
MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you very much. Welcome, everyone, to the NCSG Finance Committee meeting on Tuesday, 23rd of July 2019.

On the call today we have Ayden Férdeline, Sam Lanfranco, Stephanie Perrin, Thato Mfikwe, and from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please mute your mic when you're not speaking. Thank you very much and over to you, Ayden.

AYDEN FÉRDELINE: Thanks, Maryam. Hi, everyone. Great to see so many of you on the call today. Before we get started, I just wanted to note, you have received a calendar invitation for a one-hour meeting. However, and while it is my ambition that we can cover the agenda in one hour, we might not be able to, so if you would be able to block 90 minutes, that would be greatly appreciated. But if do you have any concerns about potentially extending today's meeting, please raise your hand or comment in the chat and we can deal with that and perhaps schedule another call if we need to. So, we'll have hard stop after 90 minutes but we will try to get as much done in the first hour if we can.

I would also like to suggest one small change to the agenda. This agenda was circulated to you last Thursday. I'm going to propose that we add a small discussion of proposed intersessional task force to the agenda at the conclusion of our call, so that can form a part of Any Other Business.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Are there any other items to be added or changes to be made to the agenda for today's call? Seeing no one, before we dive in to the first agenda item, does anyone have any updates to their Statement of Interest? Hearing no one, let's move on to the first agenda item which is to continue formulating our draft comment on the proposed financial assumptions and operating initiatives.

Let me paste a link to our Google Document in the Zoom chat for you in case you wanted to take a look at it, and I'm going to open it up myself. I don't think we need to spend too much time on this document as we reviewed it line by line on our last call and it has been shared with NCSG members and on our mailing list. But what I did want to do is to open a discussion on two comments that Sam left in the Google Doc.

On the first page around paragraph 5 where it says that in response to our session that we encourage ICANN Org to update its projections to reflect more realistic scenario, which is that the entire DNS marketplace continues to contract particularly as we see evidence of the number of registries had declined.

In regards to that text, Sam asked who has evidence-based information on this. I may be wrong but I always thought growth had contracted, not that DNS numbers are shrinking. So I was wondering if anyone is able to perhaps clarify whether or not this is factually accurate or if anyone has any suggestions on how we should address this comment from Sam? Please go ahead, Sam.

SAM LANFRANCO:

Okay, can you hear me clearly?

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ: Yes, we can.

SAM LANFRANCO: Okay. I raised the question – I haven't had the chance to look recently but as I had looked in the past, it looked to me more like the industry was disappointed about the rate of growth rather than actual contraction, on the one hand and in the other, some of the participants were leaving the industry because they haven't gotten the economies of scale they were hoping for. But as you know, the registrars, the registries are more like an oligopoly at the moment. There are a handful of them that control a massive number. Some of the new ones have a lot of domain names but they were handed out for free and some are being used for dubious purposes, so they're likely to have a short life. So we have to be careful how we're interpreting growth and shrinkage here.

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ: Thanks, Sam. I'll add myself to the queue but ahead of me is Stephanie. Please go ahead, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hi, Stephanie for the record. I don't have it ready to hand but the last time I was looking for solid stats was actually when I was completing my dissertation and Thato gave me a link for where you can get up-to-date stats on numbers of domain names registered and the numbers in use. So that would also avoid the speculative ones, the domainers, in case

you wanted to count actual used domain names. I could dig that up for you somehow if we wanted it. I think the easiest thing would be to ask Thato again.

But there was if you recall an altercation at the council meeting. It would've been over a year ago I think because I was on council at that time and the finance guy was coming in – not Xavier but his boss – was trying to claim that we were not in freefall and he got into an argument with Michele over it because at that point, as far as the registrars were concerned, ICANN was in a situation of falling revenues. Thanks.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

Thank you for that, Stephanie. I think what I'm going to take as an action item here is to fact check that sentence. And so, if we can find an evidence to support that claim, we'll keep it in there and if we can't then we'll remove it.

The following sentence, Sam does raise, in my opinion, a very good point as well. In the following sentence talks about there being fewer and fewer accredited registrars and registry operators, and Sam notes that fewer could reflect market consolidation and concentration and not registration shrinkage. I think that's quite a good point. I need to investigate this to see if it is still true today. But I do remember when we're preparing a comment on how depleted the reserve fund was, at that time we had seen that there was revenue decline overall because of fewer and fewer registrations. So, I think that this sentence is perhaps a little clumsy at the moment and that I would agree with Sam that we should drop the phrase "fewer" and find an alternative way of

wording this. So, if there are no objections there, I'm going to take that as an action item as well.

Aside from that, there were no other comments that we received from – this document is being shared on the NCSG-Discuss list with all NCSG members for the past two and half weeks and it has also been shared with the Policy Committee. We've not received any other input at this point in time. Taking these two action items, I will resolve these edits today after our call concludes and I will send an e-mail to our list with the proposed changes that I'm making. And then I will give us 24 hours to review those changes, and then I'm going to then forward this to the Policy Committee and also the NCSG-Discuss list again tomorrow so that members are able to review the proposed changes.

Otherwise, are there any other questions or comments on this particular document? I know that we haven't gone through it very comprehensively now but I'm cognizant of the fact that it has been shared in our list already and we reviewed it line by line on our last call.

Okay. Seeing no hands raised, I'm going to move on to the next agenda item. We're making really good time today. And I'm going to paste another link into the Zoom chat. This is a link to the Draft Internal Operating Procedures, and I'm just going to open them up myself.

You might remember that we've reviewed these procedures on our last call. Not the exact procedures that you are looking at now. We reviewed an earlier draft on our last call, and so the version that you're seeing has been updated to reflect the various action items that we took in our last call and the various comments and suggested edits that you had. This is

subsequently being shared on the NCSG-Discuss list as well, NCSG members, and it has received some input. Actually, it has not been shared actually with the Executive Committee just yet. So, it has only been shared with NCSG members.

We didn't receive a great number of comments. We received quite a few that were supportive of the procedures. There was one observer who believed we needed more procedures but we will not – there's no further information provided as to what additional procedures were needed. And what I have told that particular person is that they're welcome to propose additional procedures and then we would take this to the Finance Committee to deliberate on and to discuss further. What I also said to them was that if we work on five procedures now, that doesn't preclude as from having more in the future.

So there are, I suppose, two strategies here. We can either review these procedures line by line because we did not do that on our last call. On our last call we sort of went through this at a very high level and this could be useful or we could only focus on the comments that have been received. It depends on whether the members on this call have read the procedures or not.

There was one change that I made. Sam noted in one of the comments that we're using an acronym incorrectly, Additional Budgetary Request, when the ICANN definition was Additional Budget Request. So, every reference to the word "budgetary," I have changed to the word "budget." It's just a small but important change to the procedures there.

Do we have any questions or comments or suggestion on how we go forward? If not, I'm going to suggest, given that we are making good time, that we go through these line by line [inaudible] comfortable with the text. Someone's microphone is active. Did someone want to speak?

Okay. Link is in the Google Doc. The first is the Contingency Rule. If the NCSG Finance Committee is not formed, has no Chair or acting Chair is unresponsive for more than 10 calendar days to written request from the NCSG Executive Committee and/or NCSG Policy Committee or is not functional in the sole view of the NCSG Executive Committee, its task shall be performed by the NCSG Policy Committee until the NCSG Finance Committee is again fully functional in the sole view of the NCSG Executive Committee.

I will pause there. Are there any concerns or requested edits regarding the contingency rule?

THATO MFIKWE:

Hi, everyone. I'm sorry for not picking up. Thato Mfikwe speaking. I wanted to comment in regards to that section around the contingency. I see that, Ayden, you put that the Policy Committee needs to actually take responsibilities over the Finance Committee, if the Finance Committee is not in place.

I don't know if it would be correct to actually put the Policy Committee and to give oversight over the Finance Committee or fulfilling its roles. Because I think due to the fact that we have the Chairs of the constituencies as part of the Finance Committee, if there is anything that needs to be improved or changed within the Finance Committee, I

think it would be fair for the Finance Committee to make a decision itself in terms of how to move forward or appoint other people who can participate in the Finance Committee as opposed to now dissolving the Finance Committee temporarily until we do have proper people to occupy the committee itself. That was my main concern around this particular section, the last paragraph.

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ:

Thanks, Thato. This is Ayden. I'm speaking in my personal capacity now. I would not say that the Policy Committee is exercising oversight over the Finance Committee. That is not the intention of this. What this is saying is simply acknowledging that there could be times when the Finance Committee does not have a full contingency of members. It would be anticipated this would just be for a short period of time, and when that is the case then its role would each be performed by the Policy Committee.

I think in order for this to be useful exercise, what I'm going to also suggest is you need to propose specific edits to the text just so that we can keep the discussion going on in a given – no. We have at most 75 minutes left on this call, so when we're reviewing this document we can entertain specific changes to the text. What I'm seeing is small queue forming.

Sam's hand just went down. So, Stephanie, you're next in the queue. Please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I just wanted to endorse this section because basically it's there to cover while we're in a state of flux. So, for instance, if the Chair of the Finance Committee and the rep from NPOC were to quit or one of the other reps, you will recall a voting structure. I mean it requires both reps to be there and I can envision the situation with people coming and going where the Finance Committee would not be functional as constituted right now. In which case, it's inappropriate to hand it over to the Executive Committee for NCSG and the Executive Committee actually approves recommendations of the Finance Committee, so it would then have to fall to another committee, and I think the only one we've got left is the Policy Committee. As I understood, as a stopgap workaround situation for when the Finance Committee is dysfunctional then this would work. By dysfunctional I mean without a quorum of members. Thanks.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN: Thanks, Stephanie. Sam, please go ahead.

SAM LANFRANCO: Okay, thank you. This will be very brief. I'm just reminding us that up until the Finland ICANN Committee meeting, this particular committee had been more [inaudible] and not functioning at all for years. Hopefully we have energy to keep it alive now, but for years it had zero participants and zero meetings, so this is a good contingency in case we fall back into that situation as well.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

Thanks very much, Sam. Speaking in my personal capacity, I agree with both Stephanie and Sam there. The intention here is not to weaken the Finance Committee. It is not to have the Policy Committee taking over the functions of the Finance Committee when it's fully formed. Not at all. It is simply – because the Finance Committee does have important responsibilities, if there simply is not a quorum of members then those important tasks need to be [inaudible]. So this is simply intended to ensure that those responsibilities are always being fulfilled for the NCSG.

Let me go into the next part, Section B, Annual Comment on the Operating Plan and Budget. The following procedure will be used for developing the annual comment in the ICANN Organization Operating Plan and Budget. This procedure also applies to the annual comments submitted on the PTI and IANA Operating Plans and Budgets' one purpose.

The primary responsibility of the NCSG Finance Committee is to maintain and promote an ongoing NCSG awareness of ICANN Org budgetary matters so far as they impact the NCSG and its member constituencies. This includes the policies at the ICANN community develops and implement including policies which had carried the support of the NCSG and policies which impact upon the NCSG, its mandate, and its activities.

The NCSG Finance Committee Chair shall communicate information about the ICANN Org Operating Plan and Budget, including the adopted timeline, opportunities for public input, webinar invitations, and other relevant information, on the NCSG-Discuss mailing list.

The NCSG Finance Committee is responsible for preparing a first draft of any comment that may be submitted under the NCSG moniker. The NCSG Finance Committee shall liaise closely with the NCSG Policy Committee to ensure that comments related to the Operating Plan and Budget are developed in an informed and timely manner.

Are there any proposed edits or concerns with this text, the purpose of Section B? Please go ahead, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

This is a really small point. I just don't like the use of the term "moniker" here. It's not well understood and I think some people might think of it as a pejorative term like an alias or something. So, why don't we just say name – in the name of NCSG. How about that?

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

I have no concerns about that – does anyone else – to that small change from the "moniker" to "in the name of the NCSG"? Seeing none, I have made that change. So, let's move on.

Two, timeline. NCSG Finance Committee comments on the Operating Plan and Budget shall observe specified timelines. It will typically take 46 calendar days for the NCSG Finance Committee, in consultation with the NCSG Finance Committee and Executive Committee, to prepare a comment on the Operating Plan and Budget. The NCSG Finance Committee Chair and Committee Members shall ensure that the timeline is adhered to. In the event that ICANN org is late publishing the budget, or a reduced timeframe for comments is given by ICANN Org,

the Finance Committee Chair must request an extension from ICANN Org in order to maintain the integrity of this procedure. The Finance Committee Chair, at their discretion, may modify this timeline only if an extension cannot be granted by ICANN Org.

Just for clarity, I'm going to propose a small edit. "Chair" I will change to "Finance Committee Chair" in the final two sentences, just so that there is no longer any confusion as to who this is referring to.

In terms of where the 46 days has come from, in preparing this timeline, we have looked at the past two fiscal years and how long ICANN Org has given us to comment. Typically we are given around 75 to 90 days to comment on the budget. And so, what we have done in proposing a timeline that is 46 days is not overly ambitious, I don't think. I think it's quite realistic and it does not assume that we'll start preparing that comment the very day that the budget is opened for comment.

Feel free to raise your hand if you have any questions or comments. Otherwise, I'm going to proceed to read through.

Day 1-4. An e-mail shall be sent to the Finance Committee mailing list announcing the beginning of the comment period and circulating relevant links to the working documents.

Day 5. The Finance Committee Chair shall appoint a Rapporteur to serve as lead penholder for drafting the comment.

Day 6-7. An e-mail shall be sent to the NCSG-Discuss list advising that the Finance Committee is aware of the public comment and in the

process of preparing a draft. This e-mail shall be clear that input from NCSG members is welcomed now and into the future.

Day 7-10. The Finance Committee shall hold a call to discuss preliminary thoughts on the budget. This call shall be open to all NCSG members to provide input.

Day 8-12. Rapporteur begins drafting the comment in a publicly accessible document, sharing their progress on the Finance Committee mailing list and inviting additional input.

Day 21. First draft of the comment shall be circulated on the NCSG Finance Committee mailing list for the review of Finance Committee members. If the rapporteur does not have a solid draft ready, the Chair of the Finance Committee or in the event the Rapporteur is the Chair, the Chair of the Policy Committee may seek to appoint a replacement rapporteur.

Day 21-35. The comment shall be circulated on the NCSG-Discuss list for the review of NCSG members.

Day 35-40. A second call of the Finance Committee shall be held to review the comment and to further wordsmith and refine it. This call shall be open to all NCSG members to provide input. Finance Committee members must join this call to ensure any objections raised have been addressed, and to provide compromise and textual changes as necessary.

Day 40-45. The final comment shall be circulated on the NCSG-Discuss list for the review of NCSG members, and shared with the NCSG Policy Committee for its review and potential endorsement.

Day 46. If approved by the NCSG Policy Committee, and only upon notification of its approval from the Chair of the NCSG Policy Committee, the Chair of the NCSG Finance Committee shall submit the comment to the relevant e-mail address.

I'm going to pause here. Are there any requested edits to this timeline or clarifying questions? Okay, seeing none, we'll move on to Section 3, Individual Comments.

Any member of the NCSG, including members of the NCSG Finance Committee, can independently submit a public comment in their individual capacity provided they make clear this is a submission in their personal capacity. The rapporteur may also receive endorsements on the initially drafted public comment from NCSG members. If the comment has not been endorsed by the Policy Committee, the rapporteur may submit the comment with such personal endorsements, making it clear that the comment is endorsed by some NCSG members in their personal capacity and stating that the comment is not an NCSG submission.

Are there any questions or comments on Section 3, Individual Comments? I see Thato's hand raised. Go ahead, Thato.

THATO MFIKWE:

Hi, everyone. Thato Mfikwe again. Ayden, I just posted there on the chat because I think going through the entire document, I would like to believe that everyone has gone through the document, maybe if we could go to those sections that need us to discuss or even go to explore what needs to be edited, I think it will save us a lot of time but I think it's good way, as Stephanie also noted in regards to this timeline. So, I think we can move as proposed.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

Yeah, that's fine. Thanks for your feedback, Thato. So, what we're going to do is we're going to persist with that approach. So, before we began the review of this document, we agreed and I asked for input then on how we would go about this, so we're going to continue with the original approach that had no objections at this time of the call. I think that it is important that all members of the Finance Committee are aware of the procedures. I know that we have all read them, I know that we have looked at them previously, but given how important they are and given that this is something that is going to be guiding up now our activities over the next few years potentially, I think we need to make sure they were all really okay with the language and that there are no even minor edits that need to be made. We want to make sure these are right and that there are no surprises here. So, I think this is the best approach.

Section C, Finance Committee Official Statements. The following procedure shall be used for developing official NCSG Finance Committee statements.

1. Finance Committee Initiated Statements. Any member of the NCSG Finance Committee may propose that a statement be developed on a given matter. If there is preliminary support for the statement to be developed, the Chair of the NCSG Finance Committee will appoint a rapporteur to be lead penholder on preparing the first draft of a NCSG Finance Committee position statement. The rapporteur will be responsible for coordinating input, resolving issues, and sharing the finalized statement with the NCSG Finance Committee for its review and consideration.

Any edits, clarifying questions?

2. Consultation and approval where there is no disagreement. The draft position will be circulated for comment on the NCSG Finance Committee mailing list. The NCSG Executive Committee and NCSG Policy Committee must be notified in writing of the draft position statement. There will be a 14-calendar day period for comment, unless the item is of an urgent nature. If no objections are received by members of the NCSG Finance Committee, NCSG Policy Committee, and NCSG Executive Committee, the position shall be deemed approved by the NCSG Finance Committee.

In urgent circumstances, the Chair of the Finance Committee with the support of either the Chair of the NCSG or two Chairs of NCSG constituencies may call for comments on an extraordinary statement of the Finance Committee. In such unusual and infrequent circumstances, the comment period is reduced to 24 hours. If no objections are received, the position shall be deemed approved by the NCSG Finance Committee.

Question, comments? Before we move on, I see there is a question from Sam in the chat. Our membership is quite small. Our members – the NCSG Chair, Stephanie, myself as NCUC appointee, and yourself, Sam, as NPOC appointee, we’re three members. We also have Thato as an observer and we do have the constituent and chairs as [inaudible] observers but not observers officially per [our shot]. So, not a massive membership.

3. Mediating significant differences in substance or language. Members who seek changes to a draft position statement must submit proposed language in writing. If there are at least three members who oppose a position, a mechanism to discuss the issue will be provided by the rapporteur with the assistance of the Finance Committee Chair. If the Finance Committee Chair is the rapporteur, the NCSG Chair will be asked to mediate. Typically, this mechanism will consist of a conference call, but in some circumstances an e-mail discussion on the mailing list, or a recorded meeting at a face-to-face ICANN meeting may be suitable. If the majority of the Finance Committee members support the draft position, the position will be deemed approved.

4. Expressed personal views of Finance Committee members. When a member declares oneself as speaking in the capacity of the NCSG Finance Committee, they shall remain faithful to approved positions. When interacting with others, for example, the ICANN Org Finance Department or other Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, or GNSO Stakeholder Groups, they must not give the impression that they are speaking for the NCSG Finance Committee unless they have been authorized to do so in an official capacity, in which case they must advance only endorsed positions.

5. Updates. From time to time updates may be needed to NCSG Finance Committee positions. The NCSG Finance Committee Chair at that time will appoint a rapporteur to coordinate the revision and the procedure above will be followed.

Are there any questions, clarifying questions or requested edits to anything you can see on the Finance Committee official statements? Just catching up on the chat, I'm going to move the discussion to the end of the call to Any Other Business.

Thato, your hand is raised. Is that a new hand?

THATO MFIKWE:

Thanks, Ayden. Ayden, I was just waiting for you to get to point number five of this section, but my question of which I've been raising in – when I was commenting on the Google Docs and also on the mailing list is around maybe there was no clarity or maybe I might have missed the explanation but what I wanted to find out is there were operational procedures that were developed before by the Finance Committee and they went through a community engagement and comment process, and I was thinking that maybe the development of these operational procedures, it would be more of an update based on the work that have already started which was very extensive as opposed to starting the entire process again. So, I don't know if this is the right section to ask this question, but in my view I thought I should just raise this up. Thanks.

AYDEN FÉRDELINE:

Thanks, Thato. We have had this discussion in the Google Doc already. I think there is a misunderstanding as to what this is talking about. So, Section C is talking about an official statement of the Finance Committee. When I was drafting this, what I envisioned being an official statement could be – and I’m just saying anything now – we believe that the reserve fund should be replenished 100%. So, our position at the NCSG Finance Committee is developed, a position that we are going to be taking forward and advocating to the ICANN community. That is what I envisioned an official statement being.

So, what you are talking about was the internal operating procedures that our past Finance Committee drafted. We’re not updating those because, one, they were never endorsed. They were never adopted, so there’s nothing for us to update. And secondly, they were not an official statement of the Finance Committee as I envisioned it and as defined in Section 1 of this section.

So, I don’t want to spend too much time on this because we’ve had this discussion at least three times now in the Google Document but those procedures were never shared with NCSG members, they were only shared on the Finance Committee mailing list and they were not adopted. So, these are the procedures that we’re considering at the moment. There is nothing that precludes us from potentially adopting additional procedures in the future, potentially even some of those that the past Finance Committee worked on. But at this point in time and what is on our agenda today is the Google Doc ahead of us and we’re just reviewing this and flagging any potential concerns, edits, questions that we have about it.

So, let's move on to Section D, Convening of Face-to-Face Meetings and Other Events.

THATO MFIKWE: Sorry to intervene, Ayden, my hand was up. I don't know if you recognized it.

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ: Thato, we've moved on now. We're on Section D. So this procedure shall be used when the Finance Committee wishes to host a meeting which is not a call or webinar.

1. Usual Working Practice. The standard working practice of the NCSG Finance Committee is to conduct its business via e-mail and NCSG mailing lists, and to convene meetings via webinar –

I see that word is duplicated, so I'm just deleting it.

And to convene meetings via webinar or conference call, as this allows for maximum member participation at the lowest cost. Members of the NCSG Finance Committee have no entitlement to travel support and the NCSG Finance Committee has no access to financial resources to secure meeting space. However, from time to time the NCSG Finance Committee may wish to have a face-to-face meeting or to convene at an external forum. This is permitted provided there are no cost implications for the NCSG or its member constituencies.

Are there any edits or clarifying questions regarding Section D1? Hearing no one.

2. Requirement of Remote Participation.

THATO MFIKWE: Apologies, Ayden. Sorry, Ayden.

AYDEN FÉRDELINE: Yes.

THATO MFIKWE: Sorry for that. I'm a bit slow in raising my hand. I see that in this section it talks about that the Finance Committee can participate in a face-to-face meeting provided that there are no cost implications for NCSG and its constituencies. So, my question of which I also raised today and you just might have resolved is how is the Finance Committee supposed to be supported to participate in their face-to-face meeting if the cost implication will not be coming from NCSG or its member constituencies? So, I just need clarity. How will they be able to participate?

AYDEN FÉRDELINE: Thanks, Thato. As I also commented in the Google Doc, we're silent on that. We don't want these procedures to be so descriptive as to limit future Finance Committees. So we want to get the Finance Committee to have the freedom and flexibility to be able to secure resources through appropriate means but we don't want to be limiting the Finance Committee saying this is the only way that you can have resources. So all we're saying is that there can be no cost implications for the NCSG or its member constituencies. That's it. So, as long as

another party is providing resources, that will be permitted under this procedure. Does that make sense?

THATO MFIKWE:

Not exactly, Ayden, because as you know that NCSG has got two committees, the Policy and the Finance Committee. But now I think that the Finance Committee, since it belongs to NCSG, it also needs support of NCSG in terms of its activities, as much as the Policy Committee also obtains support from NCSG. And if this is something that was discussed in detail last year, but I was hoping that there might be improvement in terms of how we view because the charter also states that if necessary, the Finance Committee will attend face-to-face meetings as enabled by ICANN meetings. So, this statement is almost like not in alignment with that.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

Thanks, Thato. I see Stephanie in the queue. Forgive me for just making a small comment before I allow you to speak, Stephanie. I think Thato that's a misinterpretation of what the charter says. There is nothing that says that the Finance Committee must have face-to-face meetings. The charter does not state that. What the charter does state is that face-to-face meetings are permitted. And that is what our procedure says. That from time to time the Finance Committee may wish to have a face-to-face meeting or to convene an external forum, and that this is permitted provided that there are no cost implications.

So, I just wanted to put that small clarification out there. And in terms of resources of the Policy Committee, the Policy Committee does not

receive travel support. The Policy Committee does not receive any further support than what the Finance Committee receives. The support that ICANN provides the Policy Committee is a remote participation like we're in now or occasionally at a face-to-face meeting, a meeting room. And indeed, as you'll see as we go through this procedure in a moment, that is also permitted for the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee is also allowed to have a meeting room if ICANN is paying for it.

Stephanie is next in the queue. Please go ahead, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks. I think it's important that we look at the charter language that sets up all of these potentialities for the NCSG Finance Committee in the context of what was happening at the time. In another words, this would have been drafted in 2010-2011. At that point, we had just incorporated or we were in the process of incorporating the new constituency NPOC, and the Red Cross exercise was going on, and the original NCUC was envisaging a potential threat to its existence brought on by the incursion of intellectual property interest into the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group through the means of basically the .orgs and the international NGOs. I think that there was envisaged the potential for having to do fundraising, having to reach out to a lot more members and basically create a much larger group at ICANN, which would, I have to say extraordinarily difficult because as we know right now we've got a maybe half a dozen active members who are doing all the comment writing and all the engagement here and it's really, really tedious.

So, I think we have to see things in context. The Finance Committee, we blasted quite nicely during the interim period with a moribund Finance Committee. It's not clear to me that there's a whole lot of work for the Finance Committee to do – and of course we've had this discussion back and forth many, many times and I'm just an observer here, as the a nominal participant as NCSG Chair – but I would say that the Policy Committee which is managing all of these policy work, all the people who are chairing committees who don't get any funding except on a trial basis through the funding the chairs trial that ICANN is running, who are managing weekly meetings, the EPDP gets ... We have to beg to for funding for a face-to-face meeting and we're under extraordinary timelines and workloads. There's just no comparison between the workload that the Finance Committee has as compared to the actual work that's going on at ICANN among our volunteers.

So, I think we have to put this one to rest in the context of how these things was envisaged years ago and what our real needs are. As far as I'm concerned, this language serves very well to do that. Thank you.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

Thank you very much, Stephanie, for that thoughtful intervention. I'm going to continue reading through the text.

2. Requirement of remote participation. The NCSG Finance Committee may hold face-to-face meetings at a public ICANN meeting or at other events, provided there is remote participation available to enable the presence of all NCSG members who may wish to audit this session. Auditing NCSG members must be able to listen in and have some

mechanism of offering inputs in real-time. Sessions must also be audio recorded and, ideally, transcribed.

3. No cost implication to the NCSG. NCSG Finance Committee face-to-face meetings and similar events cannot result in the NCSG incurring any direct financial costs. However, if another party covers costs such as ICANN in transcribing the session, this is permitted.

4. Agendas must be published in advance. The agenda for any face-to-face meeting or event must be published at least 14 calendar days in advance of the session on both the NCSG-Discuss and NCSG Finance Committee mailing lists. Instructions, with hyperlinks on how to access the remote participation platform, will ensure that NCSG members can familiarize themselves with the session agenda and are aware as to how they can participate in it.

Are there any requested edits or clarifying questions regarding Section D, convening face-to-face meetings and other events? Seeing none, we will move on because we're also a little short on time now.

Section E, Submission of Additional Budget Request. The following procedure shall be used when the NCSG Finance Committee wishes to submit an Additional Budget Request to ICANN.

Purpose. Every year, the NCSG and its member constituencies have the option to submit Additional Budget Requests to ICANN Org for activities which will benefit the NCSG and/or its constituencies. Funding is limited, funding requests are made public, and funding requests are shared with the entire ICANN community. Great care must be taken to ensure that requests are appropriate in appearance and purpose.

2. Timeline. It is the responsibility of the NCSG Finance Committee to prepare drafts of Additional Budget Requests. They may only be submitted once they have gathered the approval of the NCSG Executive Committee. The NCSG Finance Committee must liaise with the NCSG Chair, NCSG Executive Committee, NCSG Policy Committee, and NCSG members in order to understand the NCSG's resourcing requirements for a given fiscal year. It would typically take 46 calendar days for the NCSG Finance Committee to prepare drafts of Additional Budget Request. It is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure this timeline is adhered to and the responsibility of members of the NCSG Finance Committee to ensure that the timeline is met.

Before I go on, please do raise your hand if you have any request to edit or clarifying questions. Otherwise, I'm just going to look at the two comments that are on the document. Chris [inaudible] has said that Additional Budget Request must be based on set criteria as well. Whether emergency, etc. it will need a timeline as well properly set out. I'm going to press the Resolve button because I think that comment is addressed.

Sam has highlighted 46 calendar days and asked, "I presume that there is a cut-off date after which no ABR drafting can commence since the final submission must meet ICANN's submission deadline." That is a good point, so yes. I suppose that there is, if we are following the procedure. So the final submission date is not in advance. Sometimes it can be extended. And if we look at the past three years, we're typically given around 75 days before an extension is granted to be able to submit this request. So this is doable.

To Bruna's point, yes. NPOC had no ABRs approved and NCSG had no ABRs approved this year, and the NCUC just have the small amount approved. So we want to do better moving forward.

I see Stephanie has her hand raised. Please go ahead, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes, I just wanted to acknowledge Sam's comment there. Perhaps it would be good after it is the responsibility of the Chair to manage the timeline. You could put in accordance with ICANN's set delivery date or something like that and separated by [commas], just as a reminder that we have to live by the ICANN rules.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

Thanks, Stephanie. I think that is a good point. What I added is, "It is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure this timeline is adhered to and the responsibility of members of the NCSG Finance Committee to ensure that the timeline is met in accordance with ICANN's specified deadline for receiving Additional Budget Request."

If there are any questions let me know. Otherwise, Bruna, you're next in the queue.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS:

Hi. This is Bruna for the record. I'm not sure if you're listening to me properly but if not, just highlight it to me.

Just a short question. I've read the part about liaising with the NCSG Chair and NCSG Policy Committee. Is there any [rule] of settings, some sort of ways with both the NPOC and NCSG Chair as well just so we can coordinate the whole process together and avoid duplication or things such as ABRs being submitted without the rest of the leadership knowing or things like that. Just a short question.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

My thought process here was that the Finance Committee has a small agreement and we are not meant to get involved in the activities of the individual constituencies. So what I saw as our responsibility was only to be working on Additional Budget Request and impact, the stakeholder group. That was why there is no formal interaction with the constituency Chairs and I would be reluctant to add that interaction.

But what might be appropriate – and I'm happy to hear what you think – is that the Finance Committee should share its proposed Additional Budget Request with all constituency Chairs simply on a “for your information only” basis. Not looking to get into a dialogue as to what resourcing requirements that constituencies necessarily need themselves, but I would agree with you, Bruna, that preventing duplication is probably a very good idea.

Next in the queue is Stephanie, unless you wanted to speak again, Bruna.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: I do but I'll let Stephanie go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hi. I just wanted to say that I think that it's not just the Finance Committee that has been dysfunctional. I think we need to work on the Policy Committee because, in fact, the Policy Committee has a vast area of responsibility and too few people working on it. In my view there's some delegation that needs to happen, and certainly it would be the role of the Policy Committee to coordinate the ABRs in terms of content to make sure we don't have duplication, to make sure there are no ABRs that are coming out of left field that do not fit with policy priorities, if you see what I mean. I mean there are some that are constituency level organizational. But the Policy Committee clearly has a role and it would be up to the Policy Committee in my view to strike a little ABR Coordination Committee to make sure that we don't do something stupid. The Finance Committee, as you pointed out, has a limited remit and really is just administrative in that respect. Thanks.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN: Thank you, Stephanie. Bruna, do you want to come in?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Yes. Thank you very much, Ayden. I agree that the remit is quite limited but at the same time, we have constituency appointees to the Finance Committee. And I know while we were talking about some sort of an independent committee from the constituencies, there is also some sort of maybe an informal will or maybe at least we expect that for our appointees to report back to us on the actions of the Finance Committee and so on, it's not necessarily as if Ayden had the obligation

to report back to me, but that's something that I'll maybe do out of good politics.

While I'm not saying for us to formally acknowledge this coordination between constituencies and the Finance Committee, we can figure out an informal way of doing. An informal way as well of receiving inputs from constituency Chairs into those ABRs. Because I'm just afraid that – sometimes we're treating NCSG as if it was like a separate body, but at the same time we're both part of NCSG. The separation might work for some things and at some point it shouldn't work for other things. Just like a brother comment on this. But I agree on the separation, I agree with the formalities that are being proposed on the document, but at the same time, we should figure out an informal way of coordinating ABRs. Maybe that's the way that Stephanie just addressed it as the way forward. We can have the Policy Committee forming an Ad Hoc Committee to coordinate ABRs or something like that.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

Thanks, Bruna. I think maybe it has to be the other way around. Ultimately the NCUC's appointees to the Finance Committee should report to you as NCUC Chair. NPOC's [committee] should report to the NPOC Chair. I don't think that I can compel an appointee to report to you or to report to Joan and to make sure that they're actually liaising and getting NPOC or the NCUC's input words where appropriate. I think it has to be the other way. I think that maybe the NCUC or NPOC or other constituencies that are formed need to have a mechanism of ensuring that their appointees are actually fulfilling their responsibilities and reporting back where it's appropriate.

I also agree with Stephanie that I think the Policy Committee should be serving that coordination function to ensure that the ABRs need our policy priorities that there's no duplication.

I'm just going back through the timeline again and I realized that the Finance Committee is required to liaise with NCSG members and is required to share everything it's doing as part of the ABRs on the NCSG-Discuss list. Because the constituency Chairs are subscribed to that as well, I feel like it shouldn't be a great surprise the ABRs that have been developed because we have baked in here the requirement to share things on the Discuss list.

So what I'm going to suggest is I'm going to read through the rest of the table now and then I'll open up the discussion again in case we think that there isn't the right amount of consultation taking place. I did also want to say to Raphael as I saw that he's about to leave, thank you for joining us and sorry we hadn't been able to get through the entire agenda in the allotted hour.

Day 1. An e-mail shall be sent to the Finance Committee mailing list announcing that ICANN Org has opened the call for Additional Budget Request and circulating relevant links to the working documents.

Day 3. An e-mail shall be sent to the NCSG-Discuss mailing list announcing that ICANN Org has opened the call for Additional Budgetary Request and circulating links to the relevant documents and noting that the Finance Committee is leading the drafting process.

I'm going to edit that to say, "For the NCSG."

Day 5. The Finance Committee Chair shall appoint a rapporteur who will be responsible for shepherding through the drafting of Additional Budgetary Request.

Day 6, 7. The Finance Committee Chair shall e-mail the NCSG Chair, NCSG Executive Committee, NCSG Policy Committee, and any NCSG members who are on the leadership teams of any GNSO Working Groups asking specifically what resourcing needs they anticipate requiring over the coming fiscal year. The deadline of 14 days will be provided to receive this info.

Day 6, 7, 10. The Finance Committee shall hold a call to discuss what Additional Budget Request from the NCSG and other parts of the community were approved in the prior fiscal year and identify whether there are any previously successful request that the NCSG should emulate this year.

Day 21, 22. Deadline for NCSG Chair, NCSG Executive Committee, NCSG Policy Committee, and NCSG members who are on the leadership teams of any GNSO Working Groups to provide the rapporteur with input on desired Additional Budget Request.

Day 21-26. Rapporteur begins drafting the Additional Budget Request in a publicly accessible document, sharing their progress on the Finance Committee mailing list and inviting additional input.

Day 27-30. First draft of Additional Budget Request shall be circulated on the NCSG Finance Committee mailing list with the review of Finance Committee members. If the rapporteur does not have a solid draft ready, the Chair of the Finance Committee or in the event the

rapporteur is the Chair, the Chair of Policy Committee may seek to appoint a replacement rapporteur.

Day 31-35. Additional Budget Request shall be circulated on the NCSG-Discuss list for the review of NCSG mailing list.

Day 35-40. A second call of the Finance Committee shall be held to review the Additional Budget Request and further words and refinement. Finance Committee members must join this call to ensure any objections raised are being addressed, and to provide compromise and additional textual changes as necessary.

Day 40-45. The finalized Additional Budget Request shall be circulated on the NCSG-Discuss list with the review of NCSG members and shared with the NCSG Executive Committee for its review and potential approval of the request.

Day 46. Once approved, the Chair of the NCSG shall submit the Additional Budget Request to the relevant e-mail address. The Finance Committee Chair is not committed to the Additional Budget Request on behalf of the NCSG.

Section 3. Individual Budget Requests are Not Allowed. No member of the NCSG may individually submit Additional Budget Request in an individual capacity. Should an NCSG member submits such a request, the NCSG Chair will notify the ICANN Org Finance Department that the request is not an NCSG request and does not carry the support of the NCSG.

So, I'll pause here and open up for questions, comments, and input. Is that a new hand, Bruna? I'm not seeing any hands raised. Are we happy with the text in Section E?

I'm going to move on then to Section F, Participation of Non-Members in Finance Committee Meetings.

The following procedure shall be used for inviting subject matter experts who occasionally participate in Finance Committee meetings. The procedure also deals with guests who arrive uninvited to Finance Committee meetings in which they participate. The NCSG Finance Committee operates in a transparent and open manner and welcomes participation of any NCSG member with an interest in finance matters. However, on occasion, there may be value in being briefed by persons (non-NCSG members) with specialized knowledge of a particular topic. In special circumstances, someone may arrive to a meeting unexpectedly and decide to participate. Provided this behavior is not disruptive, the Finance Committee shall be open to the inputs offered by others but only official members of the Finance Committee have full participation rights and that's when the official members may agree the final language over a formal comment, statement, or Additional Budget Request should be approved or not.

Questions, comments, edits here? The thinking behind this Section F was similar to what we were getting at before. Personally, I would really like us to be able to extend our membership because it's a little ridiculous having a committee with three members. But we're actually limited in the number of official observers we can have. Our charter

only permits two observers so we could have three members and two observers, which is really not great.

So what this has been trying to do is to say given that a charter review is incredibly unlikely and not going to happen any time soon, is that we do welcome the participation from anyone. But because our charter does differentiate between who has participation rights which is only members. We think very clearly only members have full participation rights, observers as defined in the charter – and I know we have very few – have the same rights that are given in the charter but we're going a little further I must say. Anyone who wants to participate, provide they're not disruptive, we will receive their input.

Stephanie's hand is raised. Please go ahead, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks very much, Ayden. I agree with you that the numbers is a problem that is interfering with the effectiveness of the Finance Committee. I'm trying to draw this line between what the Finance Committee does and what the Policy Committee does. But for instance, we did not get our ABR for having a little cybersecurity workshop in developing countries. I had already talked to SSAC and they were keen to help us on that. I could see us doing a joint workshop, side by side with the meeting and it involving some finance and possibly fundraising or seeking out of sponsors. For those purposes, a little subcommittee including members from other groups such as SSAC, such as the registrars and registries could be useful.

Does the Finance Committee at the moment have the capacity to strike up a small and formal working group for a project or does it not? If it does not, is it appropriate or would that have to come through the Policy Committee? I'm thinking just in terms of gathering the funds and managing the free lunch or whatever. So it's an administrative thing, not a policy thing. Thanks.

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ:

Thanks, Stephanie. I'm adding myself to the queue but Sam, you're next.

SAM LANFRANCO:

Yes, if we go back to the original NCSG charter, there was very ambitious hope that this Finance Committee would be administering not just voluntary dues from members of NCSG – that's a non-starter – but the exploring other ways of raising funding and so forth, so I think it is within our purview, within the remit that's in that original wording that we could strike committees that are cast to explore these special functions. They would not be able to make decisions on their own but they could do exploratory work and due diligence and then report back to the committee, and then the committee could proceed with the stuff. But I think we do have the latitude to bring in extra people to work on very specific tasks.

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ:

Thanks, Sam. You've summed it up perfectly. I agree with your interpretation there. I think that we do have the capacity to be able to do that.

Looking at the time, I'm going to move on now to the next item. What I'm going to do, with the internal operating procedures is I'm going to submit these now to the NCSG Executive Committee for its input. So what we will ask is that if the Executive Committee could read through and flag if it has any concerns or questions. And we'll give them an appropriate period of time to provide us with some feedback. Then we will be able to either evaluate whether we need to make some further changes, whether different procedures are required, or maybe we'll be able to even have these adopted. But I think the next step – unless there are any objections – would be to share our current draft of the procedures with the Executive Committee for its review.

Next on the agenda is the Code of Conduct document. I'm just going to find a link to that. Where did I put that? I'm just pasting the link now into Zoom.

This is something that I have only mentioned on our mailing list, but it's something that I personally consider to be something of a priority. What it is, it's going above and beyond the ICANN standards of acceptable behavior and saying that members of the Finance Committee will adhere to this policy. What I would like to do is to read it out to you and then to see if you have any questions, concerns, comments. And we'll also note that Sam has raised some comments as well in the document but I'll ask Sam to elaborate on those.

The Finance Committee is committed to conducting all of its affairs and activities with the highest standards of ethical conduct. All members and observers of the NCSG Finance Committee have an obligation to adhere to this policy.

NCSG Finance Committee members and observers must:

Proactively promote ethical behavior;

Provide NCSG members with information that is accurate, objective, relevant, timely, and understandable;

Be honest and ethical in their personal and professional conduct;

Put the interests of the NCSG above their own personal financial interests;

Not exert improper influence over any ICANN department, including the ICANN finance department;

Adhere to ICANN's Standards of Acceptable Behavior, and not maintain contact with individuals who have been banned from the ICANN community by the ICANN Board or the Office of the ICANN Ombudsman.

In addition, members and observers of the NCSG Finance Committee must be independent.

Someone will not be considered independent if they: have within the past three years served in an elected or appointed position within the ICANN Government Advisory Committee or ICANN Board; have within the past three years been an employee or contractor of ICANN, or of a company that provides ICANN with audit, assurance, or other oversight services; have within the past three years been an employee or contractor of a donor to the NCSG who has given in excess of \$10,000

and/or hold any professional responsibilities that might infringe upon their independence.

Penalty for Non-Compliance. If, in the opinion of the Chair of the NCSG Finance Committee, or of two-thirds of the members of the NCSG Finance Committee, a member or observer is not behaving in a manner in accordance with this policy, the member or observer in question shall be referred to the NCSG Executive Committee to launch an investigation.

In addition, the NCSG Executive Committee has the exclusive right to launch an investigation at any time, should it so desire. Should a complaint be upheld by the NCSG Executive Committee, the member or observer must be removed from the NCSG Finance Committee for a period of five years.

And then we have a declaration.

I declare to the best of my knowledge that having read the NCSG Finance Committee Ethics Policy and the criteria for independence that I am eligible to serve as a member of the NCSG Finance Committee. I undertake to discharge my functions and responsibilities as a member or observer of the NCSG Finance Committee ethically and with the interests of the NCSG alone in mind and I will not seek to or accept instructions in regard to the performance of these functions from any third party, including ICANN Org, any other ICANN Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee other than an NCSG constituency, any government, any business, or any other authority.

Should there be any change in my relationship with respect to the criteria for independence, or if I cannot behave in a manner that meets the ethics requirements, I will immediately inform the NCSG Finance Committee on its mailing list and resign my post.

That's what I shared. Questions, comments? Sam, I know that you had quite a few in the document itself. I'm not sure if you wanted to raise any of those now.

SAM LANFRANCO:

Okay. It's slowing me down toggling back and forth between Zoom and the documents, which probably some skill I don't know. I'll let some of those ride for a while. I am concerned with a couple where we basically are trying to impose prohibitions, which I think will be effectively challenged under a variety of principles including freedom of speech. When we get down to saying you may not engage in discussion with people who have been banned from ICANN or that certain kinds of banning take place for a certain number of years. I think there are some complications there, but in general I'm willing to live with the idea that we have this document rather than just trusting goodwill.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

Thanks, Sam. Any other thoughts from participants on the call? Please go ahead, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I agree with Sam with respect to the issue of folks that are banned from ICANN. I mean it's not every day that ICANN bans people but I gather in

discussions both of the GNSO Council over there, appropriate behavior standards in PDPs, and in discussions with the Ombudsman that this is becoming more and more of a problem. I think that if you qualify that statement, let us say for instance that my brother-in-law joins ICANN and gets himself banned. I don't actually have a brother-in-law so it's a good example. I do have a sister-in-law and she could be banned because she's very outspoken. Let's say sister-in-law. Anyway, let's imagine that that person gets banned. Well, I'm not going to stop dealing with that person but I would have to testify that I was not dealing with them on ICANN matters.

And that is as far as the ICANN ban can go. They are banned from ICANN and from discussing with members with respect to ICANN. So, possibly if we put that qualifier in there, it would make that particular section more palatable. Would that work? Because I can foresee we're going to have objections when this goes to the larger list.

There is the problem of declaration of financing. Believe me, I have kicked over this hornet's nest several times. I come from an ethics background in government and I feel very strongly the people should declare if their funding in any way might influence their participation.

For instance, I believe I declare – I'm pretty sure I do – my money that I get for my research and my money that I get in support from Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC). They give me a grant to send me to meetings that ICANN doesn't send me to in support of my work at ICANN for privacy. It's a mere \$6,000 and it's much appreciated. But that is not in conflict with our values.

If I were to be getting \$6,000 from Amazon, say, or Google, and in exchange they wanted a full report on what was going on in NCSG with respect to their domain interest then that could be a conflict. I definitely should – in my view at least – reveal that. We have plenty of members who are getting funding in similar circumstances to the Google and they don't declare.

Now, the last time I raised this, I nearly got ridden out of town on a rail with the burning tire around my neck. So it's a difficult issue but I do think that that declaration of potential conflict is something we should have in here. Thanks.

AYDEN FÉRDELINE:

Thanks, Stephanie. I agree with the point that you raised. I'll just say this declaration is only for members and observers of the Finance Committee, which is a select group. So it's not something that we'll be asking all NCSG members to agree to.

We're very short on time on the call now. So what I might propose is that we might be able to work together – you and I, Stephanie – on editing this language and see if we can get it to a stage where it might work where it might be suitable, and then we can share this document again on the NCSG Finance Committee mailing list for further input and edits potentially from members of the Finance Committee. Then once we're all happy with the language and the idea, if we do get to that stage of course, then we will be able to share it on the NCSG-Discuss list and see what others may think.

Next on the agenda – we’re going to try to end this call in 10 minutes – is the process for appointing a new Finance Committee Chair. We’ll keep this very brief. As of the 30th of this month, I will no longer be a member of the NCUC and therefore I am ineligible to be Chair of the Finance Committee because I won’t be appointed to it, which only leaves Stephanie and Sam who could chair it. The NCSG Chair is not permitted under the charter to serve as Chair, which only leaves Sam. So I did ask Sam if he would be prepared to serve as interim Chair until there is a larger membership and then other members at that time can take a vote as to who they would like to be their next leader and Sam has graciously accepted. So, thank you, Sam. As of the 1st of August, you will be the interim Chair. I understand that the NCUC has a process underway to find a new appointee.

Now, under AOB, I mentioned on the list that I think we should be initiating intersessional task force. So, a little bit of background for those who are not aware. The intersessional is a meeting of the Non-Contracted Parties House that traditionally took place on an annual basis. However, there was no intersessional this year because the previous NCSG Chair unilaterally and without consulting with NCSG members rejected the funding. The implications there was with that, the NCSG did not receive \$70,000 in resources, which I find quite shocking.

It has recently been brought to my attention that there have been discussions of whether the intersessional should be happening this coming January. I was surprised to hear about these discussions because it was an endorsed position of the NCSG that we wanted an intersessional next year. Our comment on the budget this year actually

requested funding for an intersessional because it wasn't in there. And this was something what we had as small victory in that ICANN Org actually responded in its review of the comments on the budget and stated funding for the intersessional. So it shocked me to discover that the NCSG Policy Committee Chair was advocating for a position to ICANN staff that was not in keeping with an endorsed position of the NCSG.

I've not been able to receive much further information than that at this point in time, but my thinking behind the task force was simply to ensure that we were having updates on the intersessional, not on an operational level. We don't need to know about the agenda or anything, but just to make sure that our endorsed position which is that we support the hosting of an intersessional that is not being undermined and that we do not have anyone in leadership roles in the NCSG advocating for something that is not our position to ICANN staff or ICANN mailing list.

I see a queue forming. Sam, please go ahead.

SAM LANFRANCO:

Thank you. Sam for the record. I remembered that this time. I've been to several intersessionals and in fact I was at the one in Iceland in which Stephanie couldn't go and I was there on other matters at my own expense, so that was a cheap participation by NCSG. I support the idea that there'd be intersessionals. The history that was just recounted to me about past behavior I find extremely unfortunate. I could use a stronger word. If all goes as hoped and there is an intersessional and the

money is there, and so forth, I would like to see NCSG, NCUC, and NPOC sort of come together. We'd be three hats and be much more strategic about how they go to the meetings. And this is my personal view – too much time was spent in our previous meetings with groups doing their own business as opposed to going there and honoring the remit and intent of the intersessional which was to iron out things between constituencies so that when there was an ICANN meeting, we could proceed more efficiently and more effectively. There's too much – my feeling – at the intersessionals of people simply (A) restating their positions, (B) holding meetings within their own organizations, and (C) to use something that Stephanie mentions on occasion, looking out the window to see what was available in the local venue for food and recreation. Thank you.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

Thanks, Sam. Stephanie is next followed by Bruna.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes, hi. The latest news on this is that the commercial side of our house is proposing a mere two-hour meeting added on to one of the existing meetings indicating obviously a lack of interest in meeting with us. In my view, there is great friction arising on our various PDPs, between us and the other side of the house because we are more aligned with the contracted parties than we are with the commercial side. And therefore, if we hope to have a successful GNSO review, we need to at least start a dialogue.

Now, certain parties in our constituencies are of the view that there's no point in talking to the commercial guys. I disagree. I think that we should be talking more to them in trying to find some common ground. In particular, there are elements in that group where they are more aligned than others. I really think we should try to fight this thing back but it's difficult when the guys we want to meet with don't want to meet with us. So, we don't have to really come up with something rather quickly if we expect to hold this meeting. Thanks.

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ:

Bruna.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS:

Mostly concurrent to what both Sam and Stephanie said, for one, the only intersessional I participated on was the one in Malay in 2017 in that case. I don't remember good, '18. It was really a bit confusing. We weren't as prepared. I could only say on my behalf, I wasn't as prepared as part of the NCUC at the time. We were already having some misunderstanding with regards to preparation inside NCUC.

Besides that, I also agree with Sam with regards to preparation. If we're doing something, whether it's a two-hour meeting or half-day meeting or a day zero meeting, we should be more prepared, we should have more of the points highlighted and things we want to properly discuss, whether it's GNSO review, whether it's PDP 3.0, whether we want to expand the discussions of the GNSO Council to the leaders of the NCPH level discussion.

On that note, I am not very happy with the situation of the two-hour meeting that's being proposed. I think the two-hour meeting – and the way that it's being proposed is that would take some time from constituency day, and I just find it very problematic because as a stakeholder, we don't have enough opportunities for membership engagement or engagement with the rest of the ICANN community in general. And what is being proposed right now is that will take two hours from our constituency day which is already busy enough to discuss intersessional matters. I don't know how others will feel about this but I think that at least day zero kind of meeting will be better than taking two hours from our constituency day. But that's what Stephanie said already. If they're not willing to meet with us, we have to think really quick of the strategy or ways of convincing them of the importance of this meeting.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN:

I'm speaking in my personal capacity now. That's interesting. Thank you for sharing those insights. I had not heard that. A little outside of the room for what we can deal with as the Finance Committee but on the personal level, I would like to be tracking that issue more closely and I would like to be involved. Because as Stephanie flags ahead of the GNSO review, we really need to rekindle that relationship and I would agree that there's an urgent need to begin a dialogue with the Non-Contracted Parties House.

A two-hour meeting doesn't sound great. We could have a lot on our agenda in Montreal or in the meeting in Cancún. A lot of internal politics could be arising. Who knows? We could have another constituency by

then as well and we might have to be really looking at our own internal structures. So we won't necessarily have two hours to spare then.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Hi, Ayden. I think we lost you. Can you hear me? Can anyone hear me?

SAM LANFRANCO: Yes, we can hear you. We just can't hear Ayden.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Alright. Thank you very much for confirming that, Sam.

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ: I'm sorry. I hope you can hear me again now.

SAM LANFRANCO: You're back.

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ: Sorry. I've just dialed in from my phone. Something seems to have happened to my Wi-Fi. What I was saying before then is, what I hope we might be able to do and it's great that we do have the NCSG Chair and one of the constituency Chairs on the line, we might be able to create, [open] up a mailing list or another venue where we can have some discussions over how we try to rekindle and save the intersessional event, what the value might be for the Commercial Stakeholders Group. I would certainly like to be involved in that if you would like to include

me in those conversations, which is the intersessional is something that I would like to see us saving.

I'm just checking the chat. That being said, I think it's probably time to end this call now. Thank you, everyone, unless anyone else wanted to speak of course. Otherwise, thank you very much for joining this call of the Finance Committee today.

Tons of action items that I'm taking away. I'm going to make a few small edits to the Financial Assumptions document and I will share those once I've prepared them on our mailing list. You have 24 hours to review them and then I will share those with the Policy Committee and the NCSG-Discuss list.

The operating procedures, I'm going to escalate now to the NCSG Executive Committee to see if they have any input for us.

The Code of Conduct document, Stephanie and I will work on a new draft to this and then we will share it on our mailing list.

That is it for today. Thank you again, everyone, for joining the call.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you very much, everyone, for joining the call. The meeting is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]