willingness to continue for a long time to participate to lead in the mailing list the matter as well.

It's kind of discussion really for long discussion but maybe not for this call unfortunately. And I would like to move on if there is any other update from other working groups so our review teams. In regard with your case I think we have the Whois that's started a few months ago. Okay anyway yes Kathy please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi. This time I'll – this is Kathy of course. This time I'll talk about the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group. We have moved on to the discussion of the uniform rapid suspension. For anyone who doesn't know -- and my guess is almost everyone does -- the UDRP was intended to be a fast short bypassing of the court process, something cheaper and faster than court. I was,

you know, some of us were really surprised when we were told before the new GTLDs that we needed something cheaper and faster than the EDRP and that is the URS. So there is a review now of the URS and most of the voices in the rights protection mechanism working group are very concerned about trademark owners. So the more voices we can have that might be concerned about registrants, particularly non-commercial registrants would be really good. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Kathy, for this summary and I think also you'll find the (unintelligible) also the group is looking to get the survey as soon as possible and we are working on that. So with that, I think it would be a great experience since the RPM is the first working group to use the kind of provision and operating procedure. And I think and working group got a chance to use data metrics for its work.

So okay. I don't think we have more updates regarding policy. I would like to move to any other business but we have a long, please, long laundry list of topic that we want to discuss and to take some action. And first one is the GDPR compliance model. So as you know, we have GDPR as a topic now for several months, I think since Copenhagen meeting last year and in the last weeks, there was a request for input regarding to submit different proposal compliance (unintelligible) and how we can -- with regard to (unintelligible) how we can comply with the GDPR. There were several proposals and lately, ICANN as an organization, they put three model (unintelligible) proposal and asking the community for input.

So the deadline is really, really soon, the 29th of this month. So we need to submit an input. So I know some folks are working on that and I hope that we can get that. But I'm not the best person to talk about this issue and while I don't want to put someone on the spot, but Stephanie or Ayden, if you want to

talk. I know that we had some discussion on the NCSG list about the compliance model and I did see support for the model 2B, but if you want maybe to elaborate more and explain how we should proceed on this matter that would be really helpful.

Okay. Nobody wants to talk about GDPR. Anyway. So this is one action for us is to submit a comment as soon as possible on this matter and to have our position made. So the next one is about the ICANN budget. So the public comment just started. So we need volunteers to work on that. The comment isn't until March but the first milestone is to ask for clarification or questions regarding the draft budget if you want more details. I think the deadline is the 13th of January. Why we need to cover this is because now with the empowered community, it's one of the powers to petition against the budget. So we have as a group to pay more attention to the budget, and with the current context of doing a lot of budget cuts, we need to be careful in which area it's done.

I see Ayden is in the queue. I'm not sure which item you wanted to speak, but please go ahead.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks, Rafik. Ayden Férdeline for the record and I did want to comment on the budget actually. So thanks, it's a really great summary. To everyone who is not following this too intimately just yet, we need to comprehensively review the budget and submit questions to the finance department by January 30. If we don't, from what I understand, we can't object to that line item later down the line. So we really need to explore this soon.

So just at a very high level as to what is in the budget, the personnel costs are going up 10.5%. Travel and meeting costs are going to go down by roughly 5%. Professional services costs are modestly going down. Administrative

costs are going down slightly and what really impacts us is that in addition, of course, to personnel costs going up, at the same time, the budget for additional budgetary request is being slashed in half. And that is going to hurt all of that capacity building assets and some of that outreach and engagement strategy.

So I would very much encourage us to push back against this. Headcount is going to increase to 425 by an increase of 25 staff. Initially, I was under the impression that this was a typo but apparently, it is not. Apparently, headcount will level out this fiscal year at 425. On the standing committee and budget operations call earlier this week, the CFO made the claim that staff support the community and so we should see staff as a form of support.

And to an extent that is true. However, if we look at a lot of the positions that are being hired, they don't support us. There are roughly 50 account managers that ICANN now has. These do not support the community. They support the domain name industry and so when we go through the budget, which I encourage everyone to do, and when we look at questions that we want to ask and projects that we want to query, I think we also need to be putting forward the claim that what is the right size for the organization to be. Is it really 425 staff? Staff are now 56% of the budget. If we are not going to tackle the issue of -- tackle the largest cost that the organization has and we're going to allow the modest support that we in the community receive to be cut, no, I think that's the wrong priority.

And so I would strongly encourage us to be looking throughout all of the six budgetary documents that have been published, looking for increases to -- looking for items to query. Another thing, and I really don't want to get into the weeds here, is simply the issue of staff travel as well. So there is a staff retreat in Los Angeles this week and for the GNSO Council, we have actually (unintelligible) planning session in Los Angeles next week as well.

We have been put up at a much cheaper hotel than staff are traveling at and so I think we need to be really looking at this. Why is it that staff are perceived as needing to stay in a higher quality of accommodations than the community? Why is there not a common travel standard as well? Maybe that is an opportunity for some savings to be cut.

All I'm saying is that before cuts are made to community support, the organization really needs to look internally for us to see where it's spending money. So just a reminder, the first deadline is the 30th of January where we need to give questions to the finance department by. If you send those to our mailing list, that would be a really great place to start. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Ayden. So any question or comment about the budget? Okay. So I guess we can go back to the GDPR compliance models and see if any just came back and maybe you want to talk about that one. So what we discussed (unintelligible) is that we should make a comment to the model proposal. I think it's quite critical for us. So Stephanie, if you want to elaborate here more or give any explanation that would be really helpful.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. Sorry, I was just commenting on the budget. I (unintelligible) that ICANN as an organization lives pretty high off the hog as we say here in Canada. Anyway, with respect to the CR, my apologies being slow in getting this draft comment out. For those of you who don't know me, I have just finished a doctoral dissertation on why ICANN has no privacy. So I volunteered to draft this because there's no need for everybody else to go through the agony of going through all these documents that I have gone through over the past four years.

But I am now plowing through all of the comments, and documents, and legal opinions that have been brought forward in the context of the GDPR models because I think it's important that this comment encompass a whole lot of comment. In other words, we need to have a discussion on purpose. We need to have a discussion on accreditation of actors who are getting what I would describe as third party access. We need to discuss registrant rights in a broader context.

Basically, the models that are being put forward are models to ensure that registrars don't get 4% of their revenue fined away from them and that is the focus. And I think we as a group representing the end user and non-commercial users need to remind people that there's more to life than GDPR. ICANN has been violating many other data protection laws. So that's almost worth a page right there.

And the discussion of the purpose is key. Basically, I'm going through everything and trying to organize it all. I expect it will be about 15 pages but I think it's more useful to summarize our thoughts on the models briefly but provide all of this other statement so that we can at least bring our own members up to speed. Because quite frankly, I think if you're not immersed in this stuff, looking at the GDPR page would be totally confusing. I'm immersed in it and I find it disorganized and confusing.

So in terms of selection of the models, there has been interesting discussion on the list. I think there's concurrence that 2B is a better model than many. Some may feel that the last option, 3, is a good model but I don't think it has any chance of surviving because it implies a lot of work and (unintelligible) the part of registrars. And the one thing we don't talk about is the hidden cost of all this compliance. It has to be something that is not going to break the

bank or it will never get off the ground. That's one of the risks you examine when you do a proper privacy impact assessment.

So I'm approaching this -- I'm not writing on the formal privacy impact assessment. That would take even more time and more page. But I am approaching it from a privacy risk assessment perspective and I will identify some of the key risks, including costs because nobody else is talking about it. So I hope to get that out in the next day or two at the outside. It was supposed to be there yesterday but I goofed off. Sorry.

So if anybody has any questions. So I'm suggesting of the models presented, 2B is the better model. But we like the model put forward by the registrars in the ECO presentation and I commend the manual that ECO has prepared as a very useful compendium of information on how things actually operate. I wish I'd had it when I was writing my dissertation because getting the information off the ICANN website is a whole lot harder. Thanks. Happy to answer any questions.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks Stephanie. So we are looking forward to the draft. I think we have the time constraint and hopefully we can get this done. Okay. I'm not sure Ayden, it's an old/new hand. Old. Okay. So I think we covered the two items (unintelligible) compliance form, ICANN budget. So the next we put is the non (unintelligible) assessment report. They are also asking for input. Importantly, they put also an unrealistic deadline. So it's next week. So this is assessment is done by I think an independent examiner. They did the survey. I think (unintelligible) from NCIC respond to it and also, they made interview with several and I think also someone from NCIC.

So I think if we feel strongly that we should make a comment or share some input about this report, I think maybe we should. We have a few days to do

so. As I said for the non-com for one term, I'm wondering if it's really worth it to (unintelligible) comment. But yes, I do believe it's important. So I think we need a volunteer that they can draft something quickly that we can submit. Doesn't need to be long. I think we have some discussion on the mailing list and some comments were made. So we can use that to kick off, not kick off discussion, but maybe to start something draft that can be done quickly.

Okay. I see that Renata is in the queue. Yes, Renata?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Hi, Rafik. I -- in 2C (unintelligible) has drafted a comment on non-com review. I'm sending the link now but I'm (unintelligible) take a look at it and of course, we would appreciate collaboration as well. And this was initially an NCIC comment but I see there's a lot going on in BC so maybe we should send it as BC.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, I was muted. Okay. So again, thanks for this draft. It's more easy to comment than starting from scratch. So that will be really helpful for us to make it. If it's possible, can you share it in the mailing list so other members can review and participate? Because I'm not sure that everyone will check the (unintelligible) connect or the recording. Thanks. Thanks again.

So the next one -- we have around ten minutes in the call. The next item is about the additional budget request. I think Farzaneh shared some draft about additional budget request asking for comment, and the deadline for this one is the 31st of January. So also it's coming soon. I think that this item was suggested by Ayden.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks, Rafik. I know that we're over time so we do we want to take it to the mailing list perhaps then? I don't think it's too urgent.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So thanks Ayden. What I can advise, Farzaneh already I think started the threat in the mailing list with the draft and she's looking for I think ideas and more work and additional budget requests. So I think maybe you can use that thread if you want.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks, Rafik. This is Ayden again. Yes, I will. And just very briefly, the conversation that I'll take to that thread is that perhaps we in NCSG need some modest support, the support of a research assistant perhaps 20 hours a month to help us in compiling our comments. That is the discussion that I will take to the thread that Farzaneh started. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Ayden. And the last item in any other business, which is in fact two. It's about the non-constructive party house intersessional and GNSO council strategical meeting. So both of those I think will happen next week and maybe just to give some background for the council strategical meeting, it will be the first time that we have I would say (unintelligible). And the purpose is that for the new council, we should have enough time to really plan ahead about what we will do in the next 12 months, but also to have a better understanding of our operating procedure, the different role we have for the GNSO leadership team or the liaison we have to the working groups, or to other supporting organization and advisory committee. So we have that better understanding and to do better planning.

And another maybe area to cover is about the role of the GNSO and GNSO Council with the new empowered community because it's bringing a new responsibility to the council. And so we have to be in better position to handle that. So to understand what our responsibility, what is the remit of the GNSO Council. And so we spend time at the GNSO leadership team to do the planning and to organize the agenda to prepare the material that were sent to the councilor. So the meeting will happen next week for the first three days. I

think it will be quite intense and full days of meeting. And I hope that we, as a council, we can really have a good start from there.

Then for the rest of the week, we will have the intersessional. So it's not the first time we've had it. I'm not sure if it's the fifth or the sixth time but the idea is really that we have a meeting with the other side of the non-constructed party house, which is the commercial stakeholder group and we try to talk in different topics that maybe we -- I think we can have common ground and -- or either we don't. But it's an opportunity to discuss with them, we talk with them.

And I do believe in the last years, we improved a lot our organization with the commercial stakeholder group. Maybe the intersessional will help it for that but maybe it's one of the different (unintelligible) we did in the last year. So we have those two meetings. On the strategy committee, if I'm not mistaken, the third day there will be streaming so people can listen to that meeting and also, the GNSO council call also as usual, there will be streaming. It will be on the second day.

For the intersessional, my understanding there will be also remote participation and so people can participate as observer. I don't (unintelligible) but maybe other can give more details about that. And I see that Renata is in the queue. Yes, Renata, please go ahead.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Just (unintelligible) my question as well regarding Steve DelBianco's suggestion that we may have common points that we want to do in the closing, we want to leave as combined policy messages or policy statement from NCPH. I think this is an important thing to have in our minds whether or not we decide to follow that path. Just the policy committee can be the decider in that regarding that topic. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Renata, well, I mean like (unintelligible) and I have no idea if we have

something in the comment. It's hard to say. So in particular, when we have

two session about GDPR and just a guessing, I don't think we have the same

position on that matter.

So I guess in terms of a common message or something that we share, it will

depend on what we reach there. But I mean before, it was an intersessional in

2015 in Washington, D.C. we could have something in common, a common

position. But it was not about policy per se. It was about the GNSO review in

that time and we could make a letter, drafted the letter between the CSG and

NCSG that we sent to the Board.

So it's possible but in terms of policy, like this, I have no idea to be honest.

So it depends what we discuss next week and what we can reach as

agreement. Any further comment or question here? I know two hours call is

too long and it's a lot to digest. We went through different topics but tried to

(unintelligible) to kind of have an opportunity to discuss, to give a briefing, an

update. Hopefully we can improve in the future.

But we will also follow-up on the mailing list, in particular to share some

material so you can read (unintelligible) and share your thoughts and

comments. In the meantime, if you have any questions or you want any

clarification, please do so. Seeing nobody in the queue and I don't see

question or comment, I guess we can adjourn the call for today. Thanks

everyone for joining and I think for many of you, I will see you next week in

LA.

So take care and see you soon. Bye-bye.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you everyone for joining the call. Mark, you may stop the recording.

Thank you very much for your time today.

END