
ICANN77 | PF – Joint Session: GNSO NCUC/NPOC Policy Discussion
Wednesday, June 14 2023 – 15:30 to 17:00 DCA

ANDREA GLANDON: This session will now begin. Please start the recording. Hello, and welcome to the NCUC/NPOC Policy Discussion 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 submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. Questions and comments will be read 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 at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that 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 into the Zoom sessions using your full name, for example, first name and last name or 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 Caleb for NPOC. Thank you.

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.

CALEB OGUNDELE:

Thank you very much, Andrea, and thank you to staff for supporting us during this meeting. So let's get started. I don't know, Andrea, if you can please put the agenda on the screen.

This is NPOC. Yeah. So just a little bit of housekeeping. Raoul is not currently present at the moment and I have to step in. My name is Caleb, the Membership chair, just a member of the EC. And I'm just quickly stepping on behalf of Raoul. Juan, who is the incoming chair, is currently at the Council for another event, so we needed to split ourselves so we can all at least participate in the meeting.

So welcome, everyone. Thank you for attending and thank you for participating. I'm not the only EC here. I'm aware that Emmanuel, one of our EC members, is also online. And Bolutife and some of the incoming EC members are also online, participating here. So I'm just the only one physically present at the moment. So I welcome you to today's session.

I'm going straight ahead. We have a little bit of some policy updates that we'd like to give. I would like to skip agenda number two because Raoul is expected to give that policy update on TPR, but if he's online or Juan can join us online, he can also do that. But I'll just keep to number three update on IDNs. Oh, Juan is here. Great. I will give him some time to settle down. So we'll skip to number three and allow Emmanuel to give us an update on IDNs. So, Emmanuel, please take it away. Can you unmute yourself, Emmanuel?

ANDREA GLANDON: Emmanuel, it looks like you are unmuted but we are unable to hear you. One moment, Emmanuel. We can hear you in Zoom but not in the room, so give us just a moment, please. Emmanuel, can you talk so that we can see if it's working in the room now? Okay, Emanuel, one moment. We're still not hearing you in the room.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Okay. While we are waiting for Emmanuel, just a quick update. I've just been reliably told now that Raoul is having a little bit of migraine and he's unable to join us physically. So yeah. Emmanuel, can you speak up? How is the technical team running that with you?

ANDREA GLANDON: Emmanuel, can you speak again to see if we can hear you in the room?

CALEB OGUNDELE: So while we're waiting for Emmanuel to sort the issue with the technical team staff, I would want to yield quickly to Juan who will give you policy updates from the side of NPOC. So over to you, take it away.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Thank you, Caleb. This is Juan Manuel Rojas for the record. I'm currently the NPOC Policy chair. I'm going to talk about the Transfer Policy Review. According to the last update that we had, the last meeting in Cancún, there is not too much to update more than we have in the working group. We have draft responses, the questions

that we shared with all of you. And tomorrow, in the working group session, we are summarizing these questions.

First of all, to that session, to summarize, I will try to do this update short because we have a full session tomorrow to do this, but remember that we are in the Transfer Policy Review Team, a working group, we are talking about the effectiveness of a transfer between registrars and registrants the ownership of a domain. So, one of the questions, it was about the TEAC. TEAC is Transfer Emergency Contact. The first question, it was about additional data needed to support that evaluation. And then the group needs more data to take that decision. According to the discussions, the working group members have raised that the four-hour timeframe it's not enough to provide an initial non-automated response to communications via Transfer Emergency Contact. Here we also discuss about what is the better mean to do this about phone, about mail, or that kind of information. So, this Transfer Emergency Action Contract—stands for TEAC—in this part of the question, the working group found that we have complaints about the category of that period between four hours or more time. So, the working group is trying to do survey responses between the meetings to know about the number of times that TEAC channels are used, and to know also about the models of TEAC, what steps are taken before contact, TEAC quality of the responses, the timeframe is satisfactory or not. Another was the circumstances about the use. The number of cases, also it's information that is needing, about what problems are related with this TEAC use, including abuse of the channel. Level of satisfaction of the final result. And the discussions means result that

this is not ... Normally, the TEAC is not responded inside the required timeframe. And this is one of the first questions.

Another question is about the timeframe, the four hours. Here we have some into account about the zone differences because we have some registrars in America or in Europe or Africa or something like that, so that it's relevant to have into account the differences between the time zone differences and between the registrars and the registrant. In this time, the four-hour timeframe—I have the time.

MILTON MUELLER: Is the purpose of this section of the meeting to get a complete report on every working group?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: No, this is not a full report. It is just an update between the last meeting to now. So the discussion is advancing in this process. I've just given a brief summary about the discussions that we had.

MILTON MUELLER: It just didn't seem that brief to me.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Sorry. Yes.

MILTON MUELLER: I was beginning to kind of doze off. I'm sorry.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Okay. So thank you so much for your input, Milton. Thank you so much for your update, Juan. So I think there are a few questions that we have from Kathy here. So, over to you.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Juan, thank you for your work on this. I really appreciate it. So this is transferring a domain name from one registrar to another, right? Transfer Policy. And the four hours seems very important. So let me ask you, since we're going to be the registrants in this, can you tell us—there are two scenarios. One, if we're a registrant and we want to transfer, I want to transfer my domain name from Caleb to Milton's. They're both registrars. The other is Manju wants to steal my domain name—sorry—and she's submitting the paperwork without my authority, and we want someone to stop it. By the way, this happened with one of the most valuable domain names in the world, sex.com. Someone submitted the transfer requests and it was switched. And there was a whole lawsuit over this. So, two scenarios. One is I want to switch registrars between jurisdictions, between countries, between whatever. And the other is I don't. What is this four hours? Could you just walk us through the cycle of where we would be able to intervene as the registrant? This is our .org, it's very valuable to us. What's happening with this? Where are we represented? That's where you're coming in, right? Thanks.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Okay. Thank you. Okay, Kathy. The scenario is like, okay, I am owning a domain name. The first scenario could be I need to change it to another registrar. I am the owner but I need to not have it with Caleb

but Ines. I want that my registry is Ines company, not the Caleb. That's the first changing thing. Another thing, this window of four hours, initially it was four hours, but now—

KATHY KLEIMAN: Four hours for what?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: To get the response.

KATHY KLEIMAN: But I may be asleep. It's between one and four in the morning.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Yeah, that's why that is not enough. Right. Then the discussion that I had—I haven't finished when I was cut by Milton—is we are proposing to a wide enough to 24 hours. That's why is four is not enough.

KATHY KLEIMAN: So 24 hours for what?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: To get response. Because for window time—

KATHY KLEIMAN: I'm still trying to understand. So I've submitted a change request to you that I want to transfer to Caleb. You're looking for confirmation on another channel by voice mail or by e-mail or by snail mail?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: According to us, I know you have 24 hours to respond by any means. So the window is open from 4 to 24. Because we had into account also the difference.

KATHY KLEIMAN: What happens if you don't respond in 24 hours? I'm offline for more than 24 hours sometimes.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: If not response—I don't remember this. There is a little thing that if you are not responsive between—because it's an emergency, right, that you need respond quickly. So, if not, as far as I understand that, after 24 hours can be started the transfer. Yeah. So that's it. It's important that this information that the emergency contact will be updated and the means are correct to do.

KATHY KLEIMAN: So you're saying never ever go on vacation? I'm serious.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: They are considering also kind of automated responses to do this kind of response. So yeah.

CALEB OGUNDELE: So let me just ask. I know I am chairing the session right now but I also have to ask. So you need to also explain if there are time zone changes

that will affect that 24 hours. Take, for example, someone in Australia is having a different 24-hour from someone in the East Coast here.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Yeah. That's why I think it's like—in this case, it's in initial response. It's initial response to our request. So yeah, that's why something we are talking about, "Okay, we have 24 hours." But in some times it's always have into account that the time zone from the domain owner—I don't remember if I am wrong—so that this is just the initial contact, it is not the only way to contact.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Thank you. I believe that's a summary of the TPR Policy update. We are going to move on to the agenda number two—sorry, agenda number three. Emmanuel, I think he can hear us now and the technical issues have been fixed. So Emmanuel is our incoming Policy chair for NPOC. He is going to give us some updates on the IDNs.

ANDREA GLANDON: Emmanuel, you can go ahead.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Emmanuel, can you hear us? If you can hear us, please speak into your microphone or you can send some update via the chat. Okay. If we can't hear you in the next one minute, we'll move to the next agenda item. I'm not on Zoom. I see some charts popping up. Tomslin, are you on Zoom? Who is on Zoom? Okay. So if we can get an update from you right now, I think you can just send your update to the mailing list,

because I see NCUC has lots of agenda item which is greater than us. And I feel that we need to give them so much time to do a lot of justice to it. So on that note, we'd like to—oh, you can hear me now? Great.

EMMANUEL VITUS: Yeah.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Bravo.

EMMANUEL VITUS: I think it's a bit challenging. But that's fine. Thank you very much, Caleb. It is almost 10 PM here. So first of all, I thank you everyone for coming. It's unfortunate that I'm not in D.C. due to conflict in schedule. But I hope we can meet physically during the next meeting.

Now, regarding the IDN EPDP, we have been conducting working session since Sunday to continue deliberation. I mean, during this Washington meeting on the charter questions and topic within the Phase 2 on issues pertaining the second level IDN variant management. So after the Cancún meeting, we published the Phase 1 Initial Report for Public Comments, and I think we have had some conversations in the list. So the Initial Report includes 68 recommendations, so covering issues ranging from gTLD variant definition and management at the top level. So most of the preliminary recommendations aim to operationalize the SubPro PDP outputs to allow for future applications of gTLD variant label through the new gTLD program.

So, last month, on May 17, the EPDP team held a webinar to help the community learn more and understand about the key recommendation and facilitate their participation in the Public Comment. I want to acknowledge here the participation of some of you. That was a very good webinar.

So in addition, the EPDP team met with the IDN subject matter experts from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee in May, last month, to discuss preliminary recommendation that may be of interest and so targeted inputs. So to ensure a consistent solution for the variant TLDs, it has been developed, the EPDP team monitored the activities from the ccNSO and the ccPDP4—excuse me for the acronyms, this is ICANN—on the selection of the IDN ccTLD strings. So the EPDP team and the ccPDP4 periodically hold joint sessions to discuss the preliminary recommendation to compare the similarities and also understand the differences. So it's actually in the Phase 1 report include the EPDP team analysis of the preliminary recommendation. And the four topics covered both the EPDP IDNs and the ccPDP4 about the differences between them.

I'm glad I can see some of the members joining this meeting, I mean, from the staff working on this EPDP. So they may be able to give you more answers regarding those acronyms that I'm mentioning.

So the Board has actually requested that the team should deliver an updated project plan. That was in March before the meeting, just after the Cancún meeting. An updated project plan by the end of this Washington meeting, so that's what the Board actually requested, to identify all the charter questions that will impact the next Applicant

Guidebook, as well as the timeline for the EPDP team delivery of relevant recommendation to the GNSO Council. So while the Public Comment proceeding is ongoing, the EPDP team started discussion of the Phase 2 work. So it focus on issues pertaining the second level IDN variant management and the review of the project plan in accordance with the Board request.

So two weeks ago, during the GNSO Council meeting, the EPDP leadership team presented this analysis. So we have a final discussion on the EPDP team project plan during the special working session on Sunday before the start of this Washington meeting. So the Council will be finalizing the deliverables on the four work items related to the next application round that have been requested by the end of this Washington meeting.

So what will happen next? So the Phase 1 report, Public Comment was closed on June 5. So the team is planning to pause the Phase 2 work and conduct analysis of the public comments that were received on the Initial Report. So as the EPDP team has considered all the public comments, it will conduct a formal consensus call on the proposed Phase 1 final recommendation before inclusion in the Phase 1 Final Report.

So for those who want to get involved, I think you can contact me directly or contact Peter. Peter was the representative before I joined somewhere last year. Or you can contact Tomslin directly and communicate any input that you believe may be useful to the EPDP deliberations. Also note that you can also join the meeting as a participant and take part of the substantive EPDP deliberations. I can

share the calendar with you. Most meetings happen once a week. I can share the calendar with you so that you can also join as an observer. So let's get involved to keep bringing our position to the discussion table. Thank you. I hope to see you during the next meeting. We can continue the conversation also in the mailing list for those who want to have answers to some of the questions or some of the contribution they want to bring to this EPDP conversation. So thank you very much.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Thank you very much, Emmanuel. Andrea, do we have any hand in the queue online? Okay. So I see Tomslin is here physically. Tomslin, take it away.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. Emanuel, I have a couple of questions. But I'll start with the first. So I've heard this week a couple of things that have changed from the last time we met in Cancún with the IDN EPDP. The first being that when we spoke in Cancún, Phase 2, that's the second level, items were not going to impact SubPro. Just keen to know, I've heard what the chair has presented in the Council, but from your perspective and from an NCSG perspective, why do you think those now should impact the SubPro timelines? I'll ask the other question after that.

EMMANUEL VITUS: Okay. So yes, you are very right on that. Thank you for bringing it up. As you said, during the Cancún meeting, yes, it will not impact it. But as I was saying, there was such a meeting that the team actually has with—how to call it? As I was mentioning, they actually had a couple of

meeting with subject expert matters. So they actually had a couple of meetings with them. And even within the EPDP team, there was a lot of concern that people were raising. Also, in addition to that the team also met the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. So I think all those input from all those various teams and within the EPDP team has actually brought to that conclusion. So as I said, there is a lot of conversation going on now that will be published just after this meeting. Those conclusion or recommendation will be published to the Board. So I think when that time comes, they will be more clear, points on why that will impact it and why that decision was actually taken.

I can see also Ariel on the call. Ariel is the staff member in charge of this EPDP. So probably if she can speak. I don't know if she's in the room or just on the Zoom. So maybe Ariel can intervene to give you more background to that. But I know in the document that will be published after this Washington meeting, the detail about that will be in the documents.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Emmanuel. I have the official reasons. I just wanted to get a perspective from NCSG's point of view. And with that, the other question I have is if there are things in the Phase 1 report that you think NCSG should be concerned about? I acknowledge that there are no volunteers yet to submit any comment on that public proceeding. I would just like to know from you being the expert on it if there are any concerns we should be looking at.

EMMANUEL VITUS: I think so far since I joined, looking at almost 60 recommendations, it was the string similarity. But I think considering the string similarity, we give a very strong position regarding the small team work that they did. So I think that was the main concern from NCSG perspective. And that was shared. I was expecting to have subject experts to bring their perspective within the NCSG, but unfortunately, we don't actually get people to bring their comments to the table. So from my point of view, it was the string similarity and I think it was something that we have actually brought our position to the table.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Okay. Is that all, Tomslin? Okay. Thank you very much, everyone. So we need to move with speed. So I'm going to put—okay?

KENNETH HERMAN: Thanks. If I may, I just want to go to—

CALEB OGUNDELE: Just so we're clear, please state your name for the record so we know who's speaking?

KENNETH HERMAN: Ken Herman for the record. Thank you very much. I just want to go back one to your report on the Transfer Policy, if I may. Kathy, just a follow-up, because I've been following this issue a little broadly. The four hours, was that referring to something called an emergency contact for a transfer? My understanding is—I had this feeling so I did quick some research. In the Transfer Policy, there's a four-hour

requirement between registrars for emergency contact if there's a dispute or if there's a problem. That four hours has nothing to do with contacting the registrant. It's between registrars where there is a requirement that within the Transfer Policy, each registry should designate an emergency contact nonhuman that's available to contact and respond within four hours. Now, I don't know if that's under discussion or to change. I couldn't tell myself from the discussions underway. Was that what that was referring to when you were talking about that?

CALEB OGUNDELE: Just to cut in, we have very few minutes left. So please be very brief.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. No, I think that that's the point precisely. The working group is recommending to change from 4 hours to 24.

KENNETH HERMAN: Okay. That might be more of an issue that we want to discuss at some point because, in my view, if there's a dispute, the sooner you get to it, the better between registrars and not have to wait 24 hours. I think some registrars may say, "Well, I might not have people available all the time, etc." Well, in my view, maybe you have to. If something happens to my domain name and I need to get action on it straight away, so I contact the hotline on my registrar, I want them to take action being registrars for receiving one. So that's for us perhaps to discuss at a later time. That's the issue that I think we may have something to say about.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Thank you so much, Ken. We can take the conversations to the mailing list. Thank you. So over to the next agenda item, the AOB. Recently, we got a letter from the Board chair which was sent to both Julf and Raoul, the NPOC chair, and I think it was also sent to the NCUC chair and a couple of other SO/AC chairs as well. That letter that was specifically sent to NCSG, we are trying to make some response to that. It is definitely here and is the pen holder and I'm just the contributing author, but I'd like to just give—since this also has an effect on the input from NPOC as well, I'd like to give Stephanie that opportunity to quickly, in three minutes if it's possible, give us a summary of the updates.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. Just to be clear, in case you're trying to follow all of this discussion about the NomCom rebalancing, there was an open call for public comment with questions. I think it's closed now or maybe there's a few days left.

CALEB OGUNDELE: No. It's closing on the 26th. Yeah, we still have time to respond.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, Judith Hellerstein pulled together a draft, several people, including myself, commented on that. And we sent in that comment, I believe that Tomslin did, right? Then there we discussed it in the GNSO

Council, whether the Council should respond to that, and I think Tomslin is holding the pen on that. Yes?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think I just clarified that the comment to which we submitted from the PC, that was related to the Bylaw changes or amendments from the NomCom Review 2 not regarding the rebalancing at all. So there was no rebalancing in that comment.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Ah, okay. Different yet again.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Correct. So the Council one is not a public comment either. It's the same comment to the letter that was sent to SOs.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. So basically parallel to the thing that we're working on.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Correct.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. I'm sorry. I thought we were talking in that discussion about a comment to the Public Comment. Okay. Thank you.

Okay. So basically, in this discussion of the rebalancing, what I'm calling for is some kind of qualitative review of the output of the NomCom and a discussion. I mean, we do these reviews but we don't

do a substantive qualitative review of why in heaven's name did we set up a NomCom in the first place? What is the purpose? How is it different from the assignment of the other seats? And for those who are not familiar, there are so many Board seats that are allocated to the NomCom. And the rest are elected by the different stakeholder groups. So we are currently in discussions about the Board seat that we share with the commercial side of the house. So it's rather important to us the NomCom selectees for the Board and for the GNSO Council. For the GNSO Council there is a specifically Non-Commercial member. And at the moment, that Non-Commercial member is Paul Mcgrady who hails from the Intellectual Property Constituency. And we have had in the past, well, quite a variety of Non-Commercial sitting in that chair. I think Julf was one at one point. But they're not always representatives of the Non-Commercial Stakeholders. And we have only one seat on the NomCom.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I correct one thing? It's not the Non-Commercial, it's the Non-Contracted House.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, sorry. Yeah. So, basically, I'd like to see sort of a de novo review of what are we looking for from the NomCom. So then we can measure whether we are effectively delivering what the NomCom is supposed to deliver, and then we can discuss rebalancing, right? In the meantime, however, because they're talking about a total rebalancing, in the meantime, in the current construction, the other side of the house, namely the Business Constituency, the IPC, and

the—I always say it wrong—but the Internet Service Providers and Network Providers, they each have a seat. The Business Constituency has two, one for large business and one for small business. We, on the other hand, have only one for NCUC and not one for NPOC. And if you’ve been around at all, you will have heard NPOC and NCSG arguing for another seat for quite some time.

So I would like to remove that from the more qualitative discussion of what we’re doing and keep that. That’s just a question of fundamental fairness. Frankly, we dropped the ball the last time. We also did not kick up enough fuss, I guess, at Council when it was going through. Unfortunately, this was happening during COVID. It wasn’t maybe the best time to be fighting these things.

So that’s probably my three minutes, Caleb, but if anybody has any questions or has any ideas about what should be in that letter, this is a letter, as Caleb said, coming from Tripti. We still have a few days to finish our draft and then send it out for consultation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My understanding is that the person who represented us on the committee that was supposed to rebalance didn’t show up at a crucial point. And that’s the reason we got the results we did. Is that correct?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I don’t think you can directly attribute it to that person. But it certainly didn’t help that there was a no show. If I may just give a little grandmotherly lecture here, we really have to put our shoulders to the wheel and show up. This is just not good enough. You can’t scream

about something for years and then not show up when the issue is being addressed. It's just not good enough. And if you have a reasonable reason for not being there, then tell somebody who will take time out of their busy schedules to show up for you so that we don't drop the ball. Thank you.

CALEB OGUNDELE: So we try to make time, but one minute.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: How about one second? Must be present to win. I just wanted to share that. We've heard about that in all sorts of other competitions. It works for ICANN too.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Okay. Thank you very much. So you must be present to win, not to take home. So that reminds me, I should just put this that some of the Bylaws that are changing is combating some of those seats to voting seats. This is one of the times that I feel that NCSG should be more up front, especially when we are going to respond to some of those comments that we are asking for more seats, because if we do not show up, and then we will be outvoted at the end of the day. Like you said, show up. So I don't want us to be outvoted especially when it comes to critical things that will affect us. So as much as possible, we expect your feedback. So on this note, I would like to—Julf, respectfully, one minute.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Very quickly. This is something we have discussed on the NCSG level and we will start tracking attendance for our representatives and councilors in the future.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Thank you very much. So on that note, I'd like to round up. And thank you very much for being very receptive to me as the standing chair for this meeting. And yeah, I'll see you at the next meeting. Over to you NCUC.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Caleb, can I ask a question? I apologize if you already answered it. You had an election. Could you share the results? And again, I apologize if you already—

CALEB OGUNDELE: Thank you very much. We had an election. So this is a quick update. Our new and incoming chair is none other than the amiable Juan Rojas. We have a vice chair as well, Glenn. The secretary is Bolutife. And our incoming Policy chair was Emmanuel Vitus who just spoke earlier on. Yours truly is still a Membership chair, just in my little corner. We have our Communications chair now in person of Jean Queralt, right? Yeah. So that's the quick update.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Glenn is vice chair.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yeah, he's the vice chair, I just said that. Yeah. So on that note, this meeting for NPOC is officially adjourned. Over to you, NCUC.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you for your time management skills. Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Benjamin Akinmoyeje. This is the NCUC Membership meeting. First of all, thank you for coming. Are there any new members or any first-timer in our midst? Because it will determine how I will take the agenda. Anybody coming for the first time? Okay. If they're not here—oh, you're here. No, I just want to be sure because I want to do a quick presentation of our group. So if there was no new member, I wouldn't have done that.

So, today's agenda. Thank you. I want to welcome everyone, especially those who showed up yesterday. Yesterday was quite significant for us. It's tentatively marking our 20 years anniversary. How many persons showed up at the party? We partied. Yeah, that was nice. And I want to use this opportunity to thank the front runners, those who ensure that those activities happened.

Kathy, thank you so much. You put in a lot of work. And Milton, getting there. Milton did all of the footwork, made sure the slides were ready, conceptualized the entire thing. Thank you, Milton, you are greatly appreciated. And we thank our supporters as well, like Adam, Julf, and then finally PIR. They put some money behind that. So thank you very much.

This community has been very, very instrumental, although we look small, but we're very formidable force. And you saw that yesterday at

those conversations. We're passionate about the things we believe in. I will also just want us to continue to do that. Some of that we'll share today. I thought some of our leaders, our former chairs, will show up today. Bill was supposed to be here. We're just looking for an opportunity to also celebrate these individuals. Individuals have put the work over the years, and the current ones. We want to encourage everyone to continue to participate and continue to put the momentum behind the things they believe in because that has been our driving force. We just want to thank them. So I thank you. It's in the spirit of that ICANN77 has been our marching order, like that's theme of this meeting, trying to celebrate our 20th anniversary and to continue to strengthen what we believe in and to also make sure we become more visible and pursue the ideals that seems to be everyday been eroded so that we strengthen it.

With that said, my name is Benjamin Akinmoyeje. I'm the chair of NCUC. And I have my ECs here. Would you introduce yourself quickly?

INES HFAIEDH: Hi, Benjamin. Hi, everyone. So I am Ines Hfaiedh, the NCUC Africa representative.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you. Our host is Ken. Kindly introduce yourself.

KENNETH HERMAN: Ken Herman, North America representative, regional representative for NCUC.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you. So those are leadership members. I don't think there are too many to go around the room to introduce ourselves, or is too much. Okay. We have a lot to talk about. With that said, we have pretty much talked about our 20th anniversary celebration. But one thing I want to introduce to everyone here is the fact that we are beginning to think that it's important to acknowledge those who are putting the work, who have sacrificed, we're thinking of maybe having a Hall of Fame. I mean, we can't pay people but it's important to acknowledge individuals who have done immensely well in our community. Even we are finding individuals who are fast rising, contributing a lot, there should be a way we can celebrate, even if it's a handshake and acknowledging them in our community. So we're thinking of that. If there's anybody who has a great idea, as funny as it may sound, please let's put heads together and come up with something so that people just don't think this is an all-rewarded work and what is it worth? Okay. So we should learn to celebrate our own. At this point, I don't know if it's important for me to do about why in NCUC, do you think we should do that? We have one new member but I can deal with that personally with him. Okay. Thank you. So that's what our anniversary is about.

At this point, I will quickly go over to Manju. Is Manju in this room? She was supposed to be there and she was supposed to give us a quick policy update. She's not here? Tomslin, would you take—

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I'm not going to take Manju's position. But I have a very quick one. I know I have a topic up there, which is why volunteering for writing public comment is important for NCUC. But this one was not the audience I was hoping to find when I suggested that topic. I was hoping to find a lot more newcomers here and a bigger crowd for NCUC. Basically, I'll still say it anyway.

Public comments do provide us a mechanism for our group to give our opinions after these recommendations are out there, at least to formally put those opinions publicly and documented on the record. So it's important that we do write those comments. Unfortunately, though, for the last couple of months, we're not finding those volunteers to write these comments. It's pretty hard. So I was hoping to encourage NCUC today to please volunteer for these comments, especially because it's an easy start for newcomers to do policy work. So that was what I was hoping to do today. But yeah, the room is scant.

I'll just quickly mention which public comments are currently open that we certainly need volunteers for. Chief of them is the amendments to the base gTLD RA and RAA DNS abuse contract obligations. We had a discussion yesterday. It clearly shows that we have comments. I still don't have any volunteers to draft any. So I'm still hoping for volunteers.

Then there is the PTI IANA governance proposal which they did an average of today. Listening to the comments that came from the community in that session this morning, I think it's something we should also actually look into because they're making some changes

from the transition. In fact, there are concerns from the community that there might be some principles that were in the transition that might be eroded if these changes are made. I'm not saying that there are, but I said there were concerns. So we might need to have a look at that as well.

And of course, there was the IDN EPDP Initial Report, which was just spoken about earlier today. That has only six days left. So if there was a comment to be put in that one, we need a very, very speedy volunteer. That's all I have. I'll probably through Benjamin pass the mic to Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I had a question. Is that okay?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: I wanted to pass it to you. You can't escape that. Okay, Kathy. Ask him your question.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. Thank you, Benjamin. Tomslin, what is the comment that's open now for six more days? And you said something that made me think. I'm trying to follow changes to the Bylaws. I must have missed something.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right. The one that has six days left, it's the Phase 1 Initial Report to the IDNs EPDP. But the one that's related to Bylaws is the PTI IANA amendments.

KATHY KLEIMAN: And they want to change the Bylaws.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah. They're amending the Bylaws to ... The concept they said this morning was alignment and simplicity, to align the operational, especially the financial operational procedures and processes of IANA and PTI to ICANN's. So that's really what it is about.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. For other reasons, it would be very interesting to see how they frame that. So is there any way you can just send a line or two around with a link to this proceeding in the comments? Maybe someone will want to comment to it, but some of us want to read it. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Certainly. Thanks.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN: And another thing. I think Milton and I have a further update on NCUC's 20th anniversary, but we don't have to do it now. I just wanted to let you know.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you. You have all the space to do it. We'll do it soon. Okay. So my question to Milton and probably because Kathy is already doing it, those who used to be very actively involved in the community, what do we need to do to get you to still engage one way or the other in Public Comment? We know the words for newcomers or those who haven't been active, but for those who have been very instrumental to it in the past, what do we need to do? We know you're very visible. How can we still tap into your experience to get these things out?

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So the first thing you have to do is take initiative and get things moving. And then you can sort of ask us maybe to look it over or to help you write a position. But the initiative has to be with you. You can't be with us. We're spoken for, at least I am. I'm teaching a course, running a research center.

I think what we can do for you is like what we did yesterday, where we put together programs that stimulate policy debate within ICANN around issues that we know. Based on historical perspective, we know certain issues are really crucial and we know how things get through that we don't like. We know how games are played with representation. So we know all the things that can go wrong. So if we come screaming into the room and saying, "Pay attention to this,"

then people need to follow up, right? People who are on the ground need to sort of go like, “Okay, how can we do this?”

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: I think we are listening. Thank you for that. We would take those initiatives. Thank you. Julf, then Kathy.

JULF HELSINGIUS: A radical idea. Could we actually think about somehow actually tying travel thoughts to actual policy work?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Okay. That is not it. We’ll look for how to do that. Kathy, do you mind if I—Adam raised his hand. Okay, Adam? Stephanie, I see you too.

ADAM PEAKE: I’m interrupting a bit. But Adam Peake, ICANN staff. So you asked me here to give some updates on Outreach and Engagement but it’s not on the agenda, and I was wondering if while we’re waiting for Manju, her laptop is here, which I’m not reading yet, is if you’d like we could jump to that or just carry on. I’m not entirely sure where we are. I’ve interrupted. So thank you. Let me know what you’d like.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Once Kathy finishes on this point, I’ll come to you. Thank you, Adam, for calling that my attention. I apologize.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Just a quick note. Manju seems to be nearby so she'll be coming in. So in order to help us participate, I wanted to share. And some of the people I really wanted to talk to are not in the room. So if you want to bring us in on an issue, make it easy for us to know more, especially with the GNSO Council issues. Again, the people I want to talk to most are not in the room, and it's not Manju either. But give us the links, give us the summary. What's the question? What are you guys thinking? It'll help us focus. We can't come up to speed on everything. But if there's a certain issue that's bothering you—and if it's bothering you, it's probably bothering you for a good reason. Neither do we have time to go looking for all the links and see where things are. You're on the Council list thing. So just send us as much information as possible, as much of your thinking as possible and make it a lot easier for us. We're pretty good at diving into crazy things. And I include Stephanie in this mix, too, I'm bringing into, and Milton. Just give us handles, give us clues. Thanks.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE:

Thank you, Kathy. So I'm talking to our councilors now. I just want to give feedback to our councilors. Please make it easy for us. Give us the link, give us a quick summaries, so that we can follow up with those issues. Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

It's a really good idea to watch the Council meeting, then you'll know what's going on, and you'll see all the links there. For new members that are not otherwise active, by all means, that's the way to learn. It's certainly what I did when I started. I just like to point out that in

addition to the public comments that Tomslin mentioned, we are really strapped for people to sit on PDPs. They don't have to be councilors in all cases. The trend is for these small groups. Sometimes the small groups can be only councilors, in which case, we've got double duty. Other times they can be other folks. Sometimes we can have an alternate that is not a councilor, but we are getting killed. And the idea that councilors have to do all the work and nobody else need join in is a fundamentally false one.

I'd also like to just point out that—I'd like to volunteer first. On a very positive note, I always used to be available as an English editor for anybody that would like an English editor in their comment. That offer is ongoing. It doesn't take me long to go over a draft and fix the language. It's a different matter if you're asking me to get into the entrails of the Abuse Committee. That's another matter. It would take homework.

Now, the other thing I just wanted to say is oh my God, this is the smallest NCUC meeting I've ever seen. And it's a joint one with NPOC. Where is everybody? What happened? We do have people here but we don't even see any interested ... Are there Fellows here? Usually, we have a crop of Fellows watching us. One. Thank you. Yay. Clearly, you've got jobs already. But we should do a little post mortem on this, folks, and figure out what's happening because this is not so good. I don't know what's happened to Outreach. But if we can't find people to come to our meeting in Washington, we're in rough shape. Thanks.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you, Stephanie. The challenge we keep having, and I don't know why this is happening to us, maybe we just need more vocal individuals around us to talk to the people scheduling the ICANN meetings. The schedules are really against other big meetings. People are in other conflicting sessions that they have to be in and they come to our meetings. And we've been trying to deal with this for a while and it seems like we just have to live with it. That's a big issue for us. Okay, go ahead.

NOJUS SAAD: Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. This is Nojus Saad, an ICANN77 Fellow, for the record. I have a recommendation for the NCUC on broader community engagement. But before I get to that, I just have one important acknowledgement that I want to make. Before coming to ICANN77 here in D.C., which is my first in-person ICANN meeting, I was 80% sure that NCUC is my place within the ICANN community. Because the whole mission of the NCUC, the inspiring commitment that it has to bring human rights voices into a supposedly technical community is something so incredible that I would never see in any other constituency. Thank you. And also having the actual voice on the decision-making table, having a voting power on the Board, this is something so unique and so inspiring that makes this constituency very special. After I came here and after I got to meet all of you, the incredible people that are leaders of the NCUC, I actually became 180% sure that this is my home within ICANN. The biggest reason to that is that I'm overwhelmingly touched by all the beautiful spirit that you guys have. The welcoming attitude towards me was so incredibly overwhelming. You've treated me—although I don't know anything

about the technical details, the complex things that you guys talk about, but the welcoming arms, it's such an incredible thing. I think a lot of other people would absolutely love to volunteer and be a part of this community.

One recommendation that I have, and I think that's the biggest issue, it's the barrier for newcomers to join this constituency, and that is we need to have stronger teams or volunteers that actually lead our digital engagement efforts. Here's the thing, let me give you an example. Before one year—I think it's more than a year, I actually applied to be a member of the NCUC, but I have not received anything about that. And that's not even the problem. I actually reached out via e-mail to the NCUC and I actually ccd all of the e-mails that were in the website and then inquired about this membership. I even shared my biography and everything, no reply. Then after another month, I send a follow-up e-mail to inquire about my membership, and then again, no reply. That's one side of the problem.

The other side is yesterday's session that we had on the NCUC and some other NCUC sessions, they are not actually published on the official ICANN meeting page, which is something that most of the ICANN participants and the newcomers, this is our main resource in ICANN. But if we don't see any NCUC sessions on there, I had no idea that there's an NCUC session actually going on on that day. That's the second thing.

The third thing, I mean, our mission is about noncommercial users, right? This mainly includes end users. We need to have end users involved and engaged actively in our mission of having their voices

heard in the ICANN's multistakeholder model. To make sure that we get there, we need to have inclusive language, language that is easy to understand and very simplistic on the social media platforms to engage the public more actively and more appropriately in our mission. We need a stronger social media team, we need a stronger digital team that conveys and shares our beautiful spirit that we have seen and experienced here and the digital world as well. Thank you so much.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you very much. I take half of that responsibility. I promise you, we're going to act on those. We're taking everything, that will be recorded as well. Thank you.

At this point, we're short on time. Adam, you'll quickly go maybe two minutes or three minutes, and then we'll run to Manju, and then Kathy and Milton. We should try and manage the remaining 20 minutes we have, please. Thank you.

ADAM PEAKE: Thank you. Adam Peake, ICANN staff. Following up on our meeting in Cancún where we introduced the Global Stakeholder Engagement regional VPs and the staff trying to build a relationship at the regional level between the engagement staff and NCUC, NPOC, and NCSG. So we have continued. I know that Ken has been setting up some meetings with Joe. I know Olga very well in Europe at the moment, we'll be working together next week in EuroDIG. Jia-Rong has been talking to Millie on and off about different things. Ben, I think you've

been talking to Yaovi and others. And Rodrigo, I think we're looking for some support in LAC region.

But the main thing I want to say is what we need from you is what do you want to do in your outreach and engagement, whether it's NCSG, NPOC, or NCUC? That can be bullet points, plans, things you want to do one way or another. But something that is pressing is the CROP program where you have allocated travel. It would be very nice to align those with the regional goals that we have because the regional VP signs off on those. But unless you submit your strategic plan for CROP, you can't start using it. And do note that there's an eight-week advance planning time for that. It begins in July, which means instead of a 12-month calendar, you're now down to a 10-month calendar because you need eight weeks to get your thing authorized. If you don't get it into August, you're down to nine months, etc., etc. Please get those strategic plans in. We'd love to discuss them with you. Happy to do that. Try to align them with our goals. That will help us plan our meetings and get the events better organized. But please get them in because eight weeks planning time to get you on the ground at a meeting means that we're now in a 12-month program down to 10 months essentially. Request to the chairs is get them in and we'll work together. Thank you.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you, Adam.

MILTON MUELLER: Adam, one thing that would be good, I'd like to sound you out about this, is when we did our event on Tuesday, it was nice. You gave us a room. However, I don't see why it's difficult for there to be more bottom-up self-programming at ICANN meetings so that if we decide we want to have an issue session about something, it could get on to the ICANN schedule, for example. I'm sure you'd have to set deadlines for things, but the idea that the program is completely top-down and not developed bottom-up. In some cases, within certain constraints of room availability and all that, I think it would be good if you could just say, "Okay. You get to sign up room and you do whatever you want with it. We'll put it in the program so people can find it."

ANDREA GLANDON: Hi, this is Andrea from ICANN staff. Regarding that event yesterday, there were no firm plans that I could reserve a spot that would show up on the schedule before the deadline. We were able to get you a room in a three-hour time slot. But because we did not have those firm plans in time, that is the reason that it did not show up on the official schedule. Thank you.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, that's good to know. I thought that it was just a matter of policy that you didn't do that.

ANDREA GLANDON: No, of course not. If it would have been on time, it would have been on the schedule.

MILTON MUELLER: There's a time limit?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: We'll plan better next time then. Let's not push this anymore. Since we know that now, then we have the flexibility.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We knew this last time as well. We need to get this checked. We need to be in constant contact with Andrea about the deadlines, not to miss them. Because this time, I even paid attention to do this quicker, and we still didn't get it. I don't know how to sort this out.

ADAM PEAKE: The way to sort it out is—can I just carry on as a staff?

KATHY KLEIMAN: First, I want a round of applause for Andrea who supports us and helps us and schedule stuff. So let's do that. Andrea, approximately, what's the deadline? Approximately. How many weeks are we talking about ahead that you need? I know it changes every meeting but—

ANDREA GLANDON: I honestly cannot give you that number. I want to say it was in April.

KATHY KLEIMAN: That's two months.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes. That it ended. But of course, it'll just depend on each meeting. But yes, I'll splash it everywhere that I can and I have no problem with that. But I wanted to let you know that was the reason. There was nothing else behind it.

KATHY KLEIMAN: And if you could send it not just to our leaders but to the whole group, that way, you'll catch people like us in the—

ANDREA GLANDON: Sure.

KATHY KLEIMAN: And to Adam, Adam, you want NPOC and NCUC leads to come up with CROP plans. Could you send us three templates? Give us three successful CROP plans of other groups so that we have templates and we can copy them and give them back to you?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I think we should just book a room for Hamburg right now. Because rather than screw around the deadlines—and we'll fill it somehow. We'll brainstorm. Because two months ahead—I feel for you guys and staff, I really do. It's brutal.

ANDREA GLANDON: Stephanie, just to add to that, booking a room is fine but we also do need to know the topic.

STEPHANIE PERRON: We can come up with one those. No problem.

KATHY KLEIMAN: NCUC's 20th anniversary Part 2.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Or Burnout Part 453. I just was going to propose that—really, I can understand why we couldn't get more young people interested to come to Washington to a free event. I know it's summer. Farzi is looking askance here, for those who are not watching the camera here. But I mean, surely to goodness, if we had a more active social media thing as indicated, that's a job that someone who is not immersed in policy could do for us. Happy to feed, have no clue how to do. We do have an NCUC blog of some kind and the website is a wee bit out of date, quite a bit out of date. We could sure use some help in that regard. Don't ask councilors to do that. We're drowning, okay? Thank you.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thanks, Stephanie. All taken.

ADAM PEAKE: Just to wrap up on that. I mean, the program is developed by SO/AC development team with staff. So you are part of that. I don't know your access point to that. It will be through the GNSO. So program planning is not top-down. Just to be clear, it's a community activity.

For Hamburg, let's talk. The point of having Olga as your representative is to work with me to make sure you get your plans and for us to tell you as the European Engagement Team what we're planning so that you can either slot into that because it's not just about you in your meeting, we want you in other meetings.

On CROP, the program has been going on a long time. There's community wiki pages with all the records on there and previous NCSG things and what have you. We'll just make sure that it's passed around again so that you can see the links. They change slightly over time. But what's been done, we should be there, including the request process, the evaluation and acceptance, and then a report that's written by the person who attends an event. It should all be there. It'll all be on the community wiki which means it takes an extremely long time to resolve. But apart from that, it's there. And we'll make sure that that's sent around so that we don't have to worry about it.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE:

I promise to share with you what we did last time. We had some successes too. We had an event in [inaudible]. Though it wasn't ours, we just tagged into it. Some LAC representatives were there. And they discussed NCUC-centric issues there, just the concluded [inaudible]. And it was part of CROP.

So what we need to do now with CROP is to ensure that different regions—maybe we can do something with CROP in North America, do something with CROP in Europe, do something with CROP in Africa. That's where we might need to come together to create different programs that we can submit to CROP and have it approved.

KATHY KLEIMAN: It sounds like you're confident in how to do it. Great.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Working with you and every other person in different regions will help. Thank you.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Thank you, Benjamin. Just to add that, as NCSG, what we had to do is just mapping what events we can do and apply for them through CROP. It could be to be there in representation of the constituency. That's it. Just mapping. While events, we can make presence to do that. That's it.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Okay. At this point, Manju. I know time has passed quickly. Then we give it to Milton and Kathy.

MANJU CHEN: First of all, I just really wish you called me in when you really needed me because I was having a very important conversation. You want me to do a policy update on Council? SOI, I just did it in the ... For the SOI, I just found out yesterday that the Contracted Party House haven't really been updated on what we've been discussing. They only saw the newest draft yesterday. The reactions, as I was saying, I was having a very important conversation outside, was to know what their reactions are. And then I was called inside to wait for another 20

minutes to do nothing. The SOI now, we are proposing to still can have exemptions where you be—well, I don't want to disclose who I am representing. But I have to list out the legal rationales and then I'll have to generally describe the company I'm presenting, for example, a huge company with 5,000 employees in the [inaudible] industry. Then you won't be allowed to participate in the consensus call when it comes to consensus call.

That was the proposal we had. We were supposed to be socializing this idea with our stakeholder groups and come back tomorrow to share how our stakeholder groups thinks. And I have received some positive feedback from other constituencies. While from our stakeholder groups, there hasn't been a lot of opinions on this. We're going to discuss this tomorrow, the last session. I don't know how the discussion is going to be like, because I've heard strong objections already from Contracted Party House. But honestly, I think we all got bigger fish to fry. I don't think we should be hanging up on this. We'll see what happens tomorrow. Thank you.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you, Manju. We can push this conversation further.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Can we please get on the record, Manju, that—first, thank you for coming in. You were called and then you were next on the agenda. We didn't realize the last conversation would take as long as it was. We were before and after. So thank you for being here. You have heard some very strong objections at least from one person, namely me, that

in the policy world, as I know it in the Washington, D.C. world, and it was in our comments as well, you disclose who you represent. Law firms don't come in to make policy changes for themselves unless it's in front of the American Bar Association. If they come in front of the policy-making body, they tell you who they're representing. I know it's a little different with other—but that's how it's done. If you're a lobbyist and you disclose, there's a law. And many states have the same law. You do not go in front of regulatory agencies and not say who you're representing unless for very, very narrow exceptions. I've now gone out to many, many even more senior policy attorneys. I've only been doing it for a few decades. Anyway, I'll pass it over to Stephanie to talk about another country. But it's standard to talk about this.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Okay. I don't want to be rude here. I want to hear Milton and Kathy talk about the 20th anniversary, but we only have five minutes left. So if you want to take that conversation, we should continue with this conversation, it's up to us.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: With all due respect, Benjamin, this is a really important issue. I thought we had a compromise sorted on the voting. Are we not okay with that? Can we live with it? I can live with it. As you say, I think we might have a bigger fish to fry and I don't think the other side's going to give in. I take your point, Kathy, I'm not arguing on the validity of it. But how far can we get? I mean, let's face it, this place has operated on

a “don’t tell” basis since its inception. So we’re moving the yardsticks on this CCOICI thing. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: So just briefly, I’ll just response. Yes. I mean, I can live with it. But Kathy just demonstrated how people cannot live with it and there are a lot of people, apparently, on the Contracted Party House side who had the same belief, so I’m not sure. Also, again, I just found out yesterday that they didn’t even know about the newest proposal until yesterday, which while I’m playing their representative on the CCOICI but there’s nothing I can do with that. I circulated the documents to them, the stakeholder groups. There are people who are like, “Well, I think it’s okay.” But of course, there are a lot of people who are like, “Well, no. Still no.” That’s what’s happening now.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Go ahead, please.

ADAM PEAKE: Can I just ask who the representatives are on this group?

MANJU CHEN: So it’s not our group. It’s the Contracted Party House. It’s a Council committee. So it’s councilors from the Registry Stakeholder Group. Well, it’s all open records so I’m not naming names. From Registry Stakeholder Group, it’s Sebastien. And Registrar is Antonia.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, in fact, the issue forum that we did yesterday was our version of the beginning of a 20th anniversary celebration. It was what NCUC really should be celebrating is that it represents positions in the ICANN regime that are important or correct, and nobody else in this regime is going to stand up for it. Kathy and I think that that event really had an impact. I'll let her elaborate on that. And it's a very important issue, this question of PICs and the contracting and whether ICANN enforces the contracts and so on. We're thinking of doing a follow-up that would be on Zoom so that more people could participate, we could do a better job of publicizing it. I'll let Kathy take over from here.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Sure. It was like the good old days, guys, of really having focus on an issue that's in front of ICANN that needs our input badly. Kudos to Milton and Farzi, we had two amazing panels. One was challenges to the multistakeholder model through this introduction of private-public interest commitments and registry voluntary commitments, and then access to DNS sanctions and trade barriers. Two awesome panels that everyone now wishes were taped that people could hear. So we want to do it again. And maybe in two parts.

One is if you don't know what a PIC is and RVC is, let's do an intercession. Because we heard that we had lost some people that were looking around. So let's do an intercession. Not mix up the policy. We will do a special intersection. I volunteer to do that. We'll do

it on Zoom because we need to get to this before Hamburg. This is timely now.

And then let's try to do a redux. Milton was an amazing moderator and I was a panelist. Whether ICANN should change a fundamental Bylaw and expand ICANN's mission into content, this is part of the discussion. Whether we should completely bypass the multistakeholder model and allow registries on any topic whatsoever, including topics we have actively worked on for many years in the ICANN community, let them bypass it and write their own commitments that ICANN will not only accept but enforce. Let's talk about this. Let's think about this. This is fun. Thanks.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you, Kathy. Thank you, everyone.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Do you want another session on this?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Let's see a reflection. Who wants more session on this? We have more than 50%.

MILTON MUELLER: And the other 50% are staring at their computers and didn't hear you.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you, everyone, for showing up. And thank you for an amazing time. A round of applause for all of us. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]