ICANN76 | CF – GNSO: NCSG Policy Committee Session
Tuesday, March 14, 2023 – 10:30 to 12:00 CUN

ANDREA GLANDON: Hello, and welcome to the NCSG Policy Committee session. My name is and I am the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments will be read aloud if submitted in the Q&A pod or in the chat pod. I will read them aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session.

If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to the Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or a surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Andrea. I'll start with my name as recommended by Andrea. My name is Tomslin, and I'm the policy chair for NCSG. Welcome to our policy meeting in Cancún, and welcome to those attending online who couldn't be here with us.

On our agenda today, we have a couple of things. I don't see all the presenters in the room yet, so I'm hoping everyone makes it. If they don't, we might have to move things around a little bit just so that we accommodate those who are present or those who are ready. Oh, I see more of them coming in.

So we'll look at the Council agenda first. Then we might proceed with the transfer policy review. Is that okay? Raoul, I understand you're still waiting for Juan, and he mentioned we should move him up to the top. Okay. All right, well, if he doesn't make it to the room, we'll probably leave it in the same order. If he does, then, yeah, we'll bring it up.

So we'll start with the second agenda item which is the Council agenda review. The Council meeting is tomorrow, so we'll review the agenda that the councilors will be going through. So I'll please ask Andrea to bring up the Council agenda. All right, the Council agenda is now on the screen.

As you can see, there is no consent agenda on the Council discussion tomorrow, however there is a vote. And the vote is regarding the adoption of the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement. We just like to call it CCOICI, and no one ever remembers what it means.

It's a working group that the Council put together to look at some improvements in the Council. And Manju here is the chair of the working group. And they've sent a report with regards to they are reviewing self-assessment of working groups.

They've made a couple of recommendations, one being that working groups should have frequent and periodic self-assessment during the life of the working group. Currently, it's only done at the end, so one of the recommendations is for periodic assessment. And they also proposed some updates to the questionnaire for the working group self-assessment. The Council will be voting to adopt this report, yes, for comments. Kathy?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay, it sounds like the Council is going to adopt this, right? It's going to be adopted. And I know you chaired it. I don't remember talking about it, but I missed a number of policy meetings that conflicted with the closed generics small team that I'm on.

Giving more to the overworked working group chairs is not fair. I mean, I know you're going to vote on it. I know it's going to pass. I know it sounds like a good idea. They're already volunteers that are massively overworked. If I sound like I remember being there, it's because I remember being there for four years. Adding something else to their roster, and especially something that's going to be six months or every year or something, I don't think we're going to get any more chairs. Sorry. Just to be honest. Sorry.

MANJU CHEN: I'm not sure I understand you right because there's nothing more added to the chair's work. It's just a self-assessment for the working group members. So the working group members do this self-assessment and the result is sent to the Council. And the Council will be like, oh, the working group is doing fine and then the work just carries on. There's no…I don't understand what you're saying about.

KATHY KLEIMAN: How do working group members do a self-assessment without it…? I guess I'm envisioning almost everything in a working group is organized by the chairs and, well, by the charter that's sent to us by Council. And then the individual issues are handled working with ICANN staff. And we meet and we organize and we write and we distribute and we talk and then we hold meetings and then we assess. So there must be something else going on, which makes me happy.

MANJU CHEN: So the self-assessment thing is like the one when you're finished with a working group and you'll be like, how did feel about the working atmosphere of the working group? Was it good? Were we productive? How was the liaison talking between the Council and the working group? Were we having communication issues? Do you think we reached consensus smoothly? Those kind of questions. So while people are complaining about how for some working groups in the end they were like, well, I mean, the working atmosphere sucks so we didn't reach any consensus. So to avoid that in the end, we put one in the middle so if it already sucks, nobody's working, then Council knows in advance and they could be considering brainstorming ways to improve that working atmosphere. So it's not really about the content of the EPDP. It's about how the members are feeling about their working with each other and stuff, yeah.

KATHY KLEIMAN: It sounds like it's not something the chairs of the working group have to organize, distribute, collect, review, analyze, report on. Good. Thank you. If that could be in the notes that this is something coming from Council maybe being done with the staff that works with Council working with the staff that works with the working groups, that sounds great. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Just to quickly reply, yes, it is. I mean, because we're changing the working operational procedures of the working group. So it's like there in the text. It's going to be conducted by staff and the result will be sent to the Council leadership or the whole Council. So yeah, yeah, yeah, everything is in the text.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. I think, Kathy, you will have to remember to say your name. All right, Tomslin again. So the next agenda item on the Council is the next steps for consideration of expired domain deletion policy and the expired registration recovery policy. I think this is the review of this policy. When this was put together there was a recommendation to review it after a couple of years to see if the policy is being implemented or being used well or if there are any issues with it.

The Council has previously considered when to request for a policy status report from staff on these two policies. But the fact that the Council considers itself busy and have capacity issues, they previously agreed to delay this request for a policy status report for about 24 months and that time has now expired.

So the Council has to look into it again, and so a small team of volunteers volunteered to look at…well, the Council asked the contracted parties house members if they have any concerns about the policy and if they have seen issues. Then another question was put to ICANN Compliance about the same. And this small team looked at those responses to determine whether there is something urgent we need to look into on this policy. Considering again, the capacity issues I mentioned earlier.

They will be making a recommendation to the wider Council that there are some little issues. There’s room for improvement on the policy, but there’s nothing absolutely urgent that we cannot wait for another six months. That is what this discussion is about. I don't know if anyone has comments about it. I don’t see any hands. None in the room as well.

All right, we’ll move on then to the next agenda item. On this item the Council is simply just reviewing, or a better word would be getting updates, on projects that have an impact on SubPro's timeline. And as you can see on the screen there are four of them.

The IDNs EPDP Phase 1 is one of them. The GGP, the GNSO Guidance Process on Applicant Support, is the second. Closed generics is the third. That’s a facilitated discussion. And there will be a small team put together, a Council small team, to address the responses of…well, the ICANN Board's plan on the SubPro recommendations.

So the Council will be getting updates on these four just to have a feel as to how they might or might not impact SubPro's timeline. So I don't know if anyone has comment on this. Check the room, online. No hands, all right.

All right, we'll move on then to the next, thank you. On Item 7, like I mentioned, the Board has put forward their plan on how to go about approving the hundreds of recommendations of SubPro. They had a meeting with the Council and gave us an update. I think they've had a couple already with the community this week as well. And the Council continues discussion on what the next steps for the Council are with regards to what they've received so far and, again, related to the Board's proposal on how they want to address this.

Like we saw in the previous item, one proposed way forward is that Council small team to look at those issues the Board, especially those items the Board says they will defer and will be sending back to Council or have sent back to Council to reconsider. The Council needs to work out how to address those, and so this small team will have to consult with…the Council might have to request the SubPro PDP working group to reconvene for consultation. They might do that.

They will also consult with the community, and they might also want to consult with the wider Board as well. But that's what this discussion will be about, and we'll probably come out of this with next steps. I don't know what they are at this time. We just have things that have been proposed. I don't know if anyone has a comment on that. I see Kathy's hand.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yeah, if the Council creates a small group on this, and it sounds like it will, is that right, Tomslin? It looks like you're going to create a small group? We definitely need somebody on that group. There are a lot of issues of concern about applicant support and end user issues. We'll get to them in the section on SubPro and on the ODP, but we should definitely have somebody on there to make sure that our concerns are represented. And it might not just be pending issues. Pending issues are issues that the Board has not decided to go forward on, but the Board has rejected or is in the process, is about to reject some recommendations of SubPro. You might want to review those as well and see if there are other ways to do it. Some of them are very important to us and involved applicant support. Again, stay tuned for slides in a few minutes.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. Yeah, the small team, just for everyone's information, will be made up of councilors because it's an internal Council small team. And, yes, we do have someone in NCSG on the small team already and, unfortunately, that happens to be me.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Oh, councilor, can we talk?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah, any other comments? We'll move to the next item then if there are no other comments. WHOIS disclosure system. All right, on this item I don't know if members remember that design that was proposed by ICANN Org a couple of months ago. Now the Board has directed…. Well, before that, the Council asked the Board to do approval of concept-ish kind of system before it goes to…the SSAD itself is implemented or approved so that we can see if we can get some more data. And this was out of the SSAD or the ODA if you remember that.

So this WHOIS disclosure system is going to sort of try out a system where actors can request for closed data of registrants. And they will be triaged and stuff like that. Now I think, like I mentioned, the Board has directed Org to implement the system. And the small team will be meeting with Org to get an update on how the implementation or the status of the implementation of this WHOIS disclosure system.

And so here this small team will now—because I think this is happening today, if I'm not mistaken—so the small team will update the wider Council about the conversation they had. The update they received from Org about the implementation of the system. And then the Council will consider whether the instructions that were given to the small team on what they should work on, if it requires an update. Especially during this implementation phase what the small team should be working on and what they should do post-implementation of the system as well.

So that is what this conversation is about and the updates that the Council will be receiving from the small team. I see Kathy's hand up for comment.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yep. Kathy Kleiman. I'm supposed to do that, right? Who's our person on the small team?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Stephanie is.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thank you, Stephanie.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: That's easy. Any other comments? I see none. I will move on then. So that takes us to the any other business section of the Council agenda where we will discuss the GNSO chair election timelines. That's for your information, Julf. And we'll also get a policy status report on the policy and implementation working group final recommendations. So that's all that's on the agenda for the Council meeting tomorrow. If there are no other comments or questions, we'll move back to our agenda. I don't know, if Raoul and Juan are ready, we'll bump up the Item Number 5 on our agenda.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: I have no hurry now, so no rush.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Oh, no rush?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: No, no rush.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I will keep the agenda as it is then. All right, so then in that case we'll move on to Item Number 4 which I'll pass the mic to Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay, as everyone knows now, I like to do slides. So I'll be talking about two things. Just one of them now and then there are other agenda items, and then we'll come back to the slides for the second issue. So this is something Julf and I are presenting. A proposal for a sharing of leadership responsibilities for items before the Council by NCSG councilors.

So as a good lawyer, I start all resolutions with "whereas." Whereas, there are many issues before the Council. Whereas, tracking them in detail is too much for any one NCSG councilor to follow and far too much for any one NCSG member, yet we do not want to miss issues of concern, of great concern to NCSG.

Plus, we do not want any one councilor, including our amazing, outstanding, and great chair, to have too much work. And NCSG members really do want to help, but we often don't know the procedural details behind something. It's very difficult to analyze the issues sometimes without that background. So the idea just review everything on the Council agenda and let us know what you think is often hard to do in the abstract.

Therefore, how can we find a way for NCSG to cover all of the issues of concern to us, which is not all the issues on the Council agenda? Just all the issues of serious concern to NCSG and Council, and how can NCSG members better help you as councilors?

So a modest proposal that every NCSG councilor take the lead on one—one—issue that's before Council coming up on the Council agenda and that they study that one topic. That then they present that one topic—whatever the Council resolution is, whatever the background is—in the NCSG monthly policy meeting. I would recommend a slide or two just so we can follow you. It also helps organize things and direct things.

So study the topic, present it, be the front person answering the questions from NCSG members so that you're the front person for gathering our input, our concerns.

If we ask questions that are really important to the upcoming vote but that you can't answer—we're not saying you have to have the answers to everything—but you be the person to take them back to look into it. I mean, this may be things we need to resolve before we vote on these things.

You research it or you talk to the right people, and then you get back to the questioner and the whole of the NCSG Policy Committee, the people who are interested. We can help you. We, members of NCSG, can help you with this. If we need research, we're not saying you have to do all of it but that we work together.

So overall, the work is too much for one person. The speed, the pace, and the importance of what we're about to handle in Council is going to speed up far too much for just our wonderful chair. So I'd like to enlist all six incredible councilors to go forward to work with us on this proposal. Each one of you working with us, taking one issue coming up on the Council agenda. So six people. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. I'll yield before I comment.

JULF HELSINGIUS: I just wanted to add that this also ties in with my proposal of having newcomers shadow the councilors on this. So they could pick one of the topics and be a shadow to the person.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Julf. Yeah, so I think it’s a good idea, and I hope councilors are listening. Just one thing, Kathy, which you mentioned about research. We, the policy committee and NCSG and generics, should remember that we now have Daniel who is helping us with research.

KATHY KLEIMAN: In this case, the research is often procedural. It’s, what’s happening in Council? When is it going to be voted on? Is it going to be tabled? Daniel, I don't know if that’s the deep research that you do. Do you do Council research as well, procedural research?

[DANIEL]: [I bet] I could.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. Often this is something that councilors will know. I'm just saying there's research and there's research, and this is about often a policy committee meeting is within a week of the Council meeting. So it could be, are there any options to table things? That's the kind of research. Because by the time it gets up to a Council vote most of the heavy research has been done. But it's a good point as we begin issues. And, Daniel, don't worry. We're going to have a lot of work.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. So I'll open up for councilors to comment. And I see Bruna's hand up already, so Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS: Hey, everyone. Hi, Tomslin. Thank you for handing me the floor. Good to see everybody even though it's just remote this time. But just to comment on the proposal, I like the idea of each of us taking the lead on introducing a certain topic at the PC meetings and so on but I'm just failing to see how can this idea bring in newcomers.

Because I think one thing we need to address is how are we sharing the load in terms of Council work. And I know like [inaudible] people like you, Manju, have been taking the bigger parts of the work and some of us it's slightly less. I am one of the ones who is doing much less than you guys, so I need to acknowledge that. But at the same time, I am just not too sure how either a shadow mentor kind of thing, I honestly don't like the shadow term because I think our newcomers need to step into the light in some of the things.

But my point is, how is this idea actually going to bring in newcomers? Because what we have at the end of the day is meetings like this, like PC meetings with 20 people tops, half of them are councilors. The other half of them is more experienced members of the NCSG. So my comment here is just for us to maybe add a component on how to shine the light or how to bring attention for newcomers in our topics. Because we know that when discussions get to the Council level they tend to be way more complicated to follow, and that's a problem even I am having in following Council. I guess it's just that we need to be a little more proportional or a little more, I don't know, acknowledging of the discrepancies and complications for newcomers to understand what the Council is doing. And a suggestion like this, I'm not understanding why. But I'm open. I'm open to discussing it and helping shape it. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. I'll pass it to Kathy to respond, but….

KATHY KLEIMAN: No, no. Julf, can respond to that.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Oh, Julf to respond. However, I just wanted to say two things. I guess your suggestion about the slides and background might help address the issue of how we help newcomers understand what is going on. Not necessarily skill them. That doesn't help with….

KATHY KLEIMAN: And how we help everyone understand what’s going on.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah, yeah, that too. And, yeah, I'll give it to you to answer the question on participation.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. I'm actually going to answer by not answering. In that I don’t want this discussion to be too much distracted by now talking about newcomers. I just threw that in as a sort of additional component, but let’s focus on what Kathy presented. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. So which…? Because, Bruna, if I understand your question correctly, you wanted to know how this proposal addresses newcomers’ participants. And I think, Kathy, your slide didn't appear to be…your proposal is not attempting to solve that problem. It’s trying to solve a different problem.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Exactly. Exactly. It’s trying to help expand, knowing that a number of issues, it’s going to get very fast and very deep and very thick as we go into new gTLDs, to sharing, bringing everyone in, all our councilors into the policy meeting.

Julf’s idea I think layers on top of that with some newcomers, but this is not a newcomers proposal. This is absolutely for the people who are on Council and for the people already involved in the policy committee which are generally, sorry guys, old-timers. Those of us who are here. And I like the idea of bringing newcomers in but, as Julf said, this is kind of—you're right and as you said—a different proposal.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS: Thanks. No, just to be a little more clear, my point is the proposal that's being discussed now addresses some issues in terms of work distribution for the councilors but they don't necessarily address how are we going to streamline the discussions [so as our] members and so on.

So maybe what we can consider is, what is that bridge? Who's going to bring in the newcomers into this? Can we use the people that are already doing the pilot program on policy? Maybe that's a good suggestion for now. Maybe one or two of them may have interest or would like to work together with the councilors in that. I think it's a good way even for us to form new councilors in the end game, but we need these new people now. And not just that. We need members to come to the PC meetings as well.

Because at the end of the day, what's the point of us discussing redistribution of work and bringing in newcomers and so on if our members are not attending the PC meetings? If it's just the 20 people all the time. So just, yeah, this too. So maybe we can bring the newcomers in that one. So that's all. Thanks, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. So I get the sense that we should start with this proposal as proposed. Run with it. Then we can add additional layers to it. Like we always say, there's room for improvement, right? And maybe we might have to also make it part of if we adopted also encourage when we're going into Council elections for the stakeholder group, make sure councilors who are intending to be councilors, rather, people who intend to be councilors be aware that this will be part of their responsibility. I see Rafik's hand up.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Can you hear me well?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Not very well.

RAFIK DAMMAK: And now? Sorry, so let me speak out. So regarding the idea of reporting, I believe that that's expected from our representative to the GNSO Council. I just don't believe it needs to be a specific format. It's really up to them to find what's best. Something that they can manage in a sustainable way. So should not make it difficult.

On the other hand, there is already a lot of material produced at the Council level, including by the staff. So just it can be reused. And at the end, really if people need to understand the topics, there is a lot of reading to be done. There is no shortcut. You cannot understand complex policy issues in just a one-pager. It just will give you maybe a high-level idea what it is, but you cannot really understand the consequences and the importance of the topic in just some summary.

I'm not saying that to make it difficult for people to join but just to expand that. You can have a quick overview about what is discussed but if you are interested in some topic, you will have really to do a lot of readings to ask a question and so on.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Rafik. Any other comment or question? All right, Benjamin?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Good morning. I was just thinking that we have Dan here now. Dan is a good resource such that some of the things because where this is coming up most that we're finding out is that we find out that there are some conversations that we're missing or things happening that our councilors should have brought to our notice but it's not happening and we're not seeing a participation.

So I'm beginning to think complicated as these conversations are, maybe Dan can help gather some pertinent issues that our councilors should be focusing on or that they are already focusing on but the linkage is between us and the community that a broad audience needs to put effort or support or momentum into.

Instead of waiting for one individual to digest all the documents, understand it, and then do the policy development work at the Council level, and then come and educate the community as well—which I'm thinking maybe might be overwhelming—but since we have someone here who is solely for constant research can help us in bits and bits start dishing it out. And at that point we the community are also empowered to even call our councilors to order like, hey, you should be focusing on this conversation. It's not happening. What is your point? So that we can ask them the right questions that can guide them to also focus on their duties.

That's just what I'm thinking as against us discussing the same points we discuss every meeting of the shadow or how do we get policy, our councilors to participate more actively and all of that. Just, as I said, I was thinking. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks for your thought, Benjamin. And you made a point about Daniel identifying topics. I think it should be the reverse. We have to tell him what is of interest to us, not the other way around. And I think Kathy attempted to address this too earlier.

I think that what Kathy is hoping the councilors do here is become topic leads rather than…I think we've focused on research but I think it's about a leader of each topic so that they not only become the person presenting or giving the background to the community but also the point of contact for that topic as well. And they should work with Daniel, right? They should work with Daniel. But I see Bruna's hand up, and so I'll ask Bruna to speak. Then Steph.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thanks, Tomslin. No, I was just going for the same framing. Like the same framing to be let's talk about it in the level of having the councilors as co-leads for the discussions. Like co-leads assuming that there will be somebody else from the community also helping shape the debate and so on. But also, we need to ask for these people to join the policy committee, otherwise it’s pointless to just have this discussion like just us. And I like the idea of liaising with Daniel as well. Daniel, we didn't meet yet, but that’s really good to know you're helping us in this.

But just one question for Benjamin because he said that there are topics and things councilors did not bring to the NCSG attention. So would you have any examples, Ben, on how did we fail to bring this into the community? Because I think also that GNSO Council sessions are all open for the community, so people can listen in. They could follow. If you think there is something that was not discussed, you can also raise this on the list.

And just to be…the reason why I'm saying this is not because I'm mad or anything. Because I know how much work Tomslin, Manju, a lot of us have been doing in the Council this past month. So I don't want to be unfair with the dedication they have been adding to Council work. And just the way you framed your comment was a little confusing, Ben, that’s all. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. Benjamin, did you want to answer the question?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: [inaudible]

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Well, Bruna did.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: [inaudible]

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right, so Bruna's question was you mentioned there were things that the councilors are not bringing to the community. If you have an example, that was Bruna's question.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Oh, not that I have one in particular, but there are places where…okay, so I was having an informal conversation with someone from the CSG and [he] says we've been asking for your community to participate. And it is a common thing where people say we're overstretched, we are not…I mean, for the past one year I've been an administrator so I have not been participating actively in policy. But [mine] is to galvanize and encourage people to participate, so I listen to such things. And what I was offering is a way we could do the heavy lifting that is not cumbersome for everybody. That was the idea I was aiming at. But at this moment it's obvious that it's cued toward some individuals who are overly burdened with the tasks, and that is all I'm just…not that I particularly went out and noticed all of this. It wouldn't be of any good right now if I start mentioning that. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay, thanks, Benjamin. Stephanie? We can't hear you, Stephanie. All right, we'll probably move on then.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Can you hear me now?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah, we can.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Great. I apologize. I'm on the…the links don't work for me. I'm using the browser and I keep losing the unmute button. Which might be a good thing for you guys. I'll shut up more.

I know I've said this before, but I really must emphasize that while we want to get new members the old members are not here to chew the food for the young members, you know? Not to use a gross analogy. And I know I sound like I'm being incredibly lazy as a councilor rebuffing the concept of championing a topic at every Council meeting, but we're busy. We attend the Council meetings. We follow a lot of traffic on Council. We join small groups. We follow all that traffic. We've got staff churning out documents like there's no tomorrow. We have to read all those documents and comment.

And there's a lot of criticism, usually from people who are not on Council, about how we don't bring things to the lists enough, we don't explain things to members enough. And I'm sympathetic. I wish I had the time. But there seems to be assumptions out there that if you're a councilor, you should be working 40 hours a week or more on this. I've certainly put in lots of weeks over my ten years here at ICANN that are way more than 40 hours.

When we were doing EPDP, in order to refute some of the arguments it took research. It took just one hell of a lot of work, and I've got a really deep background in privacy. So I feel for anybody that has to get up to speed and explain everything to people who, quite frankly, aren't reading the documents, aren't listening to Council meetings, and aren't necessarily showing up at policy committee. And then we want them to join, but they've got to do some work before they get elected positions in order to get up to speed. It's not the job of the people who are in elected positions or on committees to bring everybody along. It's too exhausting. Sorry to be grumpy. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah, Kathy?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Stephanie, do you mind if I respond?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Go for it.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. For somebody like you I think the additional time will be two minutes to put together a few bullet points of what you already know. Because you've been doing this for years. You're an incredible councilor. As you said, you are already reading the traffic on the Council list. You already know what's coming up. You're already preparing for the votes, right? You guys are voting on this. We have six councilors who are voting on these resolutions within a week of the date that we're talking about. The PC meeting is normally about a week before the vote.

For most of you I think this will be very little time because you're already following certain topics. Of course, you'd lead the topic you're already on the small team on. I mean, why not? But that's just it. As you said, you're already following it. You're already in the nuts and bolts and the traffic of the policy issue.

It's virtually impossible for those of us who are on other teams to do this. We're just trying to get the best of your knowledge of what you're already doing so we can jump in on an issue that we happen to have expertise on. I think this is a win-win, Stephanie. It's not a criticism. It's actually a way of saying on the issue you're an expert on you should be presenting it in the policy meeting. Thanks.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Can I respond just for a second?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: You know, I take your point, Kathy. The person on the file is the logical one to discuss it in the policy meeting. And frankly, I think anybody who has measured the amount I talk in policy meetings knows that I don't mind doing that. But to be tasked with a report to give every week is a different piece of homework. So let me give you an example from this morning.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Every month though. Every month.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. The Board was discussing metrics for the SSAD, and I'm on the SSAD small team that has been discussing that effort that's going forward. And so they're going, well, you know, we have to define metrics. Becky said that at the Council meeting with the Board. For me, the metric is, like, what the hell are they talking about? The metric is compliance with law. That's why we're running this system. The metrics for the registrars is how many people are using it and who are they and what for. And Sarah just, Tucows just brought out a good summary of what they have been pumping out and what the distribution of requests is. Now that's fine. But if I wanted to report to you accurately on all of the different issues that were going on in that subgroup—and don't forget there are other things going on. You know, PDPs and IRT.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Stephanie, if I might, you just did it. Brilliant. Round of applause. I mean, that's what we're looking for is not everything going on but what's important to us, and you just summarized it. Thank you. Now if I want to dive deeper into the materials, I can. That's all we're talking about.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. I still think it's [hard].

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. We might need to move on to the next topics now. But just before we move to the next topic, Farzi wants to have two minutes to bring something to our attention.

FARZANEH BADIEI: It's only two minutes. Thank you so much. I attended the DNS abuse outreach by contracted parties yesterday, and I became concerned because when I raised the issue of…because, you know, the contracted parties are doing these bilateral negotiations with ICANN in order to come up with a baseline for DNS abuse. So to facilitate the work of Compliance so that you can get these bad actors, like ICANN can actually enforce the policy if they're not doing anything about DNS abuse. Which in itself I think we should have discussed this. I think we discussed it, but we should really think about it. I think in a way it's concerning.

But anyway, that's not my point. So when I raised this, I saw one of the small team co-chairs on DNS abuse, he got up. He got the mic, and he said that they support, the small team supports, the small team and Council supports the work of these bilateral negotiations. Which really raised alarms in my brain. I did not raise it there, but we have to be very careful with this, like we also raised it in the small team, and especially if they can just go up and say, oh, this agenda we support as a small team of the Council and kind of like legitimize it.

So I just wanted to raise that with you because you have a better understanding of how these small teams work. And I think it's quite concerning and we might have to…and if you see that this should be escalated, we might have to talk to Mark actually.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Farzi. I'll just quickly respond to that before we continue because we're meant to discuss that under the DNS abuse update agenda item. But I'll quickly say I did share the report on the NCSG mailing list before the Council adopted it. And the thing that's in that report is the contracted parties house have aspects in the contract which the small team was asking them, and there were two things really, that reasonable, prompt, and appropriate doesn't mean anything in the contract. So the small team was asking them if they could put…be a bit more specific about what those mean in the contract. And the contracted parties house said, well, because that's a contract matter they have to negotiate that with Org. It's not a policy matter. So the question I asked was will the community then be able to input into that contract? The answer I got was there is no precedent, but we'll see. There has been a response back from the contracted parties house to the Council, however, and they have mentioned that there will be a public comment period of a draft version they come away with ICANN of the contract. So that there will be a public comment period. Now that's what we've received. That's the only information I have for now.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Thank you so much, Tomslin. That's really important to follow, but then also we have to focus on these small teams not to be so formal that the co-chair allows himself to go and talk on behalf of the whole Council. Because then we are creating governance structures inside the Council, and it's concerning.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Good. Thank you. Noted. Thanks. We'll move now back to the agenda.

ANDREA GLANDON: Tomslin, Bruna has her hand up.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Oh, all right. Sorry, Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you. Just about the small teams matter. Would there be maybe grounds or space for us bringing to Council, I don't know, the need to analyze those structures or even bringing a [reinforced] need for more transparency in these arenas? Because I do agree with Farzi. It's a little bit strange that the co-chair or the chair of this small team would go up and just speak on behalf of Council in that sense. But as well, I don't want to point one specific case or maybe one more diplomatic way would be to raise these procedural questions or the need for more enforced transparency on the discussions or anything like that. So just a question. Thanks, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. Personally, I don't see a problem with bringing this concern to the Council, especially the one about…because [I'm a councilor] and I'm not aware that a co-chair was asked to go to [represent] Council, right? So I don't know…that was not distributed on the Council list. So I don't think there's any problem bringing this in the

Council for explanation. We will move on, but I think councilors should consider bringing that up maybe in the AOB section in the Council meeting.

Back to the agenda on Item Number 4 which is an update on closed generics, I'll hand the mic to Manju.

MANJU CHEN: This agenda item was supposed to be a placeholder if we had discussions during our Council working sessions, but we didn't touch on that. We were mainly focused on the [taskforce] of statement of interest, SOI. And we had talked about SOI kind of very elaborately in our NCSG meeting the day before, so there's not really any update on closed generics from my side. But welcome any other comments, feedback, whatever you want to share on this topic. Or else I think we only have 30 minutes left and we still have several agenda items, so I think we can just skip this item. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Manju. No comment from anyone. Then we'll move on to the next agenda item which is the transfer policy review working group. Raoul and Juan, over to you.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Thank you, Tomslin. I would like to do a brief background about this policy review because in the last PC meeting we had to do this report and I think we couldn't be able to do it.

So the first thing that we need to say that the transfer policy report is that a review, it's that this comes from a report from 2020. And it's basically something that is related to registrars. When a domain name is—I forgot the word—to a [trespass] to another registrar…okay, in that report, the final report from 2020, they divided these topics into [many] groups.

One of these groups was about the famous Recommendation 27. And they have one group where they're discussing about a form of authorization, the code of authorization to transfer a domain name from one registrar to another, and change of registrar, and I am missing one, and denying transfer.

Those topics there are discussed, but just a quick note in each one. The form authorization, it has been for protect the registered name holder and prevent any duplicate process.

And the transfer authorization code, that is the name that working group adopt to talk about authorization [info codes]. The TAC, this discusses transfer authorization code, it's being reviewed. But one of the proposals made by the working group is that this code should be generated by registrar of record only with a previous request by a registered name holder their signature representative.

About the deny transfers, the working group recommends that 30 days is an appropriate period to do that.

In the next group of discussions is where the working group is currently. So the group is discussing about the transfer emergency action contact, the TEAC, that I shared with you in the mailing list about the PC.

Because in this case the working group is discussing some questions about the action contact for communications relating to transfer. According to the transfer policy, it should be a phone number or other real time communication and must be generated by a known automatic response by [inaudible] representative. And the response are required within four hours. But in this moment the group is discussing about that four hours is too small a window. So the working group is now discussing that is better wider to 24 hours.

And in other things in this, but this is in process. This is a work in process, and transfer emergency action contact, and that was the survey I gave some answer to the policy mailing list.

And another, this is related with transfer dispute resolution policy, TDRP, that says that this must be filled by registrars, not registries, within 12 months of [invalid] register and transfer. In this case the actual status of the working group is that the working group produce a phase one initial report that it was shared before some months ago. And now it is in phase two. These discussions began in February 2023, and now the discussions are developing preliminary outputs on those two topics.

Another topic of [inaudible] besides the transfer emergency and transfer dispute resolution policy, reversing transfer and ICANN approved transfers.

So the last thing is that the action items for the working group, and maybe we can share these with you later, is that the polling questions are related to in this case transfer emergency contact. And another thing is [extent] from the limitation of time of the [information] review transfer policy from 6 to 12 months. And that is the actual status of this working group. I think that it's all for now. I think it's very complete for now. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Juan. Okay, I don't know. The report that is about I think the final report. I didn't get what the status was for the final report.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Oh, the final report, it was released in January 2021. But the working group is working on initial report that it was framed on August from 2022 last year and the working group is working on initial report that it was submitted by public comments in just a few months and we are reviewing those. That's why the working group is working on the survey from transfer emergency questions to be able to discuss about the [inaudible] of these kind of contact [inaudible] contact with the number, the mail, the windows time, those kind of questions that we had to do a response. Because that mail was sent to Julf, and that is what we are talking about.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. I think Kathy right now.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Juan, thank you. That was…I know you've been attending a lot of meetings, reading a lot of materials, and creating a very detailed summary for us of the recommendation. Thank you so much for doing that. It's policy development. It's interesting and exciting.

Let me ask you, our role as NCSG we're mostly end users. We're registrants. We are affected by transfer if you're my registrar and I want to transfer to Sam as my registrar, I want to make sure that goes through. If I have one name, if I have 100 names, I'd like to make sure that they go to where I want them to be. If I'm changing my registrar, it should go through.

Are you concerned from our point of view, is there anything—this is a very detailed set of recommendations, largely very technical between registrars I think—is there anything concerning you from a registrant point of view, from a noncommercial point of view in what you're reading?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Thank you, Kathy. I can't find those concerns, but I am also always looking for. But of course, as you said, it's very technical between registrars and they are asking about information between from here to there. I think that our main concern here could be data protection things about what information is transferred from one registry to another and how to protect it. But that is not in discussion according to what has been discussed from the working group now.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Absolutely, data protection. The other thing that I can think of as being of interest to us is identity. Making sure that the person who requested the transfer is actually the owner of the domain name. But you're right. A few key things. And then what do they do if they're asking for a lot of information from me to identify that I'm the owner of these 100 domain names. (I don't have 100 domain names.) But that they're very careful with that data that I provide, absolutely. Thank you for watching for those issues as they go forward.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Thank you, Kathy. And I think that we can do the same as you're proposing I hope in each policy development process that we have. So that's important for us to have an update, as you said before. Thank you very much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks again, Juan. I don't know if there are any other comments or questions for Juan before we move to the next item. I don't see any. We'll now move to an update on SubPro, and for that I'll ask Kathy to [inaudible].

KATHY KLEIMAN: Kathy Kleiman with more slides. We have to jump over and back to the beginning. Okay, so now we're going to talk about the Subsequent Procedures Working Group recommendations. Another wonderful new phrase, not so new, but operational design phase, the ODP. And the ODP's report and next steps.

What I'm going to do, this is more a briefing so you know what's going on. My guess is a lot of this will not be debated today but will be to share with our councilors what to watch for. What I'm concerned about out of hundreds and hundreds of recommendations, there are just a few. And Tomslin and Julf asked me to prioritize, so I have tried to do so.

So first, let me tell you what is the Subsequent Procedures Working Group recommendations, what is the operational design phase. Let's just go through basic terms for just a second. So SubPro. You hear it a lot. SubPro was a horrible name for the working group, the policy development working group working on looking at the rules for new gTLDs and looking at the applicant guidebook, how you apply for new gTLDs. We had an enormous applicant guidebook in the first round in 2012, and the question was, did it work? Do we need to change it?

And the Subsequent Procedures Working Group worked on hundreds of issues, has dozens of recommendations. And a small part of those issues, anything involving trademarks, free speech, some privacy issues was taken out. Anything involving what's called rights protection mechanisms was taken out into a different working group. And you heard me report on that many times because I was a co-chair of the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group.

And now everything's—and we reported back to…we had a report and many recommendations. Not nearly as many. We were a much more limited scope than the big Subsequent Procedures Working Group. But now they're all lumped together in something called the SubPro Recommendations or the SubPro Recs. So when you hear SubPro, it's all about new rules for new gTLDs. How to apply for them. What's going to be reviewed, the operational, technical, financial reviews, blah, blah, blah. If you want to talk about it in detail, let's arrange a time.

Okay, so all of these recommendations, so we worked from 2016 to 2020. I think we deserve a special gold medal for that. And our stuff was sent to the new operational design phase. It used to get sent to the implementation review team, but ICANN decided you can't implement things that still aren't understood. And so the operational design phase is ICANN staff really looking at what can we adopt and what can't we adopt, at a fairly high level.

Okay, so let's see if this will advance. And so the operational, this ODP group of ICANN staff have presented two meetings, two discussions associated with this meeting. One was on the Wednesday before we arrived, and I attended that. One was on the Sunday after we arrived. Did anybody attend that? Just want to see if there are any other.

Okay, and so let me tell you. What they're doing is reporting. So this is the beginning of their report. The SubPro operational design phase was launched in January 2022. This is after the GNSO Council accepted and passed on to the Board the recommendations of both of these working groups. And the SubPro team, this means the ICANN team, worked diligently over the course of the year to deliver the ODA to the Board on December 12, 2022. And since then, since December, the Board and ICANN Org have been talking.

And overall—this is one of their charts, not mine. Stole it from their report. Thank you, guys. The SubPro PDP outputs, anticipated Board action in Cancún and dependencies, things that can't be done until other things are done. So the total number of outputs including implementation guidance is 298. The total number of outputs that the Board plans to adopt in Cancún is 94. And there are about 38 that are still pending. I will talk about three.

Okay, so one is—oh, sorry. I have another high-level slide. So again anything in quotes is coming from the ICANN staff's ODP report. It says, "High-level proposals of how the Board, Council, and community might move forward on these recommendations: The Board expects will approve a large majority of recommendations during its meeting on March 16. The policy implementation of these recommendations, led by ICANN Org," will now move to—and here I'm paraphrasing—will now move to the implementation review team. That will start after ICANN76. So, boom, it's going to go into how do we actually write it up and let people know that this is part of the application process.

The Board however does not plan to consider the recommendations currently marked as pending during its meeting on March 16 to allow for further discussion. Therefore, the Council would have the opportunity to make amendments to these recommendations and resubmit them for Board consideration as per the PDP manual.

So councilors, attention, it's coming back to you. And please feel free to reach out to some of us who sweated blood, sweat, and tears on some of these.

So let me tell you about three recommendations that concern me, three issues that are still open. One is applicant support. The Board has questioned and may reject our recommendation of direct—we didn't say direct payments to lawyers and writers. What I believe the recommendation said was applicants who qualify for applicant support will need a lower application fee. The application fee for a new gTLD, anybody know what it was in 2012?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATHY KLEIMAN: It wasn't a quarter of a million, not yet. We're getting there. Sam Lanfranco said it was $185,000. It was $185,000, exactly right. And it is per what, Ken, what you're saying, it's going to go up to about $240,000 according to ICANN staff estimates. That's what it costs to review these things. I mean, ICANN has been asked to just keep it, not to make money off of this, just to pay back what it needs, what its costs are.

$240,000 is a lot for anybody. It's a lot for indigenous peoples, minority groups. So the question is, of course, lowering the fee, right? It's just $240,000 is ridiculous if you're the Navajo Nation. So that's important, but what the SubPro said, and we debated this for a long time, is the SubPro recommendation was for lower applicant support application fees plus assistance in the technical and legal aspects of the new gTLD application.

It's a very expensive process and hard to write these applications. Trust me. I know. And so the idea, so my personal view—and this is my personal view but one I think we may consider taking and so I posit to the councilors—is that I'm not sure the ICANN Board has considered all ways to implement this recommendation. Paying directly someone else's lawyer is possible actually without a conflict of interest. It is possible. It may not be what they want to do. It's clearly not what they want to do, but it's only one option.

ICANN could create a directory, for example, of technical and legal consultants who are willing to work at no cost or low cost to help those who qualify or are likely to qualify for applicant support apply for applicant support and then prepare their application for new gTLDs.

Just having a place where you can send indigenous people instead of saying go find the consultants yourself, if there was a central place to say these are people who have come to ICANN and offered their expert services. ICANN doesn't even have to screen them really except maybe check if the emails work. But this is a place to go to find people. And then we can crowdsource them and give them stars. No, just kidding.

Let me stop on that. Any questions about applicant support?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Manju?

MANJU CHEN: Sorry. Because I remember reading in the 2012 applicant guidebook that there are a list of pro bono lawyers that’s published in the website for the 2012 round, were you suggesting we just do the same? Because I thought you were trying to improve the [inaudible] listing.

KATHY KLEIMAN: First, I didn't know that there was published in the first round. And if I didn't know it, probably a lot of people didn't know it. I mean, that would be…so maybe put it somewhere else. You also need technical consultants. Lawyers only do a piece of it. Technical consultants on the operational, technical, financial, as well as the legal obligations. So maybe we could take all of that, put it someplace that people could access. And maybe…the applicant guidebook is not going to come out until later. Maybe make that material available earlier. But if it’s already there, good. It's not as big of a fight. Thank you. I didn't even realize that.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Benjamin, just a quick one.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: I don't mean to stop your presentation, I think there's a document that the GGP group is working on that the applicant guidebook, the small team working group, they're working on. They didn't make that document public, but I have access to it. If we can have access to that document and start looking, because there's a whole lot of lists of some of the things you have mentioned. And they are creating metrics, guidelines for them.

It would be good for you to look at it and quickly help shape some of these things before it becomes concretized. And they are [not] hoping to change the recommendations, but if the guidelines on some of the things we have recommended and how they will be implemented or how the guidelines they will give to the Board.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Benjamin, who has put together the small group? What level is it at?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: The small group is already working. I think…okay, he knows about it.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Let me respond to that. So this is the GNSO Guidance Process, so that's the GGP on applicant support which Rafik is our representative to.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Right. That's coming up with metrics for how to measure the next round. I'm telling you the Board is due to reject this. To the Board level, and they're going to reject it. That's what's pending. So different pieces are being looked at different ways. So this particular issue is at the Board level. But thank you, Benjamin. I'd be happy to look at whatever is coming through the small group.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: For the sake of time, maybe we'll just continue. I don't know if there's anyone online. Yeah, continue please.

KATHY KLEIMAN: But this is great. This is how we learn what's happening in different places and different spaces. This is classic ICANN. Same issue being discussed, being divided up into different pieces and coming together. Thank you, Tomslin, for giving us the opportunity to talk about this.

Okay, next issue about to be rejected, applications assessed in rounds. The Board has questioned and may possibly reject this recommendation of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. This issue was heavily debated in the subsequent procedures meeting, and we finally decided and recommended to have future rounds. That means that applications aren't going to just drop from the sky whenever you want. So Julf applies for one and Raoul applies for the next one and so on and so on and so on whenever they want.

Because why? Why did we feel so strongly about rounds? Because we're user communities. And I don't want to speak for CSG, but they're a user community too. And I think they were kind of with us on this, although I don't quite remember. So user communities like NCSG, we can't follow every…we need to know when to review the applications, and we need to have certain times to prepare our comments, our objections, and our concerns.

And knowing that there's one reveal day for the year 2024 or 2025 means we'll all focus our energies. We'll all look at it. We'll use ICANN meetings to review the applications together, flag which ones are a concern, for what reasons. Freedom of expression or privacy or due…whatever our issues are, bring them up and work on them.

We can't be on all the time, and neither can the larger world, noncommercial community, and I'm very concerned about this one. We can talk about it, or I can just flag it for you. Because I think it's coming back to Council.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Just a comment about that. It has come. The small team has to look into it. And I will be interested in what you propose in terms of how we handle it.

KATHY KLEIMAN: The first thing would be to stay with the recommendation. But I'd be happy to talk with you. I assume the Board gave you reasons they're concerned about this, which I have not had the ability to see. So…no?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: What the Board gave is what's on that where you picked that snapshot which was on your…yeah.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I'm showing--I don't know if we can--I'm showing a chart. That's all we got is a chart with a few words. That's all you got too. I think we need some more reasons.

Okay, next one. Okay, now this one is near and dear to my heart, so I will try not to talk about it for the next two hours, public interest commitments. And because most of them were not public interests I got them to change the name to registry voluntary commitments. These are known as the shorthand is PICs and RVCs.

PICs and RVCs have always been concerning for us because these are ways for new gTLD registries to commit to things far beyond the ICANN consensus policy. In 2012 to 2015 dozens of new gTLDs committed to PICs with higher levels of trademark protection, including ideas that had been rejected by the ICANN community in the past. Plus many PICs and RVCs—PICs will become RVCs in the future—are very content related. ICANN can't even enforce these.

But what it is, is this is going way, way beyond. Think about some special group that you really, really want to promise extra things to.

That’s what’s going into the PICs. And ICANN's putting it into the contracts. And again, it’s not consensus policy. We never debated it. Or in some cases we did and rejected it. This is just promises that are being thrown into a contract. It never made any sense to me.

And it turns out the subsequent procedures ODP, ICANN staff found problems with it too and told the ICANN Board that they expect that some of the PICs and RVCs will be outside the ICANN bylaws. And so now apparently there is somebody floating a recommendation at the Board level that ICANN modify its bylaws to allow these PICs and RVCs.

This is a much longer discussion. Perhaps, Julf, maybe at a future NCSG meeting, or Tomslin, a particular policy meeting, this is very, very, very concerning and there’s a lot of history on this. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. Actually, I don't think we have time to discuss it in a future NCSG meeting. We have to get on the mailing list and discuss it now. And the reason I say that is because the Council SubPro small team will be moving fast, really fast, breakneck speed. So I'm really happy you gave that because we have to come up with a strategy on how this is addressed. And I know it’s definitely an ODP recommendation, not a policy recommendation. So it becomes as easy as saying please throw it out of the window. It’s not a policy recommendation. But I think we have only—and we’ve probably run out of time already. Have we?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right, so not enough time to…sorry? All right, not enough time to address the IDNs which we were hoping to get an update on. DNS abuse, we briefly spoke about it, so at least that was covered. My apologies to Emmanuel that we couldn't get to the IDNs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can we just stay five more minutes and get him in? [inaudible] not hard. You can get those [inaudible].

[EMMANUEL]: Okay, so maybe I will skip the background part of it and go straight to the point. So, yes, the IDN what is going on. So I think the group is currently working on the phase one report. We have been participating for quite a while now. We hope to publish the report just after this ICANN meeting, so that will be somewhere around April 21. So what can I say?

So the draft text we are currently reviewing because we actually worked over the weekend. The draft text we are actually reviewing still concerns the string similarity. So I think we did quite a good contribution to that work. And I will maybe share the consolidated report with you so that you have an idea of all the recommendations that we have worked on so that you can raise your flags or wait for the public comment that will start just after the publication April 21. So be on alert on that, or I will keep informing you within the group.

So I think, yeah, that's what I can say because I just have two minutes. Okay, they gave me one more. They gave me one more, so that is quite interesting. I want to mention quickly the challenges because the conversation we are having so far I think it's also concerned this work because it's a lot of workload. We have 90 minutes every week, so it's quite a lot of workload. And I was basically like a five-year-old boy starting a Ph.D. in mathematics. Because when I got [inaudible] it was very confusing, but I think now I am up to speed.

But I think it's important that we share the workload because reading, digesting, and participating for 90 minutes every week is quite a lot of work to do for one person. We have two slots within the EPDP, and I think it would be very important that we actually look at the attendance so that we can share the workload and be more involved in this process.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Emmanuel. And thanks for the request for additional help. [inaudible] the community can [inaudible]. Thanks, everyone. This brings us to the end of our meeting. Thanks for the participation and for the good conversation. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]