

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi**  
**April 24, 2018**  
**9:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Excuse me, the recoding has started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, Wendy. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the monthly NCSG policy call on Tuesday, 24th of April, 2018 at 1200 UTC. On the call today, we have Manuela Peralta, Rafik Dammak, Shah Rahman, Ayden Ferdeline, Tomslin same-Nlar, Arsene Tungali, Poncelet Iileleji, Caleb Ogundele, Claudio Lucena, Nelson Imoa Kaunda, 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 for everyone for joining today call. So just as a reminder so we have the monthly policy call usually before the GNSO Council call. And the way that we have prepared for that call using that agenda. And it's also opportunity for the members to discuss and to hear from NCAG councilor.

So we will start as usual with the council agenda. It's quite crowded with several items. And then we will go more to a general policy discussion and getting update.

Okay, so as you may see, the agenda is quite long. Usually we start with administrative matters. I don't think we need to care about that. Just kind of confirmation like the minutes and so on. And then what we have is maybe just to pay attention to the council agenda. There are two motion. One motion and one update. So the first motion is about adopting the GNSO Council response to GAC communique.

What happened before is that we usually the GNSO Council send response regarding the GAC communique. Last time it was in San Juan, Puerto Rico meeting. And we try from the council side to give our perspective and opinion regarding the GAC communique and we try to deliver that as soon as possible. Just before the board and (unintelligible) call.

So what happened, we get the response and it was adopted in the mailing list, but this was as an adjust, kind of, to formalization of the GNSO Council response. The second item, it's to the Council to confirm that it agrees with, sorry, the interpretation from ICANN regarding the community (unintelligible) change request process, public comment. And to confirm that this matter of implementation and not an issue or matter of policy. So we - that topic was brought in last August. And it was decided just to have from the community to request input, public comment, sorry, to request input from the community regarding that change. And the report coming from staff confirming that most of, I'd say, the different group from ICANN community sees that adjusted implementation. And from hear from the Council's standpoint, we just we are confirming that we agree with that.

So if we have any issue or a concern, we can ask to remove that from the consent agenda. And put it again in the main agenda. However, I don't think we have any particular problems and even ourselves we didn't comment on the issue during the public comment.

So I think these topics are fine. Okay, so going now more to the, how say, the substantive part of the agenda. So the first motion to vote is not about policy. But it's - the members motion for Stephane Van Gelder who was a counselor and the GNSO chair between 2010 and 2012. So he passed away last month and we, the council is here just making this motion as to remember what he did and his achievement as a member of ICANN community. And so this we can do at the council level and just here we can formalize our message that was sent to his family.

So I think this isn't, kind of, matter really for discussion. But it's a good opportunity to recall the work done in ICANN for policy discussion and so on. Is done by (unintelligible) years while at the end, human beings and it's, kind of, sad to see someone pass away, in particular in accident and so on. So this why we have this motion.

Okay, I guess we can move to the next agenda item. Sorry, I have had problem to use WebEx. So basically, we don't have really other - any other substantive motion to vote. And the next agenda item is regarding update from the CCD, the (unintelligible) to. And regarding the delivery of final report. So currently there is an ongoing public comment on the final report from the accountability working group. We are not asking for, I'd say, substance of the report. They are asking if we comment - if we find any consistency between the different recommendations since they were done by a different subgroup to cover different topics. And from NCAC side, we covered most of the recommendations of the subgroups. And with regard to this current public

comment, we are basically going to just focus if there is any issue or some overlap and so on. But not really commenting on the, I'd say, we are not going to ask for substantial change in the recommendation.

And so we are getting here in update, we are going to get an update during the Council call from one of the co-chairs of the working group. To explain about the timeline (unintelligible). When the working group is supposed to finish and end. And probably also talking about implementation. So it's quite - I'd say it's quite important that we work on that recommendation, spend time on that. But that comes the time of implementation and that's usually done by the - by ICANN organization or staff. And the discussion will that happen in the working group is how we can oversee the implementation and ensure that what is - what will be proposed as planned. It's aligned with the recommendation that were approved by the community. And through the (unintelligible) organization.

So as the GNSO is one of the (unintelligible) organization, we are getting here an update and probably just give -

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: And to prepare for the time of approval. Okay, so I was speaking for time now. It's good time if you have any comment or question if you want any clarification regarding those - this agenda item. Sorry. Okay, I don't see anyone in the queue but just maybe time, I don't know. It's not everybody's familiar with WebEx. If you want to be in the queue, you can just click on the hand that it's near to your name on the right side. So if you want to just click there. And I can see you, so.

Any comment, question? Okay, I don't see any. So okay, let's move to the next agenda item. The next is also an update regarding the, how say, intergovernmental organization. And, how say, the NGO access curative rights protection mechanism. So this is the update. One of the, kind of, longest working group. It was, I think, started like four or five years ago. And it was kind of resistance to - it was raise about concerns from the GAC regarding (unintelligible) protect. They don't have to remark, how we can protect their names from - domain name and to provide them easier access on that matter.

So this working group was there for a long time. And what we are going to get here is more update about the discussion and in particular when they can deliver their recommendation. But why it's phrased now here is that there was, kind of, an issue in the working group raised by one member. That he used and that appeal process that is the operating procedures of the GNSO, I think.

And so, we had and here talking like the GNSO Council leadership and also the liaison to work on that matter. And to respond to that appeal and so from there, we had also to follow up regarding the discussion (unintelligible) recommendation because (unintelligible) started when this working group, I mean the members of the working group were discussing the final recommendation. And there was a disagreement in how to decide or to decide about consensus.

So the Council will get an update here to explain about the background, the issue that is happened now for the last four or five months. And to give that heads up to the Council. But also on the other hand to prepare when we will get a recommendation from that working group. Now it's unclear what they will agree on since they have different option and doesn't seem they are - have a consensus. My understanding, they are - there is, I mean the few members

are still participating. They are pushing for one direction. And this is maybe also can rise some problems even outside that working group.

So now we are going to get updated and see how the Council as it is policy manager should add on this matter. We are talking here about the recommendation, not about that appeal proceed, because that's now it's not - I hope I give some clarification. So I mean, even for a counselor, they are just getting this information now. And they will have much more, kind of, more details during the calls. So if there is any question or clarification, will be happy to answer.

And please, if you are not speaking, please mute yourself, because we have some background noise and also it can create some echo for other. So please. Okay. Sorry, guys. So any question or comment or clarification? Oh, I see it's Kathy. Yes, Kathy, please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi everyone ,just joining the call. Apologies to be late. Rafik, there's kind of a larger question here. I haven't followed this one through all the details, but the larger question is can one person hold up a working group? Or stop the work of so many years? As a current PDP working group co-chair, I'm really concerned about and so, kind of, to all our councilors, you know, what does this mean for other working groups? And you know, because it changes our ability to say no. If you have, kind of, an outlier on any side, an outlier who keeps pushing their views and the person who brought this appeal definitely is one of those people. And he's in many working groups. You know, what do we supposed to do if we can't give them what he wants? And or it wouldn't be fair to do it. It would require too many resources to do it. You know, what's the larger message coming from this for our ability to run a PDP and make hard compromises? Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Kathy. That's good, a really good question because I mean taking here from the leadership side when this issue happened, you were already thinking it's not just about that working group. But what does this mean in term of PDP in general? So one, maybe is in term of context, that working group is really like, I think, it's for four years which is quite already too long. And when things get so long to get done, what happen, you have fewer people that continue to be involved. And this is one of the issues. So you get fewer people so how even you can say that you are going to get consensus? How you will decide that?

And also one problem when you have, why that member can't, kind of, let's say create this slow update, slow the progress of the working group is that his appeal that 3.7 (unintelligible). I invite everyone to check it. I think - not sure if it's in the working group guidelines or not. But maybe in that part. So we can find it in there - the operating procedures anyway.

If he was appealing against the two co-chairs and so that's put in strange situation when they were talking about how to decide the consensus. And he was disagreeing with the approach they wanted to take. So yeah, it happens to someone that he's using a procedure and we find out maybe that what we have as a procedure is not enough clear already. And it's also writing the question, how we, the GNSO Council, can act in this situation?

So I don't have a clear answer here. Because maybe that particular case of that working group it was for too long. You have your people inform. But and so even as you said, an outlier, he can have much more weight and influence than compared to other working group. And in fact, this working group or what they are pushing in that working group, think Kathy it can influence your, how say, your own working group, the RMP1. Because of what they are saying that we cannot cover. We cannot respond. That's my hand. I understand

that we cannot. They think that their recommendation that the issue should be handled by the RPM. So this has given rise an another problem. How we can - what the council should do with this recommendation. And if the RMP working group can really handle that you have already so many issues to cover.

So it is, kind of, several facet or aspect of this problem. And at least what we can save, the Council is acknowledging that we have to do better in terms of managing the PDP. And so, what the Council should do here. Do we have our - is our existing procedure enough? Should we improve? Should we add more procedure? What we should do here? So there are so many question and honestly, I don't have answer yet to that. But at least we are acknowledging that there are issues and we have to add more (unintelligible) and to do better job in term of managing the PDPs.

Kathy Kleiman: Rafik, this is Kathy. Can I respond?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. So yeah, absolutely. You know the GNSO is the manager of the process. And that's very important. First, I hadn't realized that anything was going to - that any of the IGO/INGO issue was - there was the thought of putting it in the right protection mechanism working group. Please don't do that. We've got enough. So that wouldn't be good. we don't have the expertise in this kind of area.

But it's interesting. The IGO/INGO working group, it did go on for four years. But it took a one-year break. And so it's really three years which puts it about right. And that one-year break was to get a paper written by a scholar who to really explore, we - the working group. And I was part of it initially.



So the working group wanted to know whether some of the assertions of immunity were accurate. The IGO's and INGOs were saying they couldn't go to court. And the answer, turns out to be it depends that often they do go to court to enforce other rights. And they sign all sorts of regular contracts with Microsoft with others with Adobe. They sign all sorts of contracts with all sorts of language that says, you know, if you're going to challenge this contract, it'll be in Seattle or Delaware or something like that.

And so the scholar came back. So it was worth waiting. So there's a lot of expertise in that working group. And the idea that we're not to use it is, kind of, disturbing. But please don't send any of this into the RPM working group. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Kathy. Just to clarify. This is one of their idea was to - we are trying to do one option, I think, is that we'll ask them to list all the different option they have and just say what's the level of consensus around them. And my understanding there is - there are like six option and this is one of them. And at the end, if they send a recommendation to the Council, then we will have to figure out. It will be the GNSO Council task to decide here and it's not anymore, the working group. So we'll have members of the working group pushing for that direction. But it's not really up to them to decide what the RPM working group should do or not.

But yeah, we are taking this into consideration. So when we have to (unintelligible) all councilor and I mean in general, not just NCH about this. And we have to be ready. So we are also trying to get this working group to finish, to deliver after so much time. And they have to make a decision at the end. Even if they disagree, at least they can list the different option and they put the different level of consensus and we will see what will happen then.

Kathy Kleiman: That's a good idea. That's a good idea to get them to report back at least on something That makes sense. Just a quick note that if - that the - one of the two co-chairs of the IGO/INGO, as you know, is one of the two co-chairs of the RPM working group. So to the extent that some of this is personal, that might continue if any of this got sent to the RPM working group. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Kathy. Yeah, he - (unintelligible) he's really aware. And he's not really supportive at this go to RPM. So that's what I can say.

Kathy Kleiman: Great, good to hear. And good luck. This is a tough one. Good luck with this one.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Any other question or comment on this? So anyway, we will get, I think, like briefing from the liaison here. I mean the liaison for the working group. And so we will yeah, I think the discussion to get an update and maybe think about what we should take as action. And how we should prepare. At the end, this working group should end - should reach closure. Someone should not stay forever.

Okay, let's move to the next agenda item. I think it will get much more comment. So the next one is regarding update on the ICANN board (unintelligible) policy proposal. So for now, it's put as a placeholder. Because there are so many moving parts. As a context, the GNSO Council leadership had a call with the RDS working group leadership and several board members. They wanted to discuss with us and it's clearly about the impact of GDBR on the RDS working group.

And so, the board was supposed to delivery different option regarding how to do that. But at the end, they just focused on one option. Is to have a

temporary policy. That (unintelligible) but having that it will - we need to work within one year on a consensus policy. One thing is temporary policy is something that was never tried before. And so, we don't know also how to teach when we have such case. How we can create a consensus policy in the PDP in such short time.

So based on this issue, we, how say, we kind of, the situation at the council level is how we will - what we need to do. We don't know yet if the board is going any way to have a temporary policy or not. So this is what is suggested. That was discussed. That was presented by the board. And, we kind of are trying to explore the impact and the different paths. But it's not decided yet if the board will vote or will approve a temporary policy.

But in the same time, we should do some preparatory work if needed. And to explore what are the options. So a usual PDP cannot be really the answer. Because it usually take so much time, long time. So creating a new PDP won't be a good option. Another one is have an expedite PDP which is by design shorter. Because it's supposed to be a narrow scope. Another option is to, kind of, use the existing RDS working group in the way that maybe to ask and to constantly work on that. But this also need probably amendment in the charter and so on. So one reminder is the RDS working group is a board-initiated working group.

So we have all those kind of option, but we don't know how much it will take, and if they are really the right path to use or not. And with regard to the RDS working group, since they all this issue regarding GDBR and people their attention is - I mean on that matter. They also decided to suspend their work for now. So we have the RDS working group and, kind of, it's in limbo. And also we don't know if the board will go with the (unintelligible) policy and if go with that, what we- path we should follow.

So this is, kind of, really trying to summarize. There was a briefing around the call with the board with (unintelligible). We have more question than answer in fact because even if we go like let's say with the expedited PDP, there is some work that needs to be done like - regarding this copying and so on. So to follow that process. So we are in, kind of, uncharted territory because we have this procedure in process, but we never use it. And so the temporary policy having that one-year constraint it's pushing. It will create either incentive and probably (unintelligible) either to work it or for some people to try to slow.

So we have all this kind of say moving parts and it's unclear for now what we should do. Okay. So let's see who is in the queue. Any comment or question? I don't see any. But I got those. Okay, Ayden, please go ahead.

Ayden Ferdeline: Thanks, Rafik. Hi, it's Ayden Ferdeline. This is just a really basic question actually. And I just want to make sure that I understand. So this one year, it would be if we went on this route of the expedited policy development process to develop a temporary policy. It would be one calendar year to develop a policy. And then implementation would happen and how long would that be for implementation? Or would ICANN board be, sort of, tracking the work of the expedited PDP and developing the implementation mechanism alongside it? Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: I think, my understanding it's one year to (unintelligible) the consensus policy. The orientation, I not recall we went to that area yet, because even to develop the policy it's unclear if we can do it within one year or not. Because based on the previous experience of what we have already in other working group for other PDP including the RDS itself. So we didn't - trying to recall it. But I don't think we discussed implementation. But this is question that we have to

put at the end, because even if we have this temporary policy, I think after that, the contracted party, they don't have to apply that. So it's really you have that time limited. So we can have situation that okay, we even if we get consensus policy, how much we take to be implemented on its own

But I think at the end of the day, there is incentive because that dateline or time consent it creates huge incentive (unintelligible) even for ICANN organization to or staff to (unintelligible) can quite quickly compare it to what we have. Now, okay. I see (Stephanie). Yes, please go ahead.  
(Unintelligible). Okay, I can't. I mean I hear someone typing. Maybe it's Stephanie? Oh, yeah.

Stephanie Perrin: Hello.

Rafik Dammak: Hello.

Stephanie Perrin: Oh, wonderful. Thank you. I'm unmuted. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I think this is a really difficult problem that we have to solve here, as you have described. My recommendation, I mean I just fired this off to Chuck when I rejoined the PDP working group, is that we almost need to, kind of, structure that we had in - have (unintelligible) constituent stakeholder groups recommend people to join this. And we streamline it. Because quite frankly, there will be absolutely not point in continuing a (unintelligible) current PDP. And I think the part that totally irritates me on that PDP is there's a whole pile of complete strangers who don't belong to any stakeholder group who are slowing things down, you know. Even the business community would not endorse some of these guys. And that's the only community they could join.

So the fact that we have been totally stopped by a bunch of people with no skin in the game, right, except their business model is a bit frustrating. And I

don't see us reaching a conclusion unless we find a way to I don't like it use the work eliminate them but at least contain them. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Stephanie. So let me see here. Whatever will follow, let's say it's (unintelligible) PDP. We have the flexibility is our procedure to not choose the working group model. So it can be (unintelligible), drafting team, and so on. And so let's say , kind of, some discussion that if we go that path, so maybe - I'm not sure what will be the final, kind of, structure. But that one option may be is like what happened with CCWG is to have a representative from the different stakeholder to be that - in that structure. I'm talking here, it's not working group, but can be drafting team or taskforce and so on.

And our procedure allow us to choose something and this is one of, I think, the topic for discussion. So I think there is an announcement -

Kathy Kleiman: Hi all, this is Kathy. Did we lose Rafik a few minutes ago?

Ayden Ferdeline: Kathy this is Ayden. I think we did lose Rafik.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, thanks for the confirmation. Hey, I'm no longer online. I'll just be on audio only. But, I will hang around in hopes that he returns.

Maryam Bakoshi: Rafik Dammak can you hear me? My apologies also (unintelligible), I replied to you. I responded to you, Kathy. We have lost Rafik Dammak and we'll try to bring him back in the call. Thank you for your patience.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks for letting us know what's happening. WebEx, we're having fun.

Rafik Dammak: Can you hear me? Hello? Okay.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, we can hear you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. I'm not sure what happened. Anyway, so Stephanie I'm not sure if you spoke after my comment, but I hope that – I mean, that answer your question. I'm not sure if we still have some problems, or not?

Okay, I'm not sure. We have some technical issues, no?

Kathy Kleiman: Rafik we can hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so because – yes. Nobody was responding, so I was wondering. Okay, so, any other comments or questions here?

Okay so just to answer quickly. I think for accreditation model, it's for later on. I'm not sure when you say by 11, what does it mean. But, I think it is much later and not now. But, yes it's in our agenda to discuss.

Okay, if there is no further question or comment, we can move to the next agenda item. Okay, so the next one it's – how say, it's also - this is more a discussion with regard to the (unintelligible) inter registrar transfer policies. So, this is an existing policy and – okay, so here is more to get an update. I think this is about the review if I'm not mistaking.

So, I mean, I don't have much more details than you guys on this matter. We're going to get an update on this matter anyway. And so, one of the issue with, let's say, this one is that it's not the insurance that we have to review policy after some time from the implementation.

And I think in terms of policy reviews, something that we didn't do before and it's something in use, so getting use it within the council and how to

handle this is one of the first instance with regard to policy. So, we will get more updates here and we will share the information that we will get from staff. So, they work on the report regarding – let's see, regarding the implementation, okay?

Any questions or comments? And just to respond again to Stephanie. So, we will discuss accreditation more in a few minutes, so please wait a little bit.

Kathy Kleiman: Rafik, this is Kathy. I'm on audio only now.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, so we're talking – I just want to double check. So, we're talking about item number nine now? The review of the inner register transfer policy. Did we skip item number eight - The discussion of updates to the consensus policy implementation framework?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, I didn't notice that because I have problem with my – the WebEx.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, me too.

Rafik Dammak: So, I think I'm missing that one.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, looking forward to discussing that one too. I have nothing to add on nine, thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Kathy. Yes, it's basically this here we are getting more update, particular. So, we can share later. So, and let's go back to the previous agenda items.



It's a discussion on the consensus policy implementation framework. And this is coming to the concern to (unintelligible). I'm sorry, is there any way that we can – I mean – I probably - maybe to see them. I'm trying to see the item number eight, but (unintelligible) cannot see it anymore. Or can you center, or something?

Maryam Bakoshi: Can you see it now?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, anyway. Yes. So, this agenda item is about the implementation of framework.

So, we had the staff (unintelligible) rigidity (unintelligible) start working on this framework. And this is coming to the council for review and to get input, so I think most of us we find out more details during the call. But, we also receive it today. I'm talking here about the council. We receive it today, the information about that framework and so, it's basically about the post implementation.

And as I talked previously regarding IRTP, it's the case of review so we have - maybe just a reminder, working to spend time working on the policy and making the recommendation. That's what is (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) is implementation which is more the work of the staff, but after the implementation we have to do a review.

So, we are working now the kind of framework on how to – framework to cover that and to create proper process flow. And to check if it's - let's say if it's aligned with what we are expecting...review. This is quite critical because we have... more policy review coming soon.

So, we have to, kind of, I think, (unintelligible) in talking here from (unintelligible) side to follow these morals carefully. And also, we have to probably to put more people to participate in the process. Okay, sorry.

Kathy Kleiman: Rafik Dammak...

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: May I comment?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: Great, it's Kathy. I haven't seen, of course the document that's been circulated. So, I don't know exactly what's being talked about here. But, I did want to flag that implementation has been a real problem lately for the last few years.

So, the normal flow is that the GNSO, you know, through working groups and other ways – adopts policy. And then it goes into implementation and we're seeing that the implementation – if you're a technologist, implementation is just implementing the policy, you make it happen technically.

But, we're actually seeing major changes to policy taking place in the implementation process. This is happening – it's – people who are on the Proxy Privacy Implementation Review Team can talk about it. But, I understand that there are problems there. It's happening with rights protection mechanism. We are seeing things that would change items of policy of consensus policy actually changed in implementation.

So, let me flag it that implementation should not be a time to re-write policy or to take a second bite at the apple. And I don't know how we can put that in stone. I thought it was in stone, or ready, but it's not. And so, if we could put that in stone, that would be great, thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Kathy. So, from documents it was just shared a few hours ago. So, I don't think even the counsel had time to review it. But, my understanding is really about the review of consensus policy implementation.

We are going to review the implementations. It's not about that implementation phase itself. And yes, I think we – there are problems with implementation because it first manages by staff.

And as you said, and the example you mentioned, you have groups that are using the implementation and going to the implementation review team trying to push for some directions that it's not following the recommendation coming from PDP. And we have also – this is (unintelligible) an issue...

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so yes in fact, we have an agenda item about privacy and proxy services on that regard. So, probably in that agenda item we can talk about implementation issues. But, for this one, it's really about the review of implementation, so it's different. Different aspect of the same problem, I think, so I hope it's clear.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so if there's no further question or comment we can move to the next agenda item. And, sorry for the confusion. Having hard time with WebEx

myself. So, we went through agenda item number nine and then we came back to eight.... Think to 10.

And this is an update on privacy and proxy services accreditation issues... Implementation review team. So, this is what – a topic requested by the liaison because as it was mentioned that there are several issues on the review team – implementation review team. There is a disagreement about the implementation plan and also about the process if they should put it on public comment or not.

And what we find out, in fact, the procedure, or process – it doesn't really give that much - as we are not the sole manager of the implementation, it's kind of, somehow - it's not easy for the council to intervene here. So, even if the liaison issue, she has to, kind of, discuss with – how do you say—the representative from GDD. So, we are finding some issue with the current procedure we have. And also, with this issue and how some group may use the implementation phase to push again for things that were not approved on – during the PDP.

So, this agenda item will be one of opportunity to, kind of, highlight the issue we have with one of the implementation review teams, so okay. Let me see the queue. Any question or comment? Okay, (unintelligible).

But, so even we have several agenda items, not about PDP per say, but, a lot about what happened after the PDP. And it's something that I don't think we did a good job within the council to, kind of, monitor or follow back. So, this one of the good opportunity for us to discuss more and to see how we can manage this better.

In particular, when we will have now more and more the view of concerns with policy. So, it's a lot of question, I think and it's good time to get more updates and briefing in particular from our liaison, or also from the PDP staff on those activities. So, okay.

Any question, comment? I'm sorry guys, I'm having a hard time with WebEx. I'm trying to switch between the chat and the queue from the (unintelligible).

Okay, so the next one – item number 11 is update and join (unintelligible) of the on rise protection mechanism in all GTNT in all (unintelligible) subsequent procedure PDP. And this is, kind of, action from our Puerto Rico meeting. So, we have a discussion regarding the time line and what is supposed to be dependency between the RP working group and the separate working group.

And so, we had the liaison of the two working group working with the leadership trying to see – to work on some consolidated time line between the two working group. So, I'm not sure if we will get, kind of, that time now, or it's more about the latest update from... on that side, or front. It's one of, kind of, the issue again – from a concept perspective managing different (unintelligible) and hear if there's kind of dependency, or something, how we can manage and how we can help the two working groups to – on this (unintelligible).

So, okay, any question or comment on this?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, Rafik. It's Kathy.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: So, I have to say, we don't know as a co-chair of the working group, of one of these two working groups. I have no idea what our liaisons – or what our liaison's going to say on this because he hasn't talked to us, which is a little odd. So, I just wanted to let you know that, that Paul McGrady has not said – has not communicated -- at least to the RPM co-chairs -- about what's going on here.

The last update I have was the one we gave together with Jeff Newman and Cheryl Langdon-Orr -- the co-chairs of SubPro in Puerto Rico -- where we've said the dependencies aren't actually all that important with, kind of, parallel tracks. And that in all events we're working and at least in RPM we're, kind of, working through -- very quickly right now – the URS review and collecting data from the Trademark Clearing House review. And we're going to be a little late, but not that late, as things go.

And probably, you know, we'll be getting back fairly on time. So, I'm not sure what's coming through here and I wanted to let you know that it... Surprise to me as it was to you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Kathy. My understanding from what I heard now is that we are still working on that. So, I'm not sure we are going to get the consolidated timeline by then, but yes. So, they are working, that's what I get, and this is coming, kind of, place holder. It was requested, like, a few weeks ago anyway. So, we'll see and at the end is that the liaison are supposed to work with the working group leadership on any matter. So...

Kathy Kleiman: I agree, they are supposed to work with the working groups (unintelligible). So, just wanted to let you know that hasn't happened, but also to let you know there is something else going on in the RPM working group. We had three

co-chairs and J. Scott Evans quit very suddenly. You know, he's been involved for 20 years and also to the intellectual property issues, he's one of the founders of the intellectual property constituency.

He had switched to Adobe a few years ago and we knew it was really hard for him to participate because he was coming in very early Pacific Time, he was doing a lot of travelling and connecting from all sorts of places. He was working really, really hard to stay as co-chair. But, apparently, he was asked by his company...

And so, he resigned. And we weren't sure what would happen next and there was great, kind of, consternation in the working group particularly among those who no longer felt represented among the co-chairs. But, Brian Bekham of the World Intellectual Property Organization, he was nominated – he accepted the nomination for co-chair yesterday.

So, just wanted to let you know, there's been lots of support for his nomination. He would come in as the third co-chair, assuming the working group approves. So, that may take care of some of the concerns about that battle of leadership that had been expressed.

So, just wanted to let you know that's the latest update. Brian Bekham - he of course can't be approved as co-chair until the council approves him. But, he just accepted that nomination yesterday.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Kathy. So, yes, it's (unintelligible) really up to the working group. So, if the working group members support him, it should be okay. So, I see a comment from Avri.

In fact, that was a topic of discussion during the council strategic meeting in LA and the result of, kind of, I'd say question about what is expected from the – from liaison and - I mean, because we – I mean, it's basically a council of he or she is supposed to liaise with working group - or also... But, for example like, the (unintelligible) or CCSO, or decision and so we work on trusting the description of what is expected and the role of liaison. And the different agenda item you can see we are trying to empower the liaison be more – how to say – proactive here and to help the leadership and to understand their roles.

So, that's why we're hiring now more, like for example the case of (unintelligible) corrective rights. We empowered, or we asked the liaison to be the facilitator on that matter and also we are hearing from the IRT. And so, we are trying to respond to that because it seems that it wasn't clear – even to the liaison – what its - their - that role means.

So, we – hopefully, we are trying to improve it so. There were several issue regarding the expectation from the liaison and how they can have support leadership with working group.

Kathy Kleiman: Let me just question that goal to helping and supporting the leadership may not be their goal. And I'm not speak – I have great respect for Paul McGrady, but he's a very active member of the working group on behalf of his client. So, we've got – and I didn't see what Avri's question was. I have to say I don't understand the role of the liaison, but as we're defining it, let's be careful.

And let's – you know, if you guys could help as counselors and watch this. Paul McGrady, for example, is the one who nominated Brian Beckham as co-chair. So, he is very, very, very active in the issues of the working group. So,



I am wondering, are we expecting people to step back from their role as advocate?

Especially attorneys who have, you know, that zealous advocacy requirement under the rules of being an attorney for a client? Are we expecting them to step back and be more neutral... on? These are questions, you know, lots of people have in lots of roles. But, not sure it's quite defined as liaison, yet. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Kathy. I will try to find out...we have about the role of liaison. And point taken regarding – I mean how liaison... can be liaison and also an active member are not, it think that was discussed. Yes, and so, I understand the concerns and I think that was that this kind of issue arises.

So, for that case, I cannot speak really about all this. But, I hear your concern is something that maybe we can follow up later on. We try to find the description we get and share it with you.

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific, thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so any other question or comment on this item? Okay, so I think that was the last agenda item. What was left is any other business and just an update on (unintelligible) for ICANN 62.

So, basically the (unintelligible) Council leadership we work with the staff to prepare the block schedule for GNSO. And we focus it first on the – how to allocate slow to PDP working group, taking in consideration their needs and their requests. So, we had, I think, two conference call with leadership of the PDP working groups and the last one was just a few hours ago.

So, and we have now, kind of, agreement around the PDP slot. We are still working on the cross community session. So, there were (unintelligible) – how do you say – the proposal were submitted there.

But, now (unintelligible) saying... by the representative are different so and the stake holder group constituents want. And we have to decide about the final list of gross community and high interest topic session. After getting that, we will start getting meeting requests from stakeholder group and constituency for their own meetings.

And also, we have to work with other (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) since many of them have interest on the PDP sessions. So, we're trying, kind of, (unintelligible) a part. They have to be fixed and decided. And so we are – the GNSO council leadership are working on that.

And just at the end of that agenda item will give some updates about the progress. But, all this is still – let's say – under construction for now. Okay, any question or comments on this? Okay, I think no.

So, we can move back to our agenda. Maryam can you move to the NCNG main agenda please?

Maryam Bakoshi: Sure.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. So, usually we – here in the policy discussion, we try to get some updates from working groups, but also the public comments. But, I think just maybe since we have less than one hour left and as Stephanie (unintelligible) that we can discuss accreditation models. So, we have one agenda item called (unintelligible) compliance process and that covers the accreditation model, but also all the GDBR discussion we have.

So, I'm thinking if we can switch here so we can discuss first about all GDBR models to have, kind of, good chunk of time. And we can move later to more policy updates. Okay?

(Unintelligible) support for this. Okay, I don't see any problem, objection, so let's do with that. And so, okay. So, Stephanie as you, kind of, pushed for this and request that we discuss more about tax (unintelligible) model.

I guess, by – for the context is that there is conf call organized by business constituency and (unintelligible) protocol constituency that, kind of – how to describe it – ad hoc group working on accreditation model. And so they have call, I think, few hours. And now they have, like their own (unintelligible) hosted by ICAN so on, so. I guess that's the context.

Okay, so probably you can give more updates in that, or what's the plan? Because I don't think many of us are on that list, which is also not public.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Stephanie, please go ahead. Stephanie, can you unmute yourself?  
Maryam please unmute Stephanie so she can speak.

Stephanie Perrin: Hello, Stephanie Perrin speaking, can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, we can hear you.

Stephanie Perrin: Great, thanks, (Fik). With respect to that business community initiated ad hoc group, according to Mary Wong, those records of the call – which ICANN is supporting – are now public. So, you can actually check them out. I don't

know what's on the agenda for the call today... know that I had time to look over Mike Palage's proposal.

I have, in fact, been talking to Palage lately and his proposal, I think, is very sound. In fact, it's part of what I am going to be introducing in the standards development process for accreditation. In case... don't know, through my University – University of Toronto – we put in for a bid to do standards development for the accreditation of third parties accessing personal information.

So, this would be not just for who is – although starting with who is – but, it's a known issue with respect to third parties getting access to Telco Data, ISP data, you know, across the board. So, and the article 29 working party has published preliminary advice -- without the appendix, mind you -- on what they expect and their involvement that they expect on these accreditations.

They – it's part of the new GDPR that they be consulted and that they – their views be taken into account in accreditation and certification modes. So, that covers a wide gambit of things that would cover – for instance – better business community websites, you know, seals on websites, that kind of stuff. But, it would certainly cover this.

So, we got – we just signed a contract a week ago for that work and we'll be talking about it more. I'm working on the documents right now. But, part of - like, Palage's proposal fills in a niche.

He is proposing that people be - when they're credited, they put a bond up, which I agree with because they got no skin in the game. They need to have some financial incentive to comply and – let me see another piece in his

proposal that was good. Yes, independent resolution of... and again, you have a right of appeal when somebody access your personal information.

If they don't treat it properly, if they for instance, access it and go out and publish it in a product that they sell to criminal gangs. And yes, you have the right to complain to data commissioners, but that's a clumsy mechanism. We also want the ability to go faster to independent resolution. I think that would work better, although I'd love some feedback if people don't think that that will work, tell me about it.

For those of us that live in jurisdictions where there is data production, going to an independent dispute resolution forum is not going to annul your rights under the law, particularly not in Europe where there's constitutional right. So, I think it's an okay idea and it would help get that installed. I think all of us are worried about what ICANN is going to instantiate in this interim period because it'll last forever and there's no time to fix everything, given the rush we're in. So, I view Palage's proposal as helpful. In terms of – shall I just keep running on taking, Fik? Let me know, here.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks Stephanie. Thank you, you gave some – I mean, you talked about several points, like, about the certification project that you are working on as well. But, so this is a kind of issue I have and I – to be honest, I couldn't make my mind here.

Is that now have this kind of alternative accreditation model discussed by (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) and having (unintelligible) and trying to bring core people to the meetings to discuss. But, what's our, kind of, rules of engagement here? Should we really get involved fully, or what kind of what we should do? I don't think we have, kind of, let say, strategy, or agreed action here.

I know that some of us are on that list, but not participating. It's mostly as observers. And so, I think maybe to just, kind of, agree on how we should proceed. (Unintelligible) is not with us on the call, but is something we need to, kind of, discuss more and think how we should do that.

Stephanie Perrin: Well, if I could carry on. Just let me give you the update first, because I think that will help eliminate how I feel about this interim process. So, as you know, I jumped and went to the Berlin group in Budapest and soon as I knew I had the time and I got this research grant tidied away. And (unintelligible) has agreed to cover it for me, thank you very much, because I was covered under ICANN for the Who Is trip and I made it work for me. But, it was very last minute, this thing.

So, I went to the Berlin meeting in Budapest, and I'm kind of limited in what I.. About what goes on those things because it's more or less chatter mouths rule there. But, certainly gave me an opportunity to brief the Budapest, or the Berlin group on what was going on at ICANN.

And they are well aware that an interim model is finally being worked on, but that it probably won't meet their requirements and they have not released the final – the article 29 group, rather, because the Berlin group is larger than the article 29 group – have not released their final requirement for accreditation. That is going to come soon, I believe. They did a consultation on it, but as you know, there is a lot of work going on. So, I think that from my perspective we should have a watching brief on this interim model.

The contracted party swears that they are not participating because they haven't got time. So, they are, kind of, holding their ground that, "Hey, you

can mark on all you like, but we're shutting down who is." So, we'll see what happens.

It looks everybody is going to be suing everybody. Certain of the business community have prob... Some pretty loud threats about how they're going to sue the registrars for cutting off access to information.

And they can do that whether they've got a decent lawsuit or not, you know, which makes it all the more important that the Article 29 Group doesn't give ICANN cover because if they do, then if they say oh, you don't need to do this, then immediately all those guys are going to be sued and it won't be good.

So I think the whole gain is I would say not what I'd call cricket. And I hope non-English speakers understand what I mean by that. I don't think it's fair what they're doing.

Anyway, I'm going to stay upon that list and watch. I'm glad that at least it's archived now and you can get the transcript. I am going to talk about my research grant if they give me a minute. But I'm sure as hell not throwing them something so that they can tear it to bits because I think that's what they - we've seen traffic that says do I have to go the full ISO model or can we get away with this.

I forget who said that. I think it was Jonathan Matkowsky. And even the APWG does not want to go ISO model. I've been sharing my research proposal with the APWG leaders. And while they understand that they need something like this, they're not quite ready to wrap their minds around it. And if they could get away with something less, they'd certainly do it.

So that's my sort of summary of that. The Berlin Group actually I didn't realize they had my proposal on the agenda for it. So I did get a chance to talk about it.

And I promised them a more fulsome explanation of how it would work with all the different pieces on things such as dispute resolution mechanisms such as (unintelligible) for the Article 29 Group such as the kinds of other standards that would be cross referenced.

I have a PhD student that I get to hire in the fall to do a full literature review, which given the standards area is kind of opaque, that's going to take a while. But in the meantime I'm coming out with documents that will help us flesh this out.

And in terms of what's going on at ICANN, I think it will demonstrate that ICANN is yet again not really meeting what they (said) in terms of industry expectations at this point in time.

So how's that for now? And then if there's still time, I can brief you on what's going on with the Whois Review Team, which progress has been - just in a nutshell, progress has been very slow. We've barely been able to get quorum at the meetings.

We've been divided into sub working groups. And I just got asked to join the law enforcement one, which is fun because I know something about that.

Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Stephanie. Okay. So yes, I think we can keep monitoring and watching the list. That's quite interesting in particular to see what some groups or some meeting that's coming like the 1st, which is one of the security



group and so on so to understand their perspectives regarding the accreditation. But yes, that's...

Kathy Kleiman: Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: ...and - sorry. Just so I just finish and I give you the floor Kathy. So also - and the sense from you Stephanie that the Working Group 29 is working on kind of the accreditation model in general and all. I'm not talking about Whois here but that's something that can impact the whole discussion later on.

Stephanie Perrin: Absolutely Rafik. There are provisions in the GDPR -- I can't tell you which numbers they are off the top of my head -- for accreditation and certification models. And in fact the (unintelligible) people are certifying certain procedures right now. I'm not sure which ones. I'm going to be talking to them shortly.

I apologize for my phone. It always happens this way. So they issued a consultation document in February. And that consultation document I gather they got comments and they are digest them. And then they released the document and the appendix was missing. So once they get that finalized, there will be an appendix with guidance on how to engage them.

I think actually the call for comments went out early in February. It was the summary document that went out in February. Sooner or later that will stop. Does that answer your question?

Rafik Dammak: (Essentially). I mean that's clear. And sorry. I think Kathy wants (unintelligible) to comment. Kathy, can you speak up now?

Kathy Kleiman: Sure. Just a comment. Thanks Rafik. First Stephanie, thank you for being in Europe for the Article 29 Working Party meeting. I think that was tremendous that you could be there in person and talking with them about what's going on with ICANN.

I wanted to comment Rafik on what you were asking about with this IPC BC accreditation group that's meeting. It meets again today at 11 o'clock Eastern Time for about two hours.

It is - it does appear to be being run by the Intellectual Property Constituency, Fabricio and Brian Winterfeldt seem to be running it. Brian of course is the current Chair of the Intellectual Property Constituency as well as running his own Intellectual Property Law Firm.

And so it looks like - we've been participating as individuals, not as representatives, Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. We did write comments, Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group comments critiquing the statement of purposes that the IPC and BC gave us or shared with the community.

We kind of tore it apart because they've used - they've gone the traditional route of taking all the uses of (unintelligible) and making them into all the purposes of personal data and that's not kosher and to the rules. You can't do that.

And so (unintelligible) (pointed) that out. Whether they'll pay any attention is unclear. I can tell you in the last meeting Stephanie, Michael and I tried to raise points (thoroughly) reading straight from the Hamilton memo.

And we were told they were wrong and that ICANN should just disregard the advice of outside counsel. We were pointing out that kind of unlimited access to data even by accredited parties is completely inconsistent with the rules unless, you know, unless it's very, very clearly related to the mission.

So registries and registrars using the database in unlimited way to facilitate the registration transfer and deletion of domain names. That's one thing. But the idea (unintelligible) by intellectual property - even law enforcement is not consistent under European law.

And so they rejected that (out of hand). So I'm not sure what their process is for handling community input except they seem to accept anything they like and reject anything they don't. So I just thought I'd share that.

The other thing is that the eco model. If you guys remember the eco model created by the registries and registrars under Thomas Rickert. Parts of it still seem to be around. And things I think we should support include not differentiating between individuals and legal entities in part because that protects human rights groups.

Many human rights groups are legal (unintelligible). And so the idea that they would have no protection, a battered women's shelter, a mosque or synagogue that they would have to publish all this information just because of their legal entity and they'd have to publish their address isn't consistent.

So supporting the registries and registrars and not differentiating legal entities and individuals, they're doing it for business reasons. It's really hard to do. And also they're being challenged - registries and registrars are being challenged by the GAC on this idea of publishing a registrant's email address.

And we've heard pretty clearly from the Article 29 Working Party that that should not be published. GAC is pushing back (at) them on this concept of the anonymized personal email that you can reach the registrant without knowing who they are and without having their email address.

There are Web forms, there are one-way email addresses that can certainly reach the registrant and let them know you're trying to tell them something; you're trying to buy their domain name. You're trying to let them know you think there's a legal problem. But you can do that without revealing their identity.

So supporting the registries and registrars they seem to be sticking to their guns on that. And I'd like to see us supporting them. But again, just wanted to let you know I don't understand how this accreditation process is working and who's making the decisions.

But we submitted our comments, our NCSG comments we submitted directly to the GDPR process of ICANN org. Thanks. Thanks Rafik and thanks Stephanie.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Kathy. Okay. I see - yes. So supporting the eco orders or maybe need to come back again because I mean (all folks) and people are more reacting to the BC IPC model but yes. I think we should bring that back. Okay. Any comment or question?

And I'm not sure if people having problem in WebEx to put themselves in the queue or not. So if you want to speak, please just click on that small hand near your name or just put a comment in the chat, so. Okay. No further comment or question. Okay. Stephanie, you want to add something there before you move on to the next item?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I would like to say a word or two more about the Whois Review Team. Folks may be aware that there was a discussion in San Juan about the fact that for some reason with the calendar the way it is, we're doing nine reviews this year or we are obliged to do nine reviews.

And one of the reviews that is already late was the Whois review. Now ostensibly it is supposed to be measuring how much (unintelligible) Whois Review Team recommendations were implemented.

And that's easy enough because there weren't any recommendations about privacy in there except for the privacy proxy services, a group that I don't happen to be on. You know, you can't possibly be on all these subgroups and working away.

But the fact of the matter is everything Whois is going to be ((Foreign Language Spoken 11:51.1)) as they say in French, shortly because the question of whether the privacy proxy system is going to continue to be in place and working is up in the air.

There's a problem with reveal. There's a problem with transfer. There's a problem with the Thick Whois in terms of allowing the, you know, the big registries, the .com, .net and all that to move to VeriSign given that there's a lawsuit about whether the United States is adequate or not anymore. That's kind of up (in the air).

And of course we know what kind of a mess we are in terms of normal data protection Whois and the conflicts with (unintelligible) except (they're the joke) to be measuring how well we've delivered on the accuracy requirements

or how well we've delivered on various other things that were in the Whois 1 report.

So it's something that I think we ought to look at but I do understand the concerns. The Articles of Commitment were grandfathered without changes in terms of ICANN reviews.

I'm coming from a government background. This review it's neither a program review nor is it an audit. It's a very queer thing that we're doing. And I think it needs work and it needs to be upgraded to the point where a review mechanism is actually a good policy and program review mechanism instead of something that the Commerce Department wanted ICANN to do.

So but therein lies risk because of course it could go the wrong way and God knows we never have enough people on these committees to swing things our way. But now might be a good time because at least the registrars, the contracted parties are having some concerns about some of these procedures.

Anyway, I'm going to send out a short two-page report on how we're doing on this. I'm deeply concerned that there are three GAC people on the Whois Review and three ALAC people. And we have four GNSO people but they're mostly business. There's me and Volker. Volker's representing the contracted parties and I'm of course representing NCSG.

But we're so outnumbered and Volker wasn't there for this particular meeting because he was moving house, you know. Bad timing. So it's quite lopsided. Thanks. I think that's all I've got to say on that. And I'll - as I say, I'll send something out to the NCSG list shortly.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Stephanie for the comment. Just I want to say something. Regarding - and this is kind of becoming (a mantra about) that we have nine reviewing the same time.

We need to be careful about that because there is a specific review organization of structure review. They are not the same. And we have already several reviews that (in going) or they are going to finish like the CCT CCR SSR that started. You have now the Whois. And what the rest is the ATRT; that's for the (sistic) review.

For the rest like the review of the NonCom or the ccNSO and so on that they concern a part of the community. So we have to be careful because we are hearing that a lot. This is kind of narrative. But just a ask for us to be cautious. We should not (repeat) like that. It's different because it's not putting the same workload or the burden as we may think.

We are not like for example (following the) SSAC review and so on because it doesn't concern us there (actively). It's just I want to add this kind of matter of caution.

And I see that Avri is in the queue and probably she want to add more here. Yes Avri. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thanks. This is Avri speaking. Yes. I think two things I wanted to say. One is you're going to be getting yet another community comment shortly on what to do about the reviews and specifically asking about ATRT and I think about Whois as well.

So then there'll be a bunch of options in (unintelligible). So the ICANN organization has basically decided to get a survey because of the report that

(Yurin) has gotten about people just being tired of reviews. And then that will come back.

Now speaking - that will come back to the Board and I'm not sure what'll happen to it next. So decisions will be made and it just - the whole thing discusses, you know, to do this we got to change bylaws, to do that we don't. So which of these options do people like best?

Speaking from - and that's just passing a message. Speaking sort of taking off that semi-boarded hat. Personally - and I'm very grateful for - to Rafik for differentiating between the specific reviews and the organizational reviews.

Personally I find that these reviews though, as Stephanie says some of them do need to be rethought out, are really a critical piece of our bottom up oversight of the organization.

And part of the story that reviews to say this is why we don't need a superceding oversight externally because we have this mechanism. So I think it's really important that we live up to these bylaws as much as possible.

I kind of hate changing bylaws before we've even gone through them once. I think on Whois we're going through it. (Unintelligible). I sort of wonder what was basically said by Kathy I believe it was that, you know, this is where we are, this is the case; it doesn't make sense to evaluate would make an excellent report for the Whois to come out with and say this is where we're at.

We've done the review. This is what we've decided and, you know, we recommend, you know, next review in this. We recommend changing this kind of review once we know. We recommend anything.



On the ATRT one of the things that we need (unintelligible) is that part of its task is the one of looking at the other specific reviews and saying do we need to change the schedule these are done on. Are they working out right? Are they being, you know, useful to the community and such? Are we overworked?

So that is actually an ATRT, you know, need. And speaking personally I'm pushing quite hard for actually doing that one because it doesn't after all take that many people. It is the sort of linchpin of this whole bottom up oversight of over ICANN; this one dealing with accountability and transparency.

I think that we see that ATRT1 and I believe two have had positive effects. And I guess the last thing I'm pushing in this through ATRT thought that I've been arguing both within the Board and anywhere else that people will listen to me is that we're just about to go into the implementation of WS2.

Some of them say well, you know, let's not do another ATRT until after we've seen what WS2 changes. But that, you know, is at least a year or two for implementation. And of course you don't see the affects for several years.

Whereas I think taking ATRT3, having it look at ATRT2, what did it achieve, how did its recommendations get implemented and basically define the base level that we're at now before WS2 so that then if we want to talk about things like metrics in the future looking at how things changed over time, we know what's pre-WS2 and not.

So, you know, as I said, that was completely said with personal hat and the hat of someone that sees this ditch as a very inviting one to die in. So, you know, I just wanted to give you that grain of salt to go with what I said. But there will be a community comment on all of this. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Avri for those details. I think it is very important. Yes. And myself also I'm kind of concerned about this because first it seems that now it's the ICANN organization will tell the committee what (it should hear). So we are kind of reversing the role.

And I think as said like kind of the month when seem to focus about the budget and I think somehow it's misleading about when we talk about the community burden because it's - I mean a few people who are participating in those review teams and they are not necessarily in the same. I think if we do the comparison, we find that there is few overlaps.

So we kind of need to be careful. Seems we are pushing here to make those changes but what I only advise I think from (NCSG) standpoint since (we are) - we care about accountability and so on, we have to be careful and not just go in the direction that it's kind of we are pushing towards so and to kind of maybe differentiate between the different reviews and what they are expected from.

So let's see what will be (suggested in) (accountability) feedback and we should respond and discuss about this, so. Okay. Thanks again Avri. Okay. Any question or comment here? I don't see any.

So we have, sorry, 15 minutes left. And I think will be just enough time for some updates from working group and review teams and so on. So we will switch back to the agenda item about policy discussion. And the first is regarding the public comment.

So we (commented lately) to public comment; one on the uniform screening for a Board member and also for - the plan for the name collision - yes, the name collision plan.

So we submitted that (comment lately). And we still have the ICANN reserve fund comment that should be submitted tomorrow. That's (went through the consultation) with the membership and (so update) the comments were resolved and it's now with the NCSG Policy Committee for endorsement. So that should be done.

We also have the proposed revisions to Bylaws Section 11. We got the draft I think was few days ago or I'm not - if I'm not mistaken, last Saturday. And so this is for membership consultation. So please review it and add your comment. It's quite simple and straightforward draft, (CSVN sub core team) the changes in the bylaw.

Other than that, we have - we still have to work on the draft final report to NomCom 2 review and the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 final report. And I think (Pisan) and (Tatiana) volunteered to work on that. And hopefully we'll get the draft soon so we can review that.

Then last open public comment is the initial report on the issue of the Customer Standing Committee Charter and I think (file) volunteered as a penholder with other members to work on that.

So we - for now I think we are current. In term of public comment we have volunteers but if someone want to jump in and join the team of penholder so please feel free to reach me of this and I will put you in contact.

So we are trying now to have small teams for each public comment to work as a group and draft because it seems more - a better way to share the burden and also good way for a newcomer or beginners in public comment to work together and to get more confidence on the drafting NCSG or so. If you want to volunteer, please feel free to reach me. Okay. Any comment or question on this? Okay. I see none.

So let's go to the policy topics and getting update from working groups, review teams and so on. So anyone want to give some (few) updates or share some of the information or request for help or action?

Arsene Tungali: Hi Rafik. Can you hear me? Arsene.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Arsene. Can hear you.

Arsene Tungali: Yes. Thank you very much. This is Arsene Tungali. I'd love to share some updates from the Cross Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds. I have got few items that I would like to bring to our membership and public.

So just as update and it's also will be that members of that Cross Community Working Group are still fixing the preamble after having received some questions and comments from members that might have (unintelligible) way the preamble is written.

So there was also need to clarify some (aspects of it). But the general idea for project that should be funded by the auction proceeds are those which are in service with ICANN's mission.

This was agreed upon and some members were agreeing that the preamble needs to be clear on the types of projects that auction proceeds funds should

be funding. So there's projects that fall within ICANN submitted mandates or mission.

So since it's taking very long, the impression around the preamble. The group will no longer discuss it. But there's calls for smaller groups to work on fixing this. And then this will be shared with the whole group.

Second would be that the working group is also still discussing a list of (unintelligible) for members with lots - some examples of type of projects that will (unintelligible).

And members are still yet to come to an agreement by which projects fall within ICANN and those which doesn't. So again it's more room for volunteers who'd be working with the staff to produce a version that will be shared with the whole group.

So third, the working group has been in the first meetings meeting with (helping) (unintelligible) with different (people) from various organizations with a way to try to understand and answer questions that member (unintelligible) that needed some (external experts), you know, that's for clarification.

And so there was a need to have someone from like ICANN and (unintelligible) and some (kin) to discuss with the members. So there was also the need to discuss with members or a member and it's said from a smaller organization.

And this has been then the nominates and the past meeting. Again, there was a need to have (unintelligible) someone who works from an advisor who or an advisor to any charitable organization. And this has been done. And so lastly,

we had an exchange with someone from a large organization and this was got from the (European) Investment Bank in (unintelligible).

So finally, the one thing the group has also been looking into whether the auction funds should be managed by ICANN or by any separate entity. And so another idea that was expressed was that ICANN may also probably (unintelligible) another entity to help manage the fund.

And so we cover this and that what happened recently the experts from the (European) Investment Bank help us understand the (unintelligible) that ICANN should be expecting if it's decided to manage the funds with a second entity. And as it - that from that bank say that that bank is managed too from (European Commission).

So if ICANN has - if we - the group has to be (certain) that ICANN will have to work with any separate entity before we can be an example (unintelligible). And so this will be all that I have for today. And invite members for the next meeting of the Cross Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds that will be happening on Thursday. So this week at 2:00 pm UTC. Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Arsene for those updates from the Cross Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds. (Unintelligible) question. I know that working group would have meeting - I mean session in Panama meeting. But what is the kind of status of the progress by when the working group is going to deliver its initial report?

I'm sorry if I missed that. But just to be sure about the timeline here so we can plan from our side for when the public comment is open so we can respond to that initial report. Do you have any details?

Arsene Tungali: Arsene here. I think - I'm not sure I have any answer to your question. But if anyone else in that - if anyone else is following probably would be able to provide the clarification on the timeline.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Arsene. Okay. Any comment or question on this? Okay. Seems nobody is asking about the 100 of million of dollar in ICANN but how it will e spent. But okay.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks again Arsene. Okay. Let's see if there is another update from any working group or review team and so on. Anyone want to share some information or - anything they want to share from working group with us in the call?

Kathy Kleiman: Rafik, this is Kathy.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Kathy. Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: So in terms of the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group, I think we've had most of the key updates along the conversation of the last two hours.

But just to summarize that there was a resignation of one of the three co-Chairs. J. Scott Evans is no longer able to participate for business reasons he said. That his company had asked him not to and pulled him back because of new business assignments.

But that Brian Beckham of the World Intellectual Property Organization has now been nominated as the third co-Chair, which is really interesting because

he's an observer of the GAC. So it will be interesting to see that process. But there's a lot of support so far.

And that we're continuing a review of the Uniform Rapid Suspension; so if anyone has any comments on this that they want to share with me privately or with the working group publicly, we're all ears. This is a really important time. We're in data gathering on the Uniform Rapid Suspension and is it fit for purpose. And so far that's going really well.

Our next meeting is tomorrow morning at 8:00 am if anyone wants to join us as a member. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Kathy. Let me check with the queue. Any comment or question? Okay. I see that Collin want to give an update. Yes. Please go ahead.

Collin Kurre: Yes. This is Collin Kurre for the record. I was just jumping in. This is a little update about a working party and not working group. And that was the Cross Community Working Party on ICANN and Human Rights.

So for the past month we have resuscitated our little dormant newsletter - dormant mailing list with a flurry of activity. And we've got a couple of ongoing projects related to attempting to establish developing models for potential resources for how ICANN's Human Rights Bylaw can be operationalized in different SOs and ACs.

So if anybody here is interested in getting involved on that work and you can find more information on our Web site, which is [icannhumanrights.net](http://icannhumanrights.net) or on the mailing list.



Rafik Dammak: Thanks Collin. You also can type the domain name. Maybe it's more - easier for people just to avoid any spelling. But any question or comment for Collin? I don't see any. I know that we have four minutes left and everyone kind of maybe tired of two hours call (and start to be).

So I mean if anybody has any update or something that you want to share from working group, review teams and so on? Okay. So I guess maybe that's it for today.

So I know that maybe the agenda from the Council was a little bit confusing but it's important to understand that as the Council is managing their PDP - I mean the policy process, it's important to keep track of the progress and the different phases. I mean the PDP is the implementation and from now on also the review of the implementation.

We'll try to keep giving updates from the discussion and share them in the list. Hopefully also get anything more details and background material. I mean it's good to check the agenda. There are also links and description about the background of why we are discussing that topic in the call. So we'll follow up with more details and information.

Okay. Is there any other business or question or comment? It's the time to do so. Otherwise I will adjourn the call for today. So please do so. Okay. I see nobody in the queue. And I guess that's it for today. Thanks everyone and see you soon. Bye bye. Let's adjourn the call for today.

Woman: Thanks Rafik. Bye bye.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

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

END