
ICANN78 | AGM – GNSO - NCSG Membership session
Tuesday, October 24, 2023 – 2:00 to 4:00 HAM

ANDREA GLANDON:

Hello and welcome to the NCSG membership session. Please note that this session is being recorded and 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 format and I will note that in the chat shortly. 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. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a 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 Julf Helsingius. You may begin.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Andrea. This is Julf Helsingius speaking for the recording. I'm a NCSG chair and I welcome you all to this membership meeting. Thanks for coming. We have lots of more people on their way, it seems.

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.

Being on time is not always our strength. So Andrea, do you think you can get my presentation up?

Thanks. So I will start with a little bit of administrative update and then we have a number of people who are presenting on different subjects. If Tomslin doesn't get here by the time I'm done with my updates, I think we'll ask Bruna to talk about IGF. But we'll see.

So I would just like to give a very quick update on what I've been rather busy with and what our leadership team has been busy with for the last six months, which, as you well know, the GNSO has these two houses, contracted Party and Non-Contracted Party House. And in our house, we split the house between us and the Commercial Stakeholder Group. And jointly we appoint a board member for board seat 14 and we appoint a vice chair for the council. But the rules really are based on the fact that we reach a consensus and both sides have to agree, which isn't always easy. And we had really hoped that we could keep our incumbent seat holder, Matthew, in place because we have been quite pleased with the work he's been doing. But when it turned out that that was not possible because the other side found him unacceptable, we then started to look for different candidates that could possibly be suitable and which both sides could agree on and who would still be really good candidates for the board. And after a long process with lots of meetings and lots of negotiation, we did in the end find a compromise candidate that we think is a good board member and both sides could actually agree to Chris Buckridge, who has a background in RIPE. And we did actually manage to get our own person, Tomslin, in as a vice chair for the council. But it was not easy, is all I can say. It is just

ICANN processes are ICANN processes, especially when you have to find consensus. Hard work.

So that's pretty much my update on the administrative side. I'm happy to take questions on those issues if there's any. But if not, Bruna, do you want to talk about IGF?

BRUNA SANTOS:

No, just to see how much do we have for the IGF chat or how long should we go about this? Have fun. Okay. No, just to tell folks that we just had the 18th edition of the Internet Governance Forum happening in Kyoto the last week from the 8th of October until the 12th. And it was, first of all, an interesting one. It was a record in terms of attendance for the IGF. We had over 6,000 people on site and 8,000 people registered for the event. So definitely an all-time success for the Internet Governance Forum. And it's a moment that we're watching kind of the agenda around Internet governance, multi-stakeholderism, and many discussions kind of shifting, right? So there was a lot of focus on the Global Digital Compact, the renewal of the mandate, WSIS+20, and many of the processes that are set to take place next year. And other than that, the agenda had also topics like Internet fragmentation, artificial intelligence, human rights, and many other discussions that were set out from the beginning of the year.

I think for the ICANN space, a lot that's been kind of echoed about this is on the renewal of the IGF mandate. The current mandate goes until 2025, so two more editions. And after that, within the WSIS process, we will assess whether or not the IGF deserves to continue, whether it's working or not, what's the purpose of the meeting, and so on. And the

reason why also this is in ICANN's agenda is this tendency from member states, UN member states, to revisit the value of multi-stakeholderism and even kind of push for a rekindling or some new relationship between the UN and member states. There is a huge focus right now on multilateralism or the way the UN works, and that means basically this model or the IGF multi-stakeholder model might be under risk, and there might be questions and issues about why civil society is at the table, why governments, they do have questions about this. So it is a relevant talk this week, and I guess in terms of the IGF update, I would maybe stop there, but we can have an open discussion about it. I should flag that next year's edition is going to be in Saudi Arabia, and as for 2025, we don't have a decision yet, but there have been rumors about Norway applying to be the host, so there should be hopefully a decision on that, but we won't hear about 2025 until mid-end of next week. And it's pretty much that. I would just maybe just wrap up saying that it's really relevant for us as civil society stakeholders within ICANN or within the technical community to position ourselves as for the relevance of the things we do here, the multi-stakeholder model we have at ICANN and at IGF as well, just because it allows everybody to come to the same space and table and discuss the same things and bring in extra expertise into the conversation. So it goes into a more practical space for policy discussions and so on. So that's one of the things that are going right now. I see some comments on the chat from Farzaneh, but I don't know. I'll hand the floor back to you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Bruna. That's a really useful update. In the same breath as you're going, can you also give us a little bit of update on what's going on with the NetMundial thing?

BRUNA SANTOS: Well, NetMundial is a different conversation, right? You guys might remember it was a process that Brazil and Brazilian government and some other stakeholders led back in 2014. It was a multi-stakeholder process as well that came up with the declaration. And there is an ongoing conversation about convening a second edition of NetMundial or NetMundial+10. We don't know yet about scope or when it's supposed to happen, but what I assume is that both Brazilian government and the Internet Steering Committee for Brazil, they are discussing this with possible partners and stakeholders both here and in IGF last week in order to see whether there's support for that, what would be the scope, why would such a meeting be relevant again. So I assume you guys might have met them or might have heard them talking about this around both ICANN and IGF last week. But so far it's just a compromise of discussing and seeing what's the value of convening a second NetMundial. And what I know is that the scope should be a little more limited. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Bruna. We still don't have Tomslin here. So yeah, go ahead. Hello, everybody.

FARZANEH BADI:

So I think that for NCSG, it is very important to follow the issue of content moderation at the infrastructure level. Unfortunately, these calls for combating disinformation and very hasty decisions that governments are taking in order to bring online safety to the internet will have an impact on content on internet infrastructure. And if we are not careful, it will have an impact on censorship at the infrastructure level. So we have been very careful at ICANN not to turn it into a content moderation organization. And that I don't see as I think that we need to monitor the issue. It is not dangerous yet. But with all these calls for like, you know, voluntary public interest for registries and asking ICANN to enforce these public interests, that actually is about—Some of them are about contents. We are going to face a lot of issues.

Now, I'm not saying that content moderation should not happen at all at infrastructure level or nothing that radical like that. I have my own personal views about this. But what we should do is to monitor the issues so that it does not happen at ICANN. And it does not happen that like we face a problem like we faced with the DNS abuse issue that the contracted parties were pressured by the government and a host of other stakeholders. And then they decided to go and do a contract amendment through bilateral negotiations with ICANN. And I think that we have to be very clear. And unfortunately, the trust and safety community is clueless about infrastructure and how infrastructure works and how its decisions affect infrastructure, what we are actually here to help coordinate. And we need to go around and we need to talk to the trust and safety communities, talk to these people who are advocating for combating disinformation at the expense of destroying the Internet. And I'm warning you now and I am

worried. Thank you. And we need to like the relation to this and IGF was that these discussions happen at IGF. So we need to be present. We need to talk about these things with not only at the IGF, but in similar venues. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Farzaneh. That's a really good point. And so, yes, we definitely need to be awake on that one. Thank you. Next, I have Rafik with his hand up and then Bruna.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Julf. So this is Rafik speaking. I will make a few points here. I think first, I support mainly what Farzaneh said. Content moderation is kind of recurring topic targeting several space and including ICANN. It's coming or it's already here. So of course, we need to pay attention and learn about what's going on in other space because there is some relation.

The other point I want to maybe share or ask for clarification is that usually at IGF there is an ICANN presence. And when I say here ICANN presence, mostly from the board and ICANN org. Of course, there are some from the community, but mostly they come with their own funding or on different capacity. Why I'm saying this is because usually there is an open forum. This kind of ICANN presenting or trying maybe to outreach at IGF to other parts of the IG community that are not necessarily involved. On the other hand, I think there was a workshop about DNS and privacy. Hopefully Farzaneh can elaborate more there as maybe she attended.

The last point I want maybe to share, and this is general about IGF. Unfortunately, IGF in terms of topics and themes is falling in the trap of going with the hype. Of course, we need to monitor trends or what's coming as new, but you need to weigh that against the hype. And this I mean about how much the AI topic and the generative AI took so much space. Personally, I don't think it really belongs to the IG space. It's kind of a mission or scope creep that we have all the time. It's not only proper to the internet governance space, but we need to be aware because that can be a diversion. And honestly, I don't think that many have that expertise in AI governance or understanding how it works. Of course, people can learn, can develop expertise, but probably I believe IGF at that time is not the space and there is a risk about hype and how also people can link that to issue like disinformation and so on. Anyway, that's just a personal opinion I wanted to share.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Rafik. Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS: Thanks. No, just very briefly on the agenda. It was the agenda for the IGF or even the overarching topics are a discussion between the MAG and the host country. And from the very beginning, it was clear that AI was one of the topics Japan wanted to bring to the conversation. It's part of their G20 agenda and a lot of like digitalization discussions. So that was one of the reasons, but I take the same comment as yours, Rafik. I shared this concern about AI overtaking the agenda and so on.

What I meant to say about IGF and ICANN's presence as well is that it was clear for us in the meeting with the board earlier today, right, that both the board and the CEO have set up the IGF as a priority for next year. And this should be, it might should be a priority for us as well, like going there, advocating for what we do at ICANN, talking, going back to the days where we went and did proper outreach there, right, and talking about NCSG and so on might be a good idea. And just like we did in previous years as well, like apply to try to have a workshop too or even a town hall or anything like that and spread the word of the non-commercials at ICANN and so on. So just bringing in some discussions. I know next year is a rough year in terms of the location. Not a lot of us will get to come, but I assume we can do, try to do something remotely or even related to the IGF just to gather some more awareness to the topic and to us here. So that's all.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you and thanks for bringing up the issue of the location, which really could be a problem for many of us, but remote participation will be, I assume, so as long as connectivity works. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. I want to move on. And Tomslin, now that you're in the room, do you think you can actually give us an update on the SubPro.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

I think so. How many minutes do I have? Okay. I could give a quick update. And basically, I hope everyone knows what SubPro is by now. And the recommendations that were in the SubPro final report were sent to the board. The board has adopted some of those recommendations, has non-adopted others, and that's speak in the

board to mean that they're yet to decide whether to -- they're still discussing some recommendations. But others, they've actually sent back to the council that they will not adopt them. And for the council to decide what to do with those, either to accept that non-adoption or for the council to provide a supplemental recommendation for those. And if the council provides such, then the board will look at them again and decide whether to adopt them or not.

Some of those recommendations that are queued in the council from the board with rationale why it wasn't adopted, registry voluntary commitments, and public interest commitments. Another is applicant support, especially recommendation 17.2 only. Then there is recommendation 18.1 that's related to terms and conditions of the support, the application program -- sorry, the next round program. And then there is recommendation 22.7, which is related to registrant protections as well. And then there's also one on string similarity evaluation.

So all of these, the council is meant to discuss and decide what to do with them. The council had put together a small team to look at these because the council said we all cannot sit in a room and look at these at the same time. So we put a small team together of councilors to review. At first it was to triage these and see what to be done with them. Now that the board has non-adopted these specifically, this small team has been asked by the council, the larger council, to propose what to do with them, whether to just accept the non-adoption and just leave it go or provide supplementary recommendation back to the board for board's consideration. Mind you, what the small team proposes or develops has to go back to the council for voting. And I think if I get my

procedures right, it's expected to have a super majority vote on supplemental recommendations before the board will reconsider or also consider them again.

So this small team has considered that for some of these items, they are easy to quickly decide what to do with them. But for others, it requires some significant amount of work and they might need community input into the team to work on that supplemental recommendation which the council will vote on. And so they intend to ask SGs, Cs and ACs for appointment of a resource, an expert, to the small team. And so they call it small team plus because now it will have members from outside the council to discuss and come up with a supplemental recommendation on these items. With that, they will then present it to the wider council for voting. So that is where SubPro proceeds, where it sits right now from the council perspective. I understand as early as two weeks after this meeting, they might be sending emails to SGs, Cs and ACs for people who would like to volunteer into the group. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Tomslin. In the queue, I have first Farzaneh, then Rafik. Farzaneh, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII:

Sorry, I've been making a lot of noise about this on the NCSG mailing list. This small, like, I remember that we had an elaborate discussion about how these small teams of GNSO council, sometimes they take these decisions and they go and they represent the council in other venues and talk and speak on behalf of the council. And we saw that

how dangerous it can be to have them, like, empower them. But this plan for this, now we are going to agree to a small team plus, we are empowering them. We are empowering the group that the design of the governance structure that we were very, very critical of, they were not transparent. It looked like another kind of like a PDP inside of the council. And it was like closed. But so we discussed all this at NCSG. I remember this clearly. We discussed, I think, both in Cancun and DC that we should be very careful about these small teams, especially about DNS abuse when they, like, we had some problems with that small team.

But now, not only—I have looked into this, I have looked at the background, not only we are going to have these small teams that are not transparent and not communicating, we are going to have, like, more people actually, like, from the outside, from GAC and advisory and like ALAC to join. We are creating a mini PDP inside the council. And I have looked at Paul's emails on the GNSO council mailing list, and it doesn't seem like they're talking about procedures. They are talking about substantive issues. And we need to, and I urge the council members to say no to a small team plus, first of all. If you need experts, if you need feedback from the community, then we should provide those channels for you to get the feedback. We should not at any cost—we should prevent this at any cost from these small teams getting bigger and bigger and bigger and becoming governance structures of their own and grow feet and just run out of the room and, like, leave us empty handed and not being able to actually make policy in a multi-stakeholder fashion and empower advisory committees like GAC.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Farzaneh, and I totally share your concern. This is not a development that we like at all. In the queue, I have Rafik and then Stephanie. So Rafik, please go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, this is Rafik speaking. So first I was checking or refreshing my memory about the process. So I'm checking the bylaws, it's clear to say that the case about non-approval, so the council, and that's clear there, council, the board, they have the discussion and then the council can send a supplemental recommendation and that's Tomslin explained about that super majority vote. So I'm not going to interpret so much, but I can read here that's the expectation, and I think that was from the beginning, it's really the role of GNSO council, the manager of process. And here as it approved the recommendation to be directly involved here to respond to the board. I can understand, and this is nothing new, it happened now for several years that the approach was to kind of delegate or create small teams to maybe to have some flexibility to be able to deliver. But there is, and I kind of sensed it from the beginning is that it's differentiating the councilor or the council and slowly, slowly to become just, I don't want to say it, but it's kind of a wrapper stamp because you delegate more and more of those activities. Of course, some it would make sense to get some expertise, but in the long run, kind of you are leaving really the decision and the substance to others to do, other who are not necessarily elected. And now here that's the discussion, who should be in the small team? Because in the beginning when we had small team, it was only councilors. So creating groups from the council, that made sense. But when we started to add, and our main argument is the subject matter expert, things can, we go into a

grey area. So I'm not sure what we can respond here, but if I have a suggestion, and maybe it's in terms of procedure, we have that committee for improvement and so on, please bring the topic of small teams, and you need to create the safeguards or the guardrails or whatever, check and balance to make this limited and to really explain when it can be used. Because I think that's a trend and we think that having small team or kind of discussion group and so on, because we had that also for like in other topic, and including like the GAC, the ALAC and so on, it becomes a solution. And I share the concern with Farzaneh, we are creating a kind of PDP without PDP process, without that, what we created as safeguards and a way to do things. So if we can bring the topic to, I cannot really name that committee, standing committee shared by Manju, as improvement is to bring this discussion. If you really want to have small team or committee, you need to create where it can happen, how it can happen and to put all the limits there. Otherwise it's just an ad hoc, we'll keep with an ad hoc approach and that's open door to all kind of abuse and issues.

So for this situation, I'm not sure we can respond because we're already open, but at least you can discuss about membership, how the decision is making, and also maybe to make clear, it should be the council to take responsibility of whatever it will send back to the board. That's what the bylaws say, that's what you can read in the general PDP manual. It's the council role, don't delegate such important thing in particular related to PDP recommendation.

That one last comment, the board took so much time to approve, the ODP was just one way also to delay things and to not approve things. So

that's another topic for discussion, but just we stop here for now.
Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Rafik. And I just want to point out to everybody that we are very lucky to have somebody like Rafik who is actually a walking reference into the bylaws, so whenever you have bylaws issues, ask him. Thank you, Rafik. I have Stephanie next.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks very much, Stephanie for the record, and Rafik, feel free to join as my alternate on this particular small team. I just wanted to say I am sitting on that small team, we meet every Monday. The original task was to come up with a way of dealing with the board's, what the heck is their, I'm forgetting their word for it. It's basically rejections that were in the final report, non-adoption. Yes, so they're non-adopting, which means rejecting things, so the council can either strike another PDP and work again, which very few people had any appetite for because it was a five-year PDP, so this has been well litigated, but the board was uncomfortable with a number of items and the whole point of the original small team was to chew over those rejected items and see if we could meet some kind of an understanding with the board. And we have had excellent support from Becky Burr and Avri as board reps discussing what the real problems were. However, now we are moving into another phase and I must say, I think Farzaneh has put her finger on most of the problematic issues.

We do, however, push back constantly on any attempt to change the language and you probably saw in the traffic that has happened in the last couple of days, Anne Aikman-Scalese, I think, picked up on misuse of terminology by the chair of the small group, who is Paul McGraady. Let's be clear to newcomers, these are two councilors voted in by the NomCom. Anne is non-voting. I think Paul is non-voting as well, right? Oh, he's voting. But Paul has been selected as being neutral to chair this group and he also chaired our [confab] with the other side of the non-contracted party house on Friday. But occasionally, it is our view that he misuses his language and I'm very glad that Anne Aikman-Scalese caught him on this. But we do try and push back and we'd appreciate if you catch something that we didn't catch because there's a lot going on.

The business of expansion was originally to get alternates because we're going to be at this for a while, particularly on the matter of applicant support. And so bringing in additional people to backfill because every week is hard. I am quite concerned about bringing in, air quotes for those who can't see me, outside experts. They might not even be in the ICANN community. They could be litigators. They could be anybody. So we'll have to watch that extremely carefully. But one of the reasons that Anne is so good at what she does is she sat on that original committee many years ago now where we set the parameters and the policy parameters for the differences between policy and implementation. And we are not supposed to be really doing either here because this is not an IRT. This is a--more of a helping to interpret thing, the language and get beyond the board objections but we cannot possibly substitute for a PDP. That's one point. And the second point is

everything has to go back to council and we will not sit there and let this go off on a life of its own. I'm there yelling back to council, back to council. There is, of course, concern about taking up council's time. Tough. You know. Because as you probably--I can't remember whether you said this but I'm sure it's implied. If we don't keep a very close watch on this PDP, it will set the tone for more PDPs. There is a major crush with the workload going on and a push to produce results partly because of ICANN being in some sort of an existential crisis about its credibility. So it requires constant vigilance. So I would suggest that we put this down as a continual running item at every policy committee meeting that we check on the health of this, make sure we raise things between meetings obviously. But I think it's something that we rightly should be concerned about. This is all the new thing. The word plus, I'll try to push that back next time. You know how bad names are at ICANN. We finally got the RDRS back to a reasonable name but it took a long time and five iterations. So we may have to rename this again. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Stephanie. Sounds like we have to throw in some minuses in there to compensate for the plus. Thank you. Right now I would like to jump to a very quick item. We just been joined by Chris Buckridge, our new board seat 14 holder. So I would just like to give a few minutes for Chris to say hello to us.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE:

Thanks. Sorry, everyone. I thought I was going to get away with sitting in the back and just listening. For those who don't know me, my name is Chris Buckridge. I'm newly at the end of this week stepping into seat

14. I'm not new to ICANN by any means. I've been working with the regional Internet registries for the past two decades and have been engaging a lot with ICANN over that period, particularly with their public policy engagement people and in the ASO context. That said, I don't have a great deal of background in the GNSO or names side. So when I said I was planning to sit in the back and listen, that's -- well, not the sitting in the back but certainly the listening part I'm very much doing at the moment, keen to hear from everyone in the Noncontracted Parties House but certainly in the NCSG about the issues that are of concern and about the perspectives that you have on those. And yeah, I think stepping into a board seat, it's made very clear that you're not representing a constituency, but I think there is absolutely an obligation on me to understand the perspectives of the constituency and the concerns and take that expertise and that knowledge into the discussions with the board. So I look forward to help from all of you in building that and carrying it forward. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Chris. And I would like to add that Chris plays a really mean bass guitar. Any questions you might have to Chris at this point before we move on? If not, thank you, Chris. If you want to stay, you're very welcome. Thank you. Excellent. Thank you. So next on our agenda, I assume, Stephanie, that's an old hand. Next, I actually would like to ask Emmanuel to actually update us a little bit on the IDN EPDP.

EMMANUEL VITUS:

Thank you very much, Julf. So I don't know if we should always be doing a [recap] on what the EPDP is about, because I know some new

members. So I'll just briefly, I mean, give a background about it. So it started in November 2020, though I joined a year ago, but it started 2020, where the GNSO Council established a team to prepare a draft charter on initiation on the EPDP, which on IDN, so the IDN stands for Internationalized Domain Names. So the EPDP is expected to determine the approach for a consistent definition of all GTLDs and also develop a policy recommendation that will eventually allow for introduction of variant GTLDs at the top level. So this year, so the work's supposed to be in two phases, so the phase one and the phase two. So this year in April, during the meeting in Cancun, the working group published its phase one initial report for public comment, which closed in June, June 2023. So the initial report actually includes 68 preliminary recommendations that I usually send to the mailing list. So by the end of the closing of the public comment, we received 12 submissions, which did not raise any significant concern or new issues that the team did not actually discuss during our usual meetings. So the team actually sought guidance from the GNSO Council with regard to false admission related to the .Quebec, because the .Quebec, they sent a comment during the public comment period. But when we sought the, how do you call it, the GNSO Council actually agreed with the team assessment to those submissions, but explained that the .Quebec is actually outside the scope of the EPDP IDN to address, so technically it nullifies our action on that. So before this particular meeting, this meeting, ICANN 78, the EPDP team actually finalized all the 69 phase one recommendations on the top level variant management after considering inputs received from the public comment on its initial reports. So the consensus call actually, so usually after that period where we include all the public comments, we have to actually vote for

what we call a consensus call, where all the members of the EPDP will give their consensus to it before we actually send it to the Council. So the period was open during the IGF in Kyoto, which was 12 October, so we had a 10 days window to actually give our agreement to that. So as of the phase one, we come to the end. The EPDP team actually spent all of the three-week session at the ICANN 78 to do deliberations on the Charter 2 questions with regard to the second level variant management. So the team actually clarified the definition of key concepts, so we had three sessions during this meeting. So we actually had the definition to clarify the key concepts, including the source domain names and variant domain sets. The team also discussed the registry object identifies and also other possible mechanism of identifying the same registry to comply with the same entity requirements for variant domain names lifecycle management.

So the team actually reached an agreement on not prescribing any specific mechanism, but leaving detail to implementation by the contracted parties. So in addition, the team also discussed whether the registrar should be charged the mandatory annual fee by ICANN for each activated variant domain name, after considering different model of variant activation based on the registry policy. So I think last but not the least, the team also concluded on the second reading of the Phase 2 draft preliminary recommendation developed prior to this meeting. So as a result of those efforts, the team actually completed the initial deliberation of the 12 out of 19 questions, or Charter questions that are making a swift progress according to the project plan and timeline, which was reduced by 13 months last year, last year November. So on Saturday, last Saturday, the consensus called for the Phase 1 report

that I spoke about earlier, achieved a full consensus on all its 69 Phase 1 final recommendations. So technically, there was no more consensus. As I said, the most important comment that we received was from the .Quebec, which the council said is out of our scope. So I think the deliberation was technically okay with all of us.

So we are now considering to continue the Phase 1 work and hold a face-to-face workshop in Malaysia in the first week of -- no, that will be second week of December, to actually expedite those deliberations. So there is one thing I want to clarify. I think we started a conversation earlier in the mailing list. It's regarding the remarks some of actually you made during the policy committee meeting and via the mailing list. What happened is that the leadership team has proposed a consensus designation for every final recommendation. So technically, they actually proposed it to us, then we need to actually accept to make it a consensus. So those consensus designations are contained in a document that I sent yesterday. It's called the Leadership Proposed Consensus Designation. So the consensus process was open, as I said, for 10 days, but during that period, I personally was not around because I was in the IGF, so I came back sick. So two days before I actually came here, I actually sent our -- because it was behind deadlines, so I sent our -- how do you call it? Approval to it. But unfortunately, I didn't have time to reach out to the team, and the reason being that there was no consent raised from what we have discussed so far from the initial report that was published. So also, there was no any contentious from the initial documentation shared with you, and I think I apologize that, well, this was one of those mistakes. It will never happen again. And I actually plead with the NCSG policy team that we should make sure that

all the people that we appointed into that group, we all attend those meetings because it becomes more difficult for one person to handle because the meeting is 90 minutes every week, and we have, I think, technically -- I don't know if Tomslin will confirm -- four people today. We have [inaudible]. So yeah, and we have some observers as well. So I think that will help so that internally we can also form a very good group if there is an issue that needs expertise from the larger group, then we actually reach out to you and also make sure that we alternate in attending those meetings to avoid such oversight. So thank you very much.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Emmanuel. Any questions about this one? Oh, yeah, Farzaneh, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII:

Yeah, I just want to know, Emmanuel, I just want to know if this group came up with any kind of recommendation or policy that was any different from the SubPro recommendations. So you have the limited public interest, public interest thing, and then also you have the legal objection. So I just don't think -- and I have been saying this -- I just don't think that creating an EPDP on IDN was a good idea. And I said this three years ago. But we wasted a lot of your time and resources on this. And I just don't think that these recommendations to me, they don't look any different from the other ones, from the generic ones. And to be honest, they really delay the allocation of these IDNs. And I think that just like results in that. There are no -- like these policy issues that you discussed, it doesn't look like anything different from the other one.

Well, I might be wrong. I just wanted to point that out. But if there are differences, then it would be great to know what these differences are. Like what is this limited public interest objection? What is this legal rights objection? Community objection, I know what it is. But is it different from the SubPro recommendations? So if they are different, then it would be good to know the difference. If they are not different, why did we do this IDN EPDP which is beyond? Thank you.

EMMANUEL VITUS:

Thank you very much, Farzaneh. I haven't personally gone through the SubPro recommendations to compare with what we're working on now. What I do is to actually make sure that the charter questions that they give to us, we should make sure that our interest as a non-commercial stakeholder group is actually respected. And if I see any concern or anything that is of concern for us, then I bring it to you. I think from the conversations, they are very, very technical. So you notice that we do come to consensus, but the debates are usually tense. I haven't gone to the SubPro recommendations, as you said. You protested maybe three years earlier. So I can't actually give an opinion on that. Maybe people who have been around for a while can probably give clarification about that. But personally, I don't have an opinion about that. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

I can try. Farzaneh, with regards to whether it's different from SubPro, I think in the earlier meetings of IDN EPDP, when they were going through the charter questions, it was explicitly mentioned that the recommendations that develop will have to work with or supplement

the SubPro recommendations. So they couldn't re-delegate anything that had already been agreed in SubPro in IDN EPDP because that was already approved by the council. So they couldn't contend each -- the recommendations in IDN couldn't contend with the SubPro ones.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Manju, go ahead.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Manju Chen for the record. I think also Tomslin is right. We are always against relitigation of issues. So that's one of the things. And also IDN EPDP is not about objection of source that much. We were talking mostly about variants and how do you allocate variants to people who want it. Of course, I understand not every language script in this world have variants and they might not need variants in their IDN gTLD, but there are significant population in the world that wants IDN and wants their variant to be allocated, which was not possible during the last round because there was no policy. So I don't think this policy is a waste of time. I honestly think it should be an issue that NCSG kind of cares more because we care a lot about inclusivity and diversity. And it's a shame that we are saying it's a waste of time. Thank you.

EMMANUEL VITUS: Thank you very much, Manju. And also Farzaneh, I know every time when we're discussing the IDNs, you also use that we are wasting time. I think that's the main reason why they actually reduced the project timeline by 13 months so that we make sure that we actually close this EPDP before the next round.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. Any questions, comments, views? Okay, go ahead, Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you. I've already put this on the list and I know it's a more contentious issue, but I do think we need to be a little more careful about reporting back on the PDPs and so on. I don't want to go back into this, but let's use this as a good example and try to do things like more in fine touch with whoever is representing us. I know you did your best, Emmanuel, but at the same time, it is really complicated that the policy committee was not consulted on this issue because it is in their procedures that it should be at least warned about this, such as a public comment. And anyone here could write a public comment in their personal capacity, but once they use the constituency or the stakeholder group hat, it kind of implies some level of consultation. And that's what I spoke about accountability on my email. So just to maybe use this as an example and see how we can restructure things and maybe work more closely together. And that's all. So just to put this on the record.

EMMANUEL VITUS: Okay, Bruna. Thanks very much. I think it's a very good proposal. Let's just work together in achieving that.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, everybody. I don't see any more hands. Oh, sorry. Go ahead. You're too quick for me.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Hello, Benjamin for the records. I just want to -- this conversation should come [at five,] but I think it's a good opportunity to get into it right now. I want to encourage our councilors moving forward to be available to our community to educate, create awareness, get them to be able to understand the issues they are running with, just to see themselves as a resource to the community. We appreciate the amazing work they are doing, but a lot of us are detached from the reality of the things they are discussing about. And to a large extent, from my own personal views, I just feel this is a platform for them to advance their own personal causes or things they are personally concerned about. So I would say, is there a framework that we use to gauge community opinion or views that they run with? Say there's a conflict between your personal views and community views, have you truly to say, hey, community, is this what you want or is this what I want?

One of the ways we could easily be doing that is to consistently, just like Bruna has said, report back to the community, ask them where, give them options. Like if you go this way, these are the implications. If we go this way, these are the implications. And help us with your technical skills to make us understand. From the past two, three years, I don't think our councilors have been doing a good job to educate us so that we can either rally around them or support them. That's what I want to say.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. I think Manju is next.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Manju for the record. So I just want to make sure that councilors, we are on the council, we are the manager of PDPs. We don't participate in PDPs as NCSG representative. Well, some of us do because we don't have any other people to do it. But that doesn't mean that we know every policy issue because that's the point of we sending representatives to PDPs for them to understand the issues. And represent NCSG stance in those working groups. So I don't think it's a fair ask for all of us councilors to always come back and tell you every issue. And of course, I would encourage you guys to come to the policy meeting. If you don't come, how can you say that we're not educating you or we're not doing outreach while we do that and policy calls when people don't show up? So yeah, if you want to know about policy issues, go to those representatives who are on the working group who should know better than us, than the policy issues, and should be informing us when there are problems, when we should raise them in the council. So that's just my opinion. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Manju. And I would like to add to that that we have a Wikipedia page that shows for each of PDP and working group who our representatives are. Go and talk to those people.

BRUNA SANTOS: No, same line as Manju. And maybe give you guys the invitation back. Come to the policy meetings, come to the general council sessions. I haven't seen, like, I have seen very few people from leadership,

constituency leadership in those meetings. And we are all part of the GNSO. I don't see why we come to these meetings if we're not attending council sessions. So I can understand and have been chair before, so I understand chairs or leadership, they might have a more administrative kind of function to the ICANN meetings, but I really think we could be doing a better job in you guys also following the meetings, raising questions, helping us document everything, because what the work, a lot of the councilors are doing, Manju, Stephanie, a lot of them, it's very heroic in a lot of ways. And being in two or three PDPs, small groups, small group plus, or anything, all at the same time, and still be expected to teach people about stuff, I really don't think it's fair. We can do our best. We can try to come to meetings whenever we're invited to, but at the same time, I don't think you should add it to the agenda. And once again, you're all welcome to attend general council sessions.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Bruna. I definitely see my role as a chair for NCSG as an administrative one, but I definitely make sure I keep up to date with what's going on in the council and for the meetings. So I encourage everybody else to do that. Next in the queue, I have Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thank you. So speaking here more as someone who's supposed to represent NCSG in the GGP working group and just since a few days ago in the IANA function review, what I can say here, maybe I missed to send some updates, but I believe I sent some, not lately. The most important here as we are representative is how we can keep on sharing updates with the membership. It's not that simple. Sometimes particularly if the

topic is kind of complex, it's how to introduce it and so on. But I think at least what is expected from us is to share some regular update, something we should do more, like maybe every few weeks just to keep people in the loop, what's going on in the working group. We should use more, and we are supposed to use more the policy calls every month when we have kind of part of the agenda to share any update. And also when we have the public comments and so on. So just to help, I mean, the representative should not get involved in the drafting and just let us maybe to have other pair of eyes to check and to make the comment. So but to be kind of a shepherd here and help the drafters for the comments. So there are different activities that a representative can do without putting too much work, I think sharing some regular update. Myself, I'm not doing enough. I hope we do more and just we leverage what we have. And the other point I agree, just feel free to ask the representative if you have a specific question about the topic because we are supposed to represent. There are some times that we have to check. So for example, now if I can share about GGP, we are reviewing the public comment NCSG submitted, so in several points, we are supporting the recommendation that make it easy. But later on at some level when there will be maybe some changes in the recommendation or substantive changes we need to share with the membership and ask for feedback and how we should proceed. I can give, for example, there some recommendation. But at the time, for sure, we need to check with the membership and the policy committee for guidance. So to speak on behalf of the group. So there are some times that need to be done. Other, yeah, we, I think we are, we have to say there are some delegation to us to do as much as possible. Just what do we need to keep the membership up to date using the mailing list or just the NCSG

call or like today, the meeting. So I try to use just to share update about GGP quickly since it's not in the agenda. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Rafik. Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, thanks. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I don't really want to repeat what Manju and Bruna have already eloquently said. But I do think that this whole issue of bringing people up to speed is at the core of a lot of tension here. And I know speaking for myself, I'm on council. That's a lot because there's council working groups on different issues. There are council, there are small teams. So I'm on the RDRS small team and I'm on the SubPro for my sins, an area where I really don't know much about it. So I had to dive into the 400-page SubPro report and all the amendments. Now it is not the job of those who are doing the work to educate people who are not doing the work. It is the job of people who would like to join and justify why they're coming to ICANN meetings to start participating by listening. Listen to every council meeting. Ask questions on a back channel. We're here to help you if your shoulder is to the plow. I hope that expression is clear to everybody and it's not just an English expression. But if you're not willing to come to the policy meetings and join in the discussion or listen to the council meetings and ask relevant questions and say this is part I don't understand, we'll steer you to all the documents and the links. We now have an ICANN resource, Daniel Gluck, who has been great helping us do things. And we are back and forth. I mean, we also criticize one another as you can see from the chat here. I find we're a little rough on each other. Bear in mind we're

all busy and trying to hang on to umpteen different things at once. Including all the wretched administration and the elections and this, that and the other. We have to stay on top of that as well as councilors. But we need to help each other more and we need to cooperate. Also on SubPro, Kathy is always there when I have a question. And for that matter, so are the team members if I ask a question. And then I can check with Kathy to make sure that would be our view as well. So I would like to say to Benjamin, in response to your criticism, Benjamin, come join us on these committees and just see how collaborative we are. But don't expect us to write briefing reports on top of all the other crap we have to do to bring people along. It's up to you to listen. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Stephanie. And for non-native English speakers, crap is a term that means lots of useful things. Benjamin, yeah, your turn.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE:

First off, I really, Benjamin for the record, Rafik, thank you so much for all you do. I really appreciate you. And to everyone, my intervention wasn't criticism. And if you see it, if you saw it as criticism, I feel maybe my English was rough or my tone was terrible. What I was trying to say is that in order to reduce the heavy lifting that you guys are currently dealing with, one of the interesting things to do is to try and see how these conversations, these technical conversations we have can be more educational. Because let's be frank, when you have this conversation here, what is the end goal? Is it just I'm the only one capable to discuss this and I will always be the only one to discuss it? Or

I'm bringing this to all of you so that some of you can get involved and let us fight this whatever things we are doing together. And I'm saying we've had desire to have webinar monthly or just to educate people and you should -- we can't go and bring external resource person because you don't like that a lot. Could you also be available as resource? And if this has been the way we have been doing things and things are still remain the same way, can we try and start tweaking the way we do our things? And if you're talking about the wiki, it's not a very educative place, by the way. And we're getting a whole lot of support as well. We've seen how Melissa and her team has curated issues like applicant support. And you've seen how much momentum has come online since that has been done. So that means it's something that is workable. So now it doesn't necessarily mean you have to even report. We can be creative in the way we report. If you do a voice -- I mean a video call to explain to everybody this is the issue, this is what is needed to be done and all of that. And Kathy is doing a lot of that. So we're just saying for other topics, especially that we don't want people to run out and go and do things we don't like or we don't want individual contribution, we want collective. We should endeavor to educate others at every opportunity we have to do one. Either we give good context of it, what needs to be done, and options available, and the implications of this. These are things you do ordinarily. But most times they get lost in the air or hidden in the numerous conversations we are having. And all I'm trying to say is to put some clarity to it. And I shouldn't -- and I don't think I'm criticizing anybody or targeting any group of persons. I'm only saying if we have a broader or a bigger room of people knowledgeable about this idea, our strength will be stronger. That's all I'm saying. But if we want to continue back and forth on this, I'm [now] tired.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Basically I will just speak for myself. The last conversation we had about attending GNSO council, because the mailing list probably for me, we can be part of it. The calendar invites, we don't get it. But I saw Andrea sent like one e-mail that she will start sending one in August. And I sent a personal e-mail to her saying could you make it like a calendar invite so we attach it to our calendar. These things are very important. We want to participate. We want to get involved. Maybe for some. But then we also need to look at how it matches into our calendar. Then the other complaint I personally have, well, I can't possibly put it on the head of or tie it to the head of the Tomslin, the time zone for meetings, PC meetings that I attend. I attend PC meetings. Obviously you can confirm that, right? It's usually not very comfortable for me. Like I wake up almost in the middle of the night or early hours of the morning just to attend PC meeting. And then my partner even complains you're disturbing me with your Zoom meetings. So these things happen. But these are things we do for ICANN, right? I know we can't change that time zone. But it's an interesting way of me complaining about that time zone not being favorable, right? Yeah.

FARELL FOLLY: I think there is a lot of misunderstanding here. And the criticism are good anyway. So because it helps people clarify views and to move forward. So what I like to say here is not to reverse all that has been said by the councilor. For the whole community and CSG membership to know that if you want to interact with councilor, it's very easy. Policy meetings, the whole agenda of the council meeting is always discussed

during policy meetings. So for anything that's about council, you attend this meeting, you can know it. If you cannot attend because of work, because of time zone, you can always listen to the recordings and then you ask questions. And if you have any issue you want to discuss with any councilor, I don't think any councilor ever refused to discuss or to explain any topic. I myself am always available to discuss any topic. But when it comes to policy, drafting, comment, I discussed that with Tomslin many times. I told him that before I've been to the council for about four years, I've been drafting public comment every, let's say, every two months. All the time. And I say when I've been to the council, I will not draft any policy anymore because that's not my job. When people want to work on policy, they volunteer. I can coach them, but I cannot continue to be a public comment drafter or policy penholder when I'm at the council because then people in the membership will never learn. So the problem is for people to volunteer to learn and there will never be lack of mentor to coach them to achieve what they want to do. So I would just encourage membership to go out to the councilor to attend meeting or to listen to the recordings afterward so that we can all work together. I think this is the best way. But if we just have expectation without discussing with the people, it will not let us move forward. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Very quickly, Andrea has a quick comment.

ANDREA GLANDON: Just before we go on a little bit further, and I verified this just to be sure, anybody can join the council mailing list as an observer. Anybody. I'll

get the information on how to do that and send it out to the list. I have started sending every week before the council meeting, I send the e-mail, I started adding the calendar invite. So it's very possible for people to be involved.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Andrea. Bruna and then [inaudible].

BRUNA SANTOS: Just some things other than what Andrea just mentioned about how easy joining the list is, ICANN has been doing a great job in improving access to a lot of this information on policy process, right? We have the GNSO summary of discussions. Andrea has been sharing a lot of the newsletters with us every week. So it really, guys, it's just like might be two hours a week to just sit down and read stuff and ask questions. And I mean, I know how problematic it sounds that we are telling you guys to read stuff, but it's like reading stuff, it's 70% of the job here at ICANN. And I don't want to sound patronizing or even like, I don't know, anything in that sense, but it's just like a lot of us got into the policy work by sitting down, reading stuff, asking questions, finding someone to be a mentor, finding someone to like just have a chat or go for a coffee or ask for a breakfast meeting or -- don't hate me about that, but yeah. But it's part of the job. So that's one thing. And it's really unfortunate that three councilors took the time to answer to Ben's intervention and Ben, you addressed Rafik instead of the councilors. So that's really interesting how the discussion is going. And last but not least, I just wanted to echo [inaudible]. I saw your very positive take on this with suggestions. Maybe what we can discuss is like you guys can

try to come up with a plan and we can see between council and NCUC membership how can we tag team and follow those issues. Like maybe a way forward is writing blog posts to the new website for you guys. So it's something we can try to do together. I'm not sure everybody will have the time, but it's something that maybe Farell, Juan, myself we can help with or just like answering some questions for you to write a blog post. So let's think about the positive and maybe discuss a future plan on how can we share more information for the PDPs and other council related work.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Bruna. Caleb.

CALEB OGUNDELE:

Thank you. So speaking of the positives, just continue from where Bruna stopped. I'm pretty sure that we used to have these, I talked about it during the fellowship session, we used to have this policy writing course that we do. I think that was probably when Bruna was chair or something, right? Yes, we used to have that. Why don't we bring this back again into the community? Let's have it and then when we do it this time, let's make sure we put it on ICANN Learn so we don't have to repeat this same process again on teaching people how to be pen holders, how to write policies, how to understand the multi-stakeholder system and their approach to the dialogue even when writing policies so it doesn't look like you are attacking someone when expressing policies like that. That's my view.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Caleb. I wanted to point out, oh okay, Manju, you go ahead first.

MANJU CHEN: It's on ICANN Learn.

CALEB OGUNDELE: It's been a while that I've probably been there, right? But it's good that since we already have this material that we re-emphasize by sending it to the mailing list again and encourage members because if you are not aware, you will never know, you will never understand what is going on and you never solve the problem.

JULF HELSINGIUS: I would also add to that that we also have this policy transition program that we actually were the pilot for that has been helpful in this but yes, the material is there and we just need to keep pointing people at it. I see a bunch of hands. I don't know which ones are old and which ones are new. Benjamin and then [inaudible].

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: I just want to put it on the record, this is Benjamin for the record, that this was not individual attack. I just want that people will have the technical skills to share with those who can make use of it. And I don't even know, to be honest, I don't want to put it on record but I don't even know who is a councilor or who isn't, to be honest. So it's remarkable that someone thinks I'm selecting technical, some councilors. I just know that Rafik always explains things to us on the mailing list. So

please, this is not targeted at an individual or a person but I knew that the conversation when he came up with, Emmanuel, it gave an opportunity to share this and that's what I did. And I knew that we also tried to create a webinar to give some level of education to our members and some individuals felt that wasn't the proper way to go. And I asked them, one of the conversations that came up was, the people who know about this in our community, can they make themselves available so that we don't have to go across the aisle to find other people to do it? So let it be on the record that this issue is not targeted towards any individual. I just shared as my role permits right now to capacitate my members and that's all I'm doing. So it's not, I don't know who is doing his job or who is not doing or what load someone is holding or not. So that is not there. Let it be on record for that. Thank you very much.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you. I have [Rima] and then Stephanie.

[RIMA:]

Hi. It seems like the conversation both live and in the chat is kind of going in between both for existing participation and for newcomers coming in how to allow people to engage and get people interested and whatnot. And I guess my perspective as more of a newcomer is I think there are a couple of maybe suggestions to help facilitate maybe both newcomer and continuing engagement. I think it's really tough even for people who are interested and are going to meetings and whatnot if it's a topic that you're not familiar with—and for me I'm familiar with none of it—to understand what's going on even if opportunities for

volunteering for a comment or whatnot arise. So for example I've seen a couple through the NCSG mailing list, a couple of volunteering opportunities for comment and I've tried to engage with one of them but I think there's a gap in explaining in plain language, okay, this is what we're trying to achieve with this comment process. This would be the potential impact. This is kind of how the process goes. And then this is how you can help as someone who doesn't know much about this. So how to achieve that? I think by instituting a little bit more of a process in place of, okay, if we're going to have potentially like a newcomer volunteer help with a comment process or any opportunity for engagement, like that person will be assigned like a specific mentor of, okay, we're going to have like a kickoff meeting to talk through some of the basics here. What do all these acronyms involved mean? Which ones are relevant for this exact process or this comment engagement? And what's the actual impact? Because I think especially for people from my generation, like that's what we care about. Like we want to know what will this actually -- what are we trying to achieve? What risks are we trying to mitigate? And for me, I think in the past couple of months, I would have liked to see that more at the fore and I think that would help really get people actually -- because I saw Farzaneh's comment that ICANN's work is just purely not interesting and it's hard to find people who might care. And maybe that's a little -- but I think that it could be really interesting actually if a little bit more of the impact was driven home. And I understand that that can be challenging because you're all, you know, if you've been in this environment for a while, you're entrenched in it. So the impact is more obvious to you on a subconscious level, but it's not necessarily so obvious to newcomers. So, yeah.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. That's a good point. Stephanie next.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I think those are very good points. I think there's got to be a happy medium in here somewhere that doesn't involve me writing PowerPoint slides on everything that's going on in the three PDPs that I'm -- or subgroups that I'm stuck with. But please understand that coming up with presentations on top of keeping up with all the work and reading all the material that's coming in, that's an awful lot to put on already overworked councilors. And I'm sorry, but there's lots of people who have been indulging in travel to ICANN meetings for almost a decade now who have not, have yet to participate on a PDP. And the way to really do this is to shadow another person. We're looking, and I think it's gone out on the list. Julf very good at putting these calls out. I need an alternate on that SubPro PDP. Kathy, as I say, is there to answer any questions. I have volunteered for years because I would sincerely like to get out of covering every RDRS aspect that comes along. And I'm happy to impart everything I know on privacy and that WHOIS thing. But nobody -- like, all you've got to do is email somebody and ask a question. That's all. Don't ask us to write a 101 textbook for a university course on what we're dealing with here. That's the thing. None of us got that. And we're not trying to pass on the misery. Believe me, we're not. But the only way -- because things change all the time. We're just swimming along in the current. And you have to start listening and ask questions. Act as if it is a university. You have to attend the lectures, right? Then you go to the library, get the book out, have a look. Can't

find the book. Go ask somebody how you learn about a particular topic. That's what's involved. And I'm sorry if I'm putting off any newcomers. I realize I'm dousing you with ice water. But it is a fair bit of work. You didn't get this from your first year course in internet governance because it doesn't get into all the politics that happens here. Where every word matters. Where a small group plus takes on new meaning because of what plus means. You know? You're not going to get that nuance. You have to participate. It's all about participating. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. I have a pretty long list of hands here. But Bruna, next.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thanks. First of all, apologies to anyone that's new that's listening to this conversation, right? It's one we have every single meeting, kind of an internal affairs discussion. But [Rima,] it's just one of the things. NCSG is one of the houses for civil society within ICANN and within GNSO. We are the place. And this community has faced some issues with funding, with resourcing, and lack of engagement from members and so on. And especially during the pandemic. So I think what you guys are seeing now is a much kind of like NCSG running on even lower energy as we had before. Because it is slightly harder. And when we talk about council and how limited the resources are, it's because it's mostly council that's doing PDPs and the council work at the same time. And that's also why it's hard for us to be teaching everybody about everything. Because like some of us have three or four calls of 90 minutes per week, plus council once a month, plus side meetings and things like that. So it is a tough agenda. And some of us, like Tomslin,

try to be councilors and chair the PC at the same time. So that's why we say it's unfair to have this level of expectation from us. But what I'm getting from this conversation is that we could be better in reporting some of these issues, right? And I mean, if and when we have time, write those emails. Or if not, try to be more clear or in a less ICAN-ish related language or anything like that. But at the same time, it's rather unfair to not acknowledge the effort that goes into the policy committee meetings and the policy meetings. We do have them rather often prior to the council session, just so everybody's aware of the positions, what's going to happen, who is talking, what are the topics, and so on. And that's where we haven't seen a lot of engagement from our members. And council session as well, we don't see a lot of engagement from our members. I see Ken in almost every session, but I don't see a lot of the other leadership. So that's why. And I guess it goes for a lot. I understand it's difficult. It's a language we're not used to. It's almost as if you're writing, like try to talk in policymaker or even regulators' language. It can be difficult to step in. But some of us are willing and trying to help. But what is not helpful is the whole thing like pointing fingers that happen in the session. And I'm not even going to go into the gender bias situation, because I think that's really bad. But in any case, we can try to improve communications. It's really welcome if you guys are stepping in, tell us how can we improve, such as meeting with doing the suggestions as well. And I mean, we're open to do some of these things. But we do need some level of engagement from new members or from members as well. So that's it.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Caleb, next.

CALEB OGUNDELE:

So one of the things that I just want to encourage you, don't be confused about this community. We are very loving people, because sometimes you see us engaging in some conversations that are a bit advanced, and then you get more confused, and then you pull away. Right? No, that's not the way we behave here. Right? We are very caring people, and we like to show you the way. And there are a lot of people you can get around with, and they can mentor you. But what I'm going to say is most of the policy work here and some of the things that we do here has historical consequences, meaning that there are a lot of historical background on even certain decisions that are going to be made and how we are going to react to some of those decisions when it comes to different PDPs. Right? Now, as a result of that, there will be lots of documents to read and lots of things. Tomslin made me aware of something at the last meeting when I was -- I wanted to write a public comment and I needed more information, and I said probably I might have lots of reading, and it made me understand something, that we have a resource that is supposed to support us in NCSG, which is Daniel, right? Who does lots of historical search through certain documents and could just maybe help give us quick summaries on some of these things. I just wanted to make us aware of this again. Probably Tomslin didn't get to emphasize it, but the day I discovered it, it helped me in one of the public comments I coauthored with Stephanie, right? Because I had a background information, right? And I was able to read through it. And in these days when we probably have AI, right? I'm not saying we should abuse it. We could just plug in a PDF document that is stressing us out, probably a 1,000-pager and just say give me a quick

summary of everything, and then it will probably help us on some of the background information we want to get. So that's just a little contribution, and I think we should be positive about this conversation. This is a very good, honest conversation we are having with ourselves. We should be positive about it and look forward in seeing how we can improve our processes. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you. I have Mili next.

[MILI SEMLANI:]

Thank you, Mili, for the record. So I think what I'm hearing is a chicken and egg problem to some degree where newcomers are like we want to participate, but we can't. And obviously people who have been doing a lot of the great work don't have enough more time to do it. But thank you, Caleb, and I'm going to segue from what you said. We also do have a lot of resources and tools already existing, even if we're really short staffed, short resourced. But I think what we're not doing is just tying these little threads. And I'm really happy to champion this as a project, and thank you, Bruna, for acknowledging that I was absolutely trying to be positive and not contentious at anybody. If you can just tie some of these threads. So like Daniel, I think ever since he's come on board, Ken and I have been very happy, although we haven't really utilized him as a resource as much. But I'm glad to know that you did and Tomslin is aware of it. We can get so much of this background that people like Rima and so many new other joiners can benefit from. I remember that every time I come to a meeting, I'm just still getting up to speed and maintaining my own notes about each issue and topic that's going on.

So if you can get some of that background history. And then we already just need this one place, which, sorry to say, is not as crazy and complicated as the ICANN wiki, because how many times have we all tried to look something on it? And I mean, Andrew's doing a great job at keeping us up to date, but it's a bit complex. And in the times of AI and much easier tools, maybe Notion or something else, organizing this information, which is a lot of which is already there, some of it can be streamlined with help of Daniel and other people, maybe at ICANN org level. And then it can just be in one place where somebody like Rima can access it and come up to speed with, OK, I want to jump into the PDP or maybe the accelerator program, or if she's confident enough, directly into any of the public writing stuff. So I think it's just tying these loose threads. Happy to champion a small team. I am starting to like this term. So yeah, if we're thinking of that. In fact, I think the phase two of this can then look into the shadow/mentorship program that so many people have been thinking about, so many people are willing to. It's great to see that every council is almost willing to be like, yes, I'll write. But I feel like if you just build a process instead of a new person looking for Farell's email, then reaching out to Farell, then thinking, what can I ask Farell without looking stupid? I think if we just delete this process and make it simpler, maybe even a form, and on the side of councilors sharing more information, yes, you guys should not be spending any more time than you already do. So maybe the small team can think of a small, easier way where at the end of every meeting, you'll attend a council meeting every month, maybe two sentences. Maybe there is a pop-up that comes up right after your meeting or a reminding- - and we can automate so much of this, like a simple WhatsApp message even that reminds you, say, council meeting done, just put a one

paragraph or five sentences, which I'm sure Stephanie at that time can probably write 10 too. Because you're primed, and you've just been in that meeting, and there's so much going on. Just put it out there. And those five lines can then go back into our Notion dashboard or wiki or whatever. That information with the date, this is the latest update from the GNSO council meeting who people in the different time zones didn't attend or had other priorities. The onus is then on the member, because then nobody can come up to any of the meeting and say, oh, I didn't know this was happening. I'm sorry. Everything is there with a date. You have to go there every week and read it. So that's also getting our members into the habit of just keeping up with information. So I think this is sort of like a plan that I want to suggest. Thank you for listening.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you. I just wanted to point out that, yes, we don't do this debriefing immediately after a meeting. But what we do is, of course, we do the policy committee meeting before a meeting where all the issues, what are the hot topics in the issues. So that is something that we do. Tomlin has been doing it very well. So I think, Sam, you had a comment.

SAM LANFRANCO:

I may be completely off base here. I appreciate all the good suggestions about what we can do. But I've served on hospital boards and I've served as the head of NGOs that did global health. And the three things that we always spent a lot of time on, especially in hospitals, is mentoring, mentees, and the mentees talking to each other, rounds at the end of the week and things like that. And ICANN has lots of people

who aren't on a particular committee at a particular point in time that have an immense amount of wealth. We have a very little-- excuse me if I call it elite internship, the fellows program and so forth. And I'm still in contact with a lot of those fellows. But most of them have nothing to do with ICANN anymore. They're off following their careers. And I think we should think more in terms of how do we attach to somebody, I to a mentee, a mentee to I, and help them navigate this stuff just in a fairly simple conversation. I've done that over my lifetime. I was annoyed yesterday, or I always get upset when at one of the public things somebody said, I'm a dinosaur. It's time for me to get out of the way for you, the young people, to take over. My view is I'm an elder. My job is to help you build capacity so you take over. And I think that we have to get to that kind of how do you build capacity on the newcomers so that they feel a reward as they're going, they're building, they're not just running. How am I going to-- am I going to try to ChatGPT to get an answer to some DNS question? No. We have a wealth of information and we have a whole lot of people who could share it on a one by one and then let the ones who are at the other end talk to each other. And they'll say, stay away from that person, go talk to that person. So that's my comment.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Sam. I have Tomslin next.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Julf. I just wanted to give some beads of comment to Rima's ask regarding impact. But Mili, don't enjoy the small team terminology and not phase two. There were just two things. One is in every of those

public comment documents that really come out, there is usually some nice introduction of why the policy and why it was even put together in the first place. And that usually just helps. And it's usually really in, I think, layman language. So if you just look at that introduction only, you get why you should be interested in it. And then if you take that and use the principles of NCSG together, you actually get why you should as an individual be concerned with this. And then you start forming your views. Obviously at that point you haven't gone into the technical and all that, which is where then you start asking questions from or to someone who's been involved in it. But from understanding, if you would love to understand why you should go into any of those things, that introduction with the principles of NCSG, they do help get that sort of compass. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you. Then Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks. So my comment basically is that maybe we are mixing several points or several issues. So I think first one is about reporting to membership, which just is how different representative or those on the council, they can share what's going on to the membership just to keep them informed. That's a different level of activity. Another thing is how to get involved or to participate actively. So to get involved, I think, as the example shared by Tomslin is about drafting comment. That's some level of activity that we take time for a short period. But to share how to participate actively, meaning joining a working group and to maybe be a representative, it depends on how the working group is set. So I think

for those three types, I guess there are different expectations and what can be done. So if you can separate, that would be helpful in terms of how you respond to those issues. And the same is being sensitive because it's something happening many times we are hearing and what we should do more. So it's how we can avoid putting the burden on people. For reporting, maybe we can try to leverage what exists already to make it easier and to add maybe an extra layer about NCSG point of view because there are some reports or some webinars. But for example, like for GNSO, after GNSO meeting, there is like the minutes and the action item. So it can be kind of packaged in terms of reporting, just maybe councilors, they can add some pointers just to explain the context for those who don't understand. While also we need to have in mind that we have the NCSG policy call just prior to the council meeting. So those can be helpful to share first the context or the background, asking for feedback. And then after the meeting, you can use the minutes and the action item just to add that layer of NCSG point of view.

Regarding the public comment, I think Tomslin is doing that work as the policy committee chair. So when he shared that we have public comment period and there are volunteers, so that's best opportunity for anyone to join, even if they're not familiar with the topic, because they will have to understand the topic by reading the report and asking the representative at that time, the representative for NCSG or those who are involved in the working group to give feedback or explanation or share about the background. But at the end, you will have to read the report because you are going to comment about the recommendation.

The other about participating in working group, it's quite similar, but just a small longer period of involvement because it can be maybe one

year or more. And that when you join, you will have to read all the material in the beginning because like to understand the charter, what is the scope, and there are some briefing and explanation. And at that time, you can ask those who like in the council meetings to explain about the charter, why we have that PDP. And also those who are involved in the prior or previous working group, link it to that topic to explain.

So here, I'm just trying to summarize quickly the different activity and different way in how to support. As you can see, I'm not suggesting that we are adding some more information. There are existing ones that we can just repackage. And the other activity, just at that time, you can ask people specific question. So I think when you ask people a specific question, you will have more help than just generally explain to me like that. So I hope that helps and maybe we can move like that and how to improve things and to organize. So thanks, everyone.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you. And I am closing the queue, but there's a lot of hands and a lot of soft people. I hope you keep yourself really short because I do need five minutes at the end for some other stuff. So next, it's Rima.

[RIMA:]

I want to start by saying I really appreciate this conversation and a lot of the responses from everyone. And I also definitely did not mean to offend or imply that the work being done is insufficient in any way. I volunteer with lots of different organizations, and I understand that it is a ton of work. And it's obvious to me that that's present here. I think

that Mili's idea of sort of like a core resource package, basically, is a really helpful one because I don't think it's a useful way of spending time to start creating more explainers or more things like this, but rather to have just an easy one-stop shop place to go of like, here's all the basic existing things that we have that you can take a look at. But I think that as something like that is being compiled, one sort of general thing to keep in mind is that this space of internet governance and tech policy and whatnot is extremely saturated, and if you want competent people to come in, I think there has to be an acknowledgment that like for most people, and I think that's already the case here, ICANN isn't the only thing that people are going to be involved in, and so like there's just no time. There's not enough time in the day to be able to read through 200, 300 pages of documents to go through that initial steep learning curve. Of course, the learning curve at first is going to be steep regardless because that's how it is with any -- coming into any organization as a newcomer, but it's too steep, I think, for ICANN now given shorter attention spans and given that people are involved in a ton of different things in this space. So I think focusing as much as possible on what this gentleman mentioned about creating a more cohesive mentorship process where, you know, there's more one-on-one and maybe that burden can be spread across NCSG rather than the same one or two or three people, and also being mindful about, okay, how can we make everything as concise as possible?

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you. Ken.

KEN HERMAN: Yes, thank you, Julf. Ken Herman for the record. I'll be concise. We all know there's a lot of information. I've tried to focus on particular issues. The challenge that I have as I sit in my little working group is trying to understand for mine as well as some of the others, what exactly is our position on anything? I mean, I hear us talking about it and we go through the policy committee -- we go on the policy committee meeting, we go through the agenda, we have any questions about it. My question, frankly, tends to be, okay, what is the relevance to us and what is our position on it and do we have to discuss that position? So I know when I talk to colleagues in other stakeholder groups what our -- I know what my opinion might be, but as I speak to people, I'm representing a larger group. And so I would welcome more discussion on what the substance of the policy is rather than how we can get information about the policy issue. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Tomslin, do you want to really quickly respond to that?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes. I just want to quickly say that in terms of what the policy meeting outcome is, sometimes it's to get input to councilors to what that position might be so that they can make that argument in the council because the councilors haven't had time to capture that position. So that is usually an opportunity for input to come in so that that position can be argued in the council.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. Stephanie, very briefly.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Stephanie Perrin for the record. And it's worth pointing out again that NCSG leaves its councilors free to vote. We don't reach a position and then vote in a block. I could vote against something freely. And the purpose of the policy meeting is to persuade each other of our points of view and discuss them. And so I encourage everybody new to chime in there and ask questions. My short proposal was I think you ladies have come up with some great ideas about how to organize. And I like the idea of a perpetual series of Qs and As. Rather than us trying to digest what you need, what are the questions that you might come up with? You know, give us three or four questions and then we can answer those questions and it can build and we can go on from there. That would be so helpful. Because I've got to tell you, if I seem grumpy, we've been at this since 9:00 Friday morning. Councilors have been in sessions, a group on Friday. You know? It's been steady. So to face this kind of criticism from our own people at this point, you're kind of going, okay, I'd like my life back. Forget it. Find somebody to sit on SubPro. But we're not doing that. I'm just saying. Be careful, folks. We're burnt out.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. Benjamin, briefly, briefly.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: I want to appreciate all the Councilors. A round of applause for the Councilors, please. Please clap for them, guys. So if there's anybody I want to criticize, it's Tomslin, but he can take it. So I want to appreciate all of you Councilors for all you've been doing and I really want you to

know that. But I'm also hopeful that this healthy conversation will bring about something positive. What we have done as a person, as an EC, is that we've been able to bring up a new website and I'm expecting Bruna's blog, as she has recommended here today, that it will come to that page.

The other thing we have done is that we have successfully got PIR support, two consecutive meetings, and they expect us to do capacity building with that little resource they've been giving to us. And if we do a good job of it, they will give us more. So all of these good ideas we have been putting together can be a good way we can get more support for NCSG to build capacity. So thank you very much.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you. And the last one is Bruna and then I'll have my wrap-up.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Briefly, and not on this issue, I promise, it's something else. Just to flag that Global Partners Digital offered to help us raise awareness to discussions on Internet fragmentation. So they shared with us a proposal of doing some workshops and further discussion on what would this topic mean for ICANN, for places like the IGF, World Economic Forum, and ISOC as well. The idea is to bring in different perspectives and so on. So Julf and I will be chatting about this and also presenting to everybody because they really want to bring in some expertise and get closer to the NCSG. So just to put this on everybody's radar, and Julf, please, have your minutes.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you. So as my last words. Thanks to especially some of the people who are – I don't want to use the word leaving us but leaving their formal positions and hopefully staying with us. So I just want to thank Farell for being on the Council for two terms. Raoul as a chair for the NPOC. As of outgoing board chair 14 holder, Matthew, who's done a great job in the board. Avri, who despite being appointed by the NomCom has definitely had her background with us and saw representing at least our voices very well in the board. So many thanks to Avri as well. And then unfortunately last, somebody who has really left us. We got on Friday the sad news that Olévié Kouami had died. So just wanted to sort of bring that up and sort of maybe remember him. Thank you. With this, I end the meeting. Thank you, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]