
ICANN83 | PF – GNSO: NCSG/C Membership Work Session
Monday, June 09, 2025 – 10:45 to 12:15 CEST

ANDREA GLANDON

Hello and welcome to the NCSG Constituency Membership meeting. My name is Andrea and I am the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-harassment policy. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand and zoom.

When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute and zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. And I will now turn the floor over to Rafik. You may begin.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks, Andrea, and thanks for everyone for making it today. So, this is our first, not going to say NCSG, but non-commercial session, because this is a common session between NCSG and NPOC and NCUC. It's kind of first experiment for us, try to streamline all the session to avoid overlap. And so, we can spend time more efficiently and to sync up and to coordinate together. So, we'll see how it will go.

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.

Since this policy forum, so we just have one common session, but we can expect in the other ICANN meeting to have like, maybe full day with several sessions and we can have different block of time. So, for the agenda, as you can see, it's kind of split or divided between the three groups. We start with NCSG and then NPOC and NCUC. So, if there is no question or comment, we can move to the NCSG part.

So, we'll try here, maybe to do some adjustments since I got a request from Farzaneh. She wanted to share about the RDRS. So, you can start, Farzaneh. If you can, breathe, please.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Thank you, Rafik. Hi, everybody. Farzaneh Badiei speaking. So, for the RDRS, as you know, RDRS is the triage system. It's an experimental system that triages the request of the third parties to request domain name registrants, privates, and personal data from the registrars. We have done this as a Pilot and it's been, I think it's been doing its work for the past year. And now we need to send our recommendations based on this experiment to the council and then to the Board, essentially.

Some of the things that I wanted to discuss with you and because we have two RDRS sessions happening now. So, one thing was that RDRS is costing ICANN \$2 million, and that's very expensive, and we didn't think it would cost that much. I'm not a techie, but we thought that it's going to be like a form that triages the request and I would be done with. But each request is costing ICANN \$300. And

if you consider operational costs and development costs, each request costs \$900. And these are like rough estimates because I can't remember the exact numbers, but it's around that.

And the policy that we had before, it says that the requester has to pay, which is a good, fair policy, and we advocated for it. But we cannot expect even the richest people to pay \$300 per request to have access. So, one thing that I was thinking that I just wanted to discuss with you, if you have any objection or any comments on this, because I want to go to RDRS, and I want to say that we need to discuss this a little bit more. And what do you think about, I think that our recommendation should be that this is not financially sustainable and we cannot have ICANN permanently pay for it either.

We cannot have ICANN pay \$2 million dollars for maintaining RDRS. So, that's one thing that if you have comments, let me know. The other is the accreditation that we discussed on the mailing list. But let's see if you have comments on this one. Do you have any direction? Yeah. Okay. Tomslin, you should be very brief. Otherwise, yeah.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Quick comment. Do we know if the people who meant to pay the \$300 have concerns or have complained?

FARZANEH BADIEI

So, they don't, they haven't said anything, because I believe there are strategies that ICANN will pay for it. Okay, so for the accreditation, we had a chat on the mailing list about accreditation, especially for the law enforcement. As NCSG, we have a consensus that law enforcement should be accredited. But for the third parties, we are thinking how this third-party accreditation should happen.

One of the concerns that I have with accreditation of third parties is that if, for example, you get WIPO to accredit all these intellectual property requesters, the registrar might just hand in the domain name registrant data without doing the balancing between fundamental rights and disclosure. And that could be problematic.

So, we have to discuss this among ourselves, see what sort of models we want to have. But it seems that consensus on the mailing list was that there should be some kind of gating mechanism and accreditation for third parties as well. This is what I got from the mailing list. Okay, so great. And we have a session at the end of the week on Thursday. Article 19, Michaela and I, as non-commercial stakeholder group, have organized a session on disclosure of private sensitive data to third parties. And with a human rights lens, please attend and discuss. And it's going to be very interactive. It's at 3:30 on Thursday. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks, Farzaneh, for this. So, now I think we can go to the main agenda item here. So, this blog for NCSG will just maybe shorten it

to 15 minutes. So, here is to try to maybe give you an overview or to share about the plan for this ICANN meeting for this week. And maybe you can share the schedule just to give some highlights.

One point we could not avoid clashing with other sessions. So, like the same here for RDRS, because there are a few time slots available. But what we try to do is to, So, Andrea, can we share the schedule? So, what we try to do is we'll have our NCSG session mainly for the policy committee. So, we'll have two sessions. The idea here is to give enough time for policy discussion. So, we'll have that tomorrow. One session in the morning. I think, yeah, we have one session in the morning and one afternoon, and this I will leave to Tomslin to figure out how the best of uses of that, because we can take into account there are two GNSO sessions in the middle of the day.

The one, GNSO Council meeting with the Board, not the Board, with GAC, and then, the I'd say the informal meeting when there is discussion about the GNSO Council agenda for the public meeting. So, the best way how to use that, if you hear something, so we can discuss about, like how to vote or about some of the policy point for the council meeting. But also, to have time for the joint session. And for the joint session, we have three meetings this time.

The first with the ALAC on Wednesday. And then with the leaders of SSAC. So, just to clarify about the naming for the leaders of SSAC is that we could not get a time slot to have all the SSAC, but I think

we'll have enough representation from SSAC to visit us. And they shared several topics for discussion.

And the last day, we will have our usual meeting with our colleagues in the Non-Contracted Party House, NCSG. So, yeah, it's good to know that it's in progress. So, these are the three meetings. We could not get one with the GAC, because even if we had asked it earlier, there was no way to get one. For this time, so we'll try for a woman meeting.

And for also CPAs, there was some miscommunication, So, we just have some informal discussion with them this time, but we'll try to our best for the next meeting. So, those are what we got in terms of joint session? The last NCSG session will be on Thursday, and that's a wrap-up session. It's kind of experiment for this time, because usually for us, we finish our meetings on Tuesday, and after, we just people attend the council meeting or other session, but we don't have really time to kind of reconvene, discuss, to share our thoughts and things about the next steps.

So, for this time, we'll have that opportunity, like what the GNSO Council has. So, we'll hear from everyone about their thoughts, what we can do for next time, kind of improvement, but also next steps. And we also will use that time to meet with the finance team. There were some comments about the changes they did in the budget, so we'll have that opportunity to discuss with them. So, that's what we have, kind of, in general, and also the session

shared, before forgetting the session shared by Farzaneh at the end of the day on Thursday.

So, this is what we have. I encourage everyone to attend. I know that there is some clashing, so for those that they have to be in working group or any other session, please join if you need to be there. But we are looking to everyone to join us and we discuss those topics.

So, this is kind of a quick overview of what we have this week. And I think most important, I believe for Policy Committee, we'll have a discussion about the joint session to go into details. But we can give an idea about the topic that were suggested by the other group and by us. Maybe we can start with ALAC. Okay. So, with ALAC, it's kind of really a continuation of the last session we had in Seattle.

So, we'll discuss about the reviews, and here it will be Manju speaking for us. And then the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning the SOIs, and it will be Manju again. We will also discuss about the new ccTLD Next Round Applicant Support. I think that will be Kathy and Pedro, and the Human Rights Impact Assessment, that will be Farzaneh and Michaela.

So, just a continuation, and we are looking forward for the leads for each to prepare and kind of to help us to share our position with ALAC and see if there are any common ground. The most important is if we can follow up. It's not just to discuss for the sake of discussing, but if we can find a way to work with them on some of those topics. And also, it reminds us, it reminds me here, that we

will have a representative from our side in one, a plenary session organized by the ALAC.

I think that will be Farzaneh speaking for NCSG, and there is another session about DNS Abuse organized by the Contract Party House, and that will be Michaela speaking for NCSG. Okay, so this is the about the agenda or topics with the ALAC.

Moving to the SSAC, okay, the SSAC. I think it will be an interesting meeting for us because they are bringing their own, they present from their side, like their priorities. And then this about Safer Cyber and the NCAP. I think this is the non-collusion, I forget what stand agreement, but I think this name collusion. But on our side, we want to discuss about accuracy, disclosure of private data, DNS Abuse, and DNS blocking. And DNS blocking is because I believe they have issued lately a report on the topic.

So, we'll see how we'll cover all this. But the most important, first, really first time to discuss with SSAC, we want to hear from them, but also to share from our side about our perspective in several of those topics. The SSAC as advisory committee, has kind of in, let's say, interesting membership. It's an opportunity to interact with them and try to influence, if possible, some of their position on what they are delivering as reports.

The last meeting will be with the CSG. Nothing surprising here. First, we'll start with kind of quite exciting topic about the Board seat 14. We'll discuss about the procedure and then about the GNSO leadership election. So, that's coming soon. They proposed

some topic like How We Meet proposal from ICANN and then the ICP-2. This is kind of particular topic to RIR, I mean, the internet Registry. The ICPCP wanted to share, so it can be interesting. And the last kind of brainstorming, issues of common ground.

So, the most important when meeting with CSG is really to find those common ground and try to work with them. Okay, so I should stop here. I think I gave a quick overview about what we are trying to do this week, the session, the topic, and looking forward to hear from you about your comment, input, suggestion, or any concern. Okay, yes, Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS

I was just going to ask the topic of the ALAC plenary that Farzaneh is joining.

RAFIK DAMAK

Two sessions about DNS Abuse. Okay, Farzaneh and the Michaela.

FARZANEH BADIEI

So, Rafik, I just wanted to know, does GAC feel that they need to respond to our letter that we sent to them on HRA?

RAFIK DAMAK

Good and hard question. I mean, when we sent them the letter, even though we didn't get direct acknowledgement, but when I checked with the GAC stuff, it was published, so they know it. So,

it's published in their website. Something we'll try maybe to check, like, informally with the leadership of the GAC here to see if there is any reaction or any comment about this.

FARZANEH BADIEI

I need to make a comment

RAFIK DAMAK

Yeah, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI

So, for the topics that is of our interest, there's one that is accuracy and we have a Small Team at the GNSO Council that we are working on, and there's another one that is of NCSG's interest is DNS Abuse, obviously. You have another Small Team at the GNSO Council and we periodically send you information about the development of that group, but these are the things that we need to follow. And we also, like in our conversation with SSAC, because they also care about accuracy, we want to bring our own perspective that accuracy is about contactability and not about identification of the domain name registrant.

And also, like for the ALAC session on the DNS Abuse mitigation, I'm not going to say anything extraordinary, like all the things that we have consensus on. But I will send a short paragraph on what I'm going to cover. Also, on the informal, so there is this informal report on DNS Abuse mitigation, on DNS Abuse that ICANN has

commissioned. And I believe that we need to discuss that on the mailing list or during a policy committee. And because in a way, in some sessions, they keep invoking this report to back up their policy positions. And I don't think the report is quite ready. That was not the purpose of the report, anyway.

RAFIK DAMAK

Okay. Thanks, Farzaneh. Let's see if there is any comment.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Thank you. Michaela, for the record. No, just to say there's a number of different DNS Abuse sessions, so just to not to feel like it's overload, but I do feel like each of them brings a slightly different angle on the topic. So, the one that I understand Farzaneh is on will give a good overview, a kind of cross-community overview of the kind of work that ICANN can and should be doing to target and kind of address DNS Abuse mitigation.

And then the one that I will be on with the contracted parties House, the idea is to make it interactive. They'll be giving us live scenarios. So, you'll see me struggle live to try to respond to how we should be addressing individual scenarios of DNS Abuse. So, I think they're very complimentary. So, we'd love to see as many of you at both those sessions. And I believe there's a GAC session on DNS Abuse as well. And perhaps one more that I'm missing. But yeah, just excited to see you guys at those.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks, Michaela. Between the DNS Abuse session and another DNS Abuse session, there is a DNS Abuse session. But I think it's a good indicator that it's a hot topic and it's coming. And when I had a meeting with Kurtis Andras a few weeks ago, that's what he also, I think, brought as a kind of hot topic. So, we can expect there are more discussions. And here is, yeah. I don't want to say the word strategize, but we need to figure out what will be our position.

We know what we stand for, but it's more like how, if there is a PDP or whatever thing, it will start. How we should get involved, how we will operationalize that. Because there are some reports, I think, Net Bacon, and there are some other reports about this. I believe they are talking about some PDP. That's what they are proposing. So, yes, Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS

No, just there is an applicant paper that presents some ideas and goals on PDPS and so on. I can share the paper with you guys if it's not on the list already. But also, it's supposedly going to, I mean, some parts of the community will also introduce their ideas around PDPs today or tomorrow in some different sessions. So, I mean, that's probably, we need to keep track of that, as Michaela was saying, and keep track of our interventions on the topic. Just that.

RAFIK DAMAK

Yes, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Farzaneh Badiei speaking. So, about the PDP on DNS Abuse, As the Small Team and GNSO Council is working on this issue, we are considering different reports, different scenarios. And so, to be honest, for us, the human rights defenders and digital rights activists, some of these DNS Abuse issues can be human rights issues, like phishing, for example. Some governments like to phish their civil society actors to have access to their private information.

So, while we haven't been vocally against having a PDP about the issue, it's just that we don't think that it's such urgent matter and we have to carefully discuss what our options are in order to tackle the issue of DNS Abuse at ICANN. Some of the issues can be tackled at ICANN, and some of them should be tackled outside of ICANN. So, we have to discuss this a little bit more whether, first of all, we think that there should be a PDP and how that PDP should be convened and what sort of format it should get, and what is the scoping, what sort of issues it should address.

In my personal opinion, I don't see that we might have to give up on certain things. And we might have to agree to a PDP, but I think it should be very narrow and very contextualized, and it should not be a PDP about DNS Abuse. Then we are going to have many, many issues inside of that PDP that we cannot even come up with policies.

RAFIK DAMAK

Okay, thanks Farzaneh for being mindful about the time, but want to check if there is any other comment? Question intervention? Okay, I don't see any. So, with that, maybe we can move to the next block or agenda item that will be with NPOC and we'll leave that to Juan.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS

Thank you Rafik, this is Juan for the record. Okay, we have only 30 minutes, But I don't want to pass the opportunity to congratulate all the newly elected people from the executive committee in NPOC. We have the newly appointed, newly elected, sorry, it's Yao as a policy chair. It was starting after a Muscat meeting. But congratulations for your election, Yao, as a policy chair. He is here as a crop recipient. But we also have here our executive committee.

Over there, it's Caleb. He was re-elected. We have a Bolutife over here. He was also re-elected. Emmanuel is our outgoing policy chair. I'm sorry, I was forgetting. I was skipping you, sorry. But you are still in position, so you are. Okay, so just for a kind of introduction, my name is Juan Manue Rojas, and I was also re-elected. I think it's my last term as a chair from NPOC.

So, as I said before, Yao is here to talk a little bit about his experience. Do you want to add something? No? Okay, sorry. But Yao, despite being elected as a policy chair, recently elected, he's

involved in Youth IGF Benin, if I am not wrong. So, he's coming here as a crop recipient because he lives over here in Austria, I think, and he's going to talk a little bit about his experience on youth IGF. So, Yao, the floor is yours. Go ahead, please.

YAO AMEVI SOSSOU

Thank you, Juan. And yeah, this is Yao for the record. Before I start, I want to thank all the community members that voted for me for the position of policy chair. And I'm looking forward to still have your support for the work here to be done. Thank you very much.

Yeah, I wanted to talk about the experience of working with the Youth IGF in Benin, and here I want to focus on talking about the barriers that I think I also experienced facing youth who are in terms of engaging in the PDP processes in the ICANN, general speaking. First, what I've noticed, the language we speak, of course, I know there's a guide, a beginner guide on our website to help navigate all this process, but still. Access to the complex language and the ICANN processes is very difficult for the young people, especially those I've been engaging with in Benin. And they are not familiar with the policy processes, as I said, and how the policy processes inside ICANN are governed.

So, what I've been trying to do since 2020, I didn't mention that since 2020, I've been advocating through Mission Public about getting the normal, like ordinary citizens' voices heard when it comes to policy and internet governance in general. So, that's something that is very dear to me. I wanted to make sure that all

the ordinary citizens of everyday life have their voices heard in the IG processes, in general speaking.

And one stakeholder group in that, ordinary citizens, are the youth that have been working with directly since 2020. And since 2023, we were able to start the Youth IGF initiative under the umbrella of the IGF, General IGF Secretariat. So, I will try to convey a comprehensive and I will simplify the language that I learned myself through the IGF ICANN processes and explaining it to the youth. And also sharing with them some resources like the Wiki available for the acronyms to be learned, and also the beginner guide on the NPOC website.

Next slide, please. So, as I said, we started the Youth IGF in Benin in May 2023. And back then, I was still based in Austria, but navigating through continent, going back home, trying to see everything's working perfectly. So, the first edition was in May 2023. And then we had the second edition last year, 2024, in July. It was also a memorable moment because particularity of that last year edition, where we were in two different cities.

We had one hub in the north, which I moderated, and another hub in the south, which was not done before. Usually, it was centralized in one location, so not many young people were able to join. So, in this year's edition, we also wanted to do the IGF, Youth IGF in July. In particularity of this edition, we are inviting all youth delegates from the 77 districts in Benin, the communes, to join. At least three representatives for these communities to join us during our

discussion. And we are going to work on our agenda, centralize around different elements, mainly capacity building for the young people in digital skills and making sure they are represented in the discussions.

Policy issues make the youth voices heard in this policy space. I also have to notice that in terms of digital policy development in Francophone Africa, this is not really something we are doing that much. So, bringing the youth voices in this process, making them aware of the policies that are being developed and being put in place is a great opportunity to give to them. And yeah, it's going to be multisectoral engaging. Both for the policy makers, the legislators, the government, civil society and civil society organizations as well, and the government and local collectivities.

Next slide, please. And yeah, our goal for Next Slide 2025 is to empower youth, as I said, and also present to them how they can effectively engage in the ICANN ecosystem. And help give them opportunity to amplify their voice. Next slide, please. The different tracks we are proposing for this 2025 edition of the Youth IGF in Benin is around DNS literacies.

We already have a DNS Forum Academy in Benin, but still not many youths have opportunity to train that. So, we wanted to have a track on that also. And about cyber security and awareness, this is a burning topic, burning right now. And we want to make sure the youth know about it and are more educated about the issue. And

about also internet's open principles, some didn't know about that. And we want to bring that back again.

And yeah, Universal Acceptance is also something we want to address and present. And we're inviting, at least, official letters have not been issued yet, but I can give stakeholders to join and present those issues as well with us. Next slide. Yeah, this final message is to, you all know that engaging with young people is very important when we want to prepare next generation of those who are going to tackle key issues and empowering them is very important.

So, that's what I've been trying to do for 4-5 years now and engaged actively since 2023, which is three years. So, I am looking forward to learn from how you have been doing this also in your part of the world and what could be lesson, common lessons to learn and share with the youth back in Benin so that they are getting more involved, both nationally, locally and then globally. Thank you very much.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS

Thank you to you, Yao, for this amazing presentation. But I would like to know if anyone has any comments or questions for Yao at this time.

DANA CRAMER

I have a question as far as this side. Congratulations, it sounds really great to see you again since last year. Like, just seeing what

topics you're doing, I'm curious about how the call for topics went in Benin for you because, like for me, I do the youth IGF in Canada and we have like a bit of an uphill learning gap. That part of the youth IGF almost needs to also educate youth on what internet governance is and all of its different areas. And we tend to also loop in a bit of national policy, too.

And with, like, such very, I guess, heavy ICANN topics, did that come up in your call for topics and how you started to propose your agenda from a bottom-up way, Or were you guys, essentially, as a multi-stakeholder, like, youth group, proposing these topics to your youth community? Who were then in agreement? Like, how did that feedback loop go? And sorry, Dana Kramer, for the record.

YAO AMEVI SOSSOU

Yeah, thank you very much for the question. Yeah, actually, the topic of this year's edition is giving the young generation means to prepare themselves for a digital economy. So, donner la voix aux jeunes, bénir numérique, inclusive in French. So, it was a bottom-up approach. We actually first sent a form to ask for, we have key topics. And then they pick. One day a major a topic that came was a cyber security issue, because cyber bullying and the privacy, online privacy, data protection.

So, in on the actual agenda which is being worked on in progress. We actually have those topics and the ICANN related topics we brought, we have this agenda item called ICANN and Opportunities in ICANN ecosystem. So, this is where we are going to tackle all the

ICANN related issues. But apart from that, we have different agenda, for example, intergenerational dialogue with the legislators, like the MPs and members from the parliament. So, they have interactive discussion with the youth.

The other topic, you mentioned the Covid issue, but this is different experience on the different part of the world, but as of now, it was not an issue raised, so that's why we didn't brought that up in the agenda for the moment. But yeah, thank you.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS

Thank you again. I would like to know, again, if anyone has any more comment or question for Yao right now? No? Right. I just have a quick question, comment, maybe. It's like, okay, we know that it's very difficult to organize these kinds of spaces, mainly when we are civil society organizations. So, my question is related, are you doing this Youth IGF separately from IGF, major IGF in Benin, or you are doing at the same time with this kind of organization? Because my question is related more to the, how do you get sponsors to do that? Do you have a call for sponsors or you have to contact each one of them, or how do you do that? Thank you.

YAO AMEVI SOSSOU

That's a tough question, Juan. I am also personally a part of the National IGF in Benin. Last IGF, I was part of a mag as well to support the organizing team. And yeah, we are actually working in

this collaboration with all stakeholders in the internet ecosystem we call that in Benin. And regarding funding, our major supporter for this activity is still the ISOC for the ISOC Foundation. And this year, we are still waiting for their support and we are grateful for that support. But apart from that, also through networking and people we know are relevant to the topic, there are key, I would call stakeholders in the internet ecosystem, like the providers of the .Pegi, for example.

We contacted them and they are supporting their capacity as well. And yes, this year also, we had the chance to have one private university who decided to give us money to support for the organization. And we are still waiting for the local community leaders to give us any kind of support they will have. We are still working with everybody together, but it's a collaborative effort. Those people we know, we reach out to them, they can refer to us and to support us in the organization of this thing. It's very tough, I have to admit.

So, if it's not from the support of the IGF, ISOC Association, and also parts IGF-SA, those are our major funding. IGF-SA and then the ISOC Foundation. Those are the two funding that help us do what we do, if I can put it this way. And then other supporters come as in-kind support and also some goodies for us. Thank you.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS

Thank you again for that. That's why I was in Weston, because you know that it's not so easy to find who sponsored this kind of events

or spaces. I think that's all for our time, but I don't know if I have any one final comment or question for this part of the session. No, I think so. All right. Bolutife?

BOLUTIFE ADISA

I'll just like to quickly commend Yao as well, because I think in addition to this, he has also contributed to a few Public Comments for NCSG. We are happy to have you on board as our new policy chair. Thank you very much.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS

Thank you, Bolutife, for that. We have, I think this is a policy session, policy meeting session. But we are writing a comment On Policy Status Report. It's about expired domain deletion policy, I'm sorry, and expired registration recovery policy. And we are writing that. If you have some time to do, please go ahead. It's me who is the penholder this time. But I would like everyone to check if has anything to add or comment in that writing that we are making.

So, it's about the PSR on expired domain deletion and expired registration recovery policies, EDDP and ERRP. So, that's it for now. I think I go back to Rafik; I think. Thank you very much.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks, Juan. Thanks, Yao. Okay, now moving to the next blog course section for NCUC.

WISDOM DONKOR

Thank you very much, Rafik. Yes, my name is Wisdom Donkor, the chair for NCUC. Yes, we have a simple one. We will be updating on Operational Procedures that will be handled by Pedro, and I will also be talking about the quarterly webinars that we are initiating, and we end up with the media and then communication. So, before Pedro comes in, I will take up the quarterly webinars.

Yes, we did identify that we need to have a way of reaching out to the vast majority of non-commercials within the world. So, we came up with the quarterly webinar so that every EC will look within their region and then reach out more to the non-commercials. So, for this first quarterly webinar, we are looking at bringing five speakers from the five regions to discuss a particular topic, maybe understanding the issues that are going on within those regions. And then onwards, then we look for one topic and then we all come together and then discuss.

After this meeting, communication will be communicated to members to nominate persons within the regions, one person within the region, then we'll bring all together and then we look for a moderator that will help us moderate this session. And also, we'll also be communicating to call for one particular topic that resonate within all these regions for us to discuss. So, that is for the webinar and then with the operational procedure, Pedro and Namra, they are leading this, so I will call him to give an update on that.

PEDRO LANA

Thanks, Wisdom. Pedro Lanna for the records. I think this is better. So, just to update, most of what I'm going to say is on the final part of the Operating Procedures. So, all the members can know what we are doing and what's the timeline of what we are doing. We started a review of the Operating Procedures a few weeks ago. We are going to review, as decided, just an important thing before starting, the Operating Procedures demand that we form a task force with NCUC members, and this task force is the main responsible for reviewing the whole thing. And as decided with this task force, we are reviewing sections 1 to 11 of the Operating Procedures this initial scoping of what could be reviewed was made by the NCUC EC.

Those reviews happen on bi-weekly meetings, once per two weeks, and the same day, the same hour, as also decided with the task force. Me and Namra, as Wisdom already said, are the Penholders. We chose to do that because the Operating Procedures also demand that we have at least one EC member in all of the task force meetings, so this kind of solved by making the pin holders the same as the EC members.

Most of the work is done asynchronously through a working doc of group of sections that are being reviewed per each meeting. And to be sure that the time is optimized in these efforts, what we do is that our suggestions of change, our suppressions, all the things that members think is important to improve on the Operating

Procedures should be done before the meeting starts. So, any other suggestions that happen during the meetings are not accepted.

So, this way, people actually direct their efforts to the asynchronous time and they can optimize. At the end, we'll have just three meetings to review the whole Operating Procedures. We have already done section 1 and 2, which is almost one third of the OP. Ops, Operating Procedures. And let me check here. The scope of what we are doing in general lines is to improve readability, solving some language and wording that was on the documents, solving gaps. For example, the limits to NCUC HR elections, we have a definition from the original ones. We implicitly understood that this happened to the chair at the NCUC chair as well, so we are making it clear on the operating procedure.

This is still a suggestion, it's not been decided yet, but also creating clear accountability rules for the leadership, reviewing institutions that are currently not working properly or could have some improvements, institutions and procedures instead there. And some outdated provisions, such as the use of Trello, which we don't use anymore.

We have already done the first part of the whole timeline, which was creating the dedicated task force, the mailing list where the work is done, defining the dates and the calendar. We are now on the second part, which is from day 15 to day 60. Which the task force uses to work on the drafts, and then, at the end, submit the

document to the EC, outlining proposed revisions and additions. Then, from day 61 to day 74, the EC will share recommendations via the NCUC discussed leaves for a 13-day Public Comment Period.

The next 30 days after this EC instruction, penholders will incorporate feedback and provide textual revision. 30 days after the draft submission, the EC will do a final, will approve the suggestions of the penholders, and there will be a final member consultation during another five-day Public Comment period. And then, within 15 days after those comment closes, the EC will resolve outstanding issues and approve the final procedures by majority votes, and then the chair will publish the new procedures. Also, there will be a possibility of appeals during five business days after publication. This is all on this timeline.

This whole procedure is demanded by the OP, but just so everyone can know and can also participate in the process through these comments when they open. Thank you.

WISDOM DONKOR

Thank you very much, Pedro. And we'll move to media and communication. Call on Pedro and Sarah. They are leading this.

AMIN HACHA

Amin.

WISDOM DONKOR

Amin? Okay.

AMIN HACHA

My name is Amin. Hi, everyone. Again. Just a quick update about the media and the communication committee in NCUC. Sarah and me, we work with a committee member to update and maintain the data, which is already in the website and we try to save the data there and we are in. We already finalizing the mapping of the new website of NCUC, where we are working to make it more-easy to be easy to access for who want to know more about the NCUC.

We had recently many times have the problem of blocking in our website and we lose for a few days. The website and thanks to Tapani, always is ready to help us to reach the website working again. So, this is the main point we are already working on and also, we are working on the new design of the website. This all from my side, I'll give to Sara to modify if I missed something.

SARA ALI MOHAMED

Hi everyone, it's Sara. Thank you. I don't have major changes to what Amin just said, but I do have a little bit of addition I would like to highlight, like regarding the media and communication work. Our main focus has been on the website. We have put together a clear outline for its structure, keeping in mind the newcomers' perspectives.

So, the goal is to make sure that anyone visiting the site is easily to understand what NCUC and how to get involved without feeling

lost or overwhelmed. And for the social media, the Working Group will focus on the publicity and content sharing, ensuring regular updates and announcements and engaging content will be published. We are also setting a shared folder that will be updated by the EC members so that the information that will be accurate and regularly updated. That's all from my side.

WISDOM DONKOR

Thank you very much, Amin and Sara. So, at this point we open up for discussion, if there are any questions, comments. It looks like we are all okay. Yes, but then, just to add a little to the quarterly webinar, we are looking at first week or second week in July. The EC is going to decide on this after this meeting. So, Rafik, at this point, that is all that we have.

RAFIK DAMAK

Okay. Thanks, Wisdom. Okay, in terms of time, we are doing too much well. So, we have, like, I believe, more than 30 minutes left in the meeting, but we can do good usage of that. So, the first time we at NCSG part, we discussed about the plan for the week and the joint session. So, we can try maybe to start discussing some of them, since we will also talk in the policy meeting so we can start with some substance.

We can go through, maybe the order. The first meeting will be with ALAC on Wednesday. And I think, yeah, thanks Andrea for sharing the agenda. Again, we will go through the same topic like last time,

but we'd like here maybe to ask first Manju about the two topics, how she wants kind of to introduce and what she wants maybe to highlight, so kind of the way how we can steer the discussion with ALAC about those two topics, in particular to take into account what just happened related to ATRT4 and so on.

MANJU CHEN

So, I don't know if NCSG has a strong opinion on this. I guess this is what we can discuss now, because, according to the Board decision, very recently they stopped, well, they postponed the ATRT4, and then they also actually concluded the Pilot Holistic Review. I think we anticipate the postponed, but I don't know if we anticipated the conclusion of Pilot Holistic Review.

I wonder how we think about it, because what I heard is ALAC is extremely unhappy about it. But I don't know if we have the same attitude. And if we don't, I think it will be a good chance, a good time for us to talk it through and understand why they're unhappy and kind of explore other ways for us to work together and asking the Board for more explanations, or asking for more options to conduct a more transparent and accountable reviews. So, that would be my take. I think we will hear them first because they have stronger feelings and then we can try to respond.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks. Okay, I will comment, and then-- Thanks, Manju. I think we can expect that strong position because they are one of the

groups that are supporting the Holistic Review. From our side, I don't think we were super fond of the Holistic Review per se, but regardless of that, we need to take into account, in terms of process or procedure, what does it mean and what the impact on the future. So, we have a question from Kathy. Chris Kind of come here. Maybe he wants to respond and clarify. But first, let's go with Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN

So, a question and then a comment, and then I'll hand it back. So, for those of us who've been following other issues, when you say that ICANN concluded the Pilot Holistic Review, what happened to it? It would be useful to know before we went in, because I don't know. Did they throw it out? Did they incorporate things? Did they decide to move forward with other things?

The other thing is, there's one more type of review that's likely to come up tomorrow. And that's what's called, ICANN's trying to call it, the specific reviews. And as of the meeting that we had in Seattle, ALAC and NCSG, in our own comments, are calling it the independent specific reviews, the old independent reviews. ICANN's trying to throw them out. And we're like, no, no, no. That's what we were using. To help what the world was using to help review ICANN and the ICANN Board. There's a reason they want to throw it out.

So, I just wanted to let you know that our comments and ALAC's comments were very much aligned on the independent specific

reviews. And because they sent us a draft of their comments after the meeting that we had together in Seattle. So, that may come up as well tomorrow. That what I think the Board did with that is, I think they accepted our comments, our comments, their comments, also BC's comments, other groups, saying, wait a second, you're moving too fast on this. ICANN staff cannot throw out the independent reviews and come up with an ICANN supervised set of rules for new reviews. But something's happening on that. So, anyway, third type of review, where we try to figure out together where ICANN wants to go on that.

RAFIK DAMAK

Okay. Thanks, Kathy. Tomslin was in the queue. And then maybe I can go to Chris.

KATHY KLEIMAN

Sorry, there was a question from Angie, I apologize, about what's happening with the Holistic Pilot Reviews. Sorry, I think that's a question for Chris.

KATHY KLEIMAN

But when you say concluded, what does that mean?

MANJU CHEN

It's what's listed in the Board's resolution, so nobody of us knows what it means, only Chris will know.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thanks, Rafik. Yeah, I was actually going to make a comment about what ALAC is really unhappy about. And having a conversation with their leadership yesterday, it does appear that there is a very specific area that they would like addressed. And that's the fact that by pausing the reviews, ICANN is in violation of the bylaws of ATRT4, which hasn't started. So, they would like that to be addressed first before the review of reviews or in parallel.

So, I just wanted to add that context so that when we discuss it, we might want to think about what specific things, too, we want to suggest as solutions. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks, Tomslin, for giving this background. Chris, I think you have several questions. And yeah, if you can really clarify, because some of us read the resolution, but maybe we don't have all the--

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

I can certainly try. Thanks, Rafik. So, Chris Buckridge, Board member, speaking for the record. Yeah, this is a very live, hot topic at the moment. There was a very interesting session this morning with ALAC to kick off the meeting with this topic. And there have been some very strong and legitimate arguments made by ALAC members.

And I think we've touched on some of those, particularly the bylaws issue is something that the Board is very cognizant of, and it is a very serious situation, which we would like to remedy as quickly as possible. But we need to do it in a way that is going to address what came out of ATR3, identifying deficiencies or need for evolution, improvement of how that accountability and transparency, and reviews more generally, are done by the ICANN community.

So, I think what we see as the Board is, well, sorry, I should go back to some of the more specific questions. On the Pilot Holistic Review, and I think it's really important to be very clear about that term, the Pilot Holistic Review, which was not the Holistic Review asked for by ATR3. It was a project established to define that Holistic Review. What we heard as the Board from the leadership of the pilot Holistic Review was that there was confusion and misaligned expectations of what that group... Was supposed to do, and perhaps what a Holistic Review, as defined or as identified in ATR3, was supposed to do.

And that there didn't seem to be in the current configuration of the Pilot Holistic Review a way forward that would reach the resolution and the conclusion that it needed to. So, the Board, in talking with the leadership there, took a step back. And part of that step back, including concluding the Pilot Holistic Review, saying, thank you for the work that has been done here, but we need to step back and maybe re-evaluate the approach that's been taken and that took us to the point we're at now.

What I think the Board would hope to see this week, and moving forward well, is what we've called a community dialogue. And where we've said we're looking ahead to the Oman meeting as a sort of marker for significant progress at that. Potentially, it could happen even more quickly than that. But I think Tomslin's point about focusing on what are the practical steps that will get us out of this situation. We find ourselves in with a need to address how we improve and evolve our accountability mechanisms, our reviews, while also acknowledging there. We find ourselves in this situation where we are not in compliance with the bylaws and would very much prioritize rectifying that situation.

So, I think what as Board we're looking for is ideas, suggestions, practical steps to review for what a review of reviews can look like. In the current structures or using new structures. potentially, I mean, the resolution from the Board is to defer ATR4. ATR4 may still be a valuable element of that process.

One of the reasons, I think there was discussion in the Board and discussion with the community of a more tightly focused and contained ATR4 that could actually address these issues. There were then concerns, I think, that that kind of containment is not something that the Board or even some of the community in sort of anticipation of ATR4, can place on that scope, and so this was not really seen as something that would be viable or would reliably lead to a solution here.

I would be really interested to hear if we were wrong about that, or if there is a strong community feeling that, yes, there is a possibility to constrain an ATR from the outset and use it for this very specific and very essential work that needs to be done. But that's very much my personal idea or thought on how we could expeditiously move from the situation we find ourselves in. But I think there will be numerous opportunities to discuss this during the week with different constituencies, different formations in the corridors, in grab me, grab my fellow Board members. I can only stress that all of the Board members share the sense of urgency and importance of resolving this and resolving it in a way that moves us forward. So, pleased to engage. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMAK

Okay. Thanks, Chris. We need to talk to them, not to grab them, literally. Okay.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

There is a code of conduct.

RAFIK DAMAK

So, Tomslin, please go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thanks, Rafik. About whether we could use ATRT4 in a tightly scoped manner. I know that there have been concerns about whether we can actually achieve that, but I also heard other

concerns, I think, from the ASOs, the Address Support Organization, and ccNSO, that if it were possible to use an existing vehicle to address this, that's probably preferable. And it could solve the problem of the bylaws. I know that the community needs to provide input on whether we should use a new vehicle or use this existing vehicle in some way to solve the problem. But I think that's a question I'm putting to NCSG now. What does NCSG think?

KATHY KLEIMAN

Who wants to respond to Tomslin's.

RAFIK DAMAK

I have a question, Tomslin. What kind of vehicles you are talking about?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Okay. Say, the vehicle I'm talking about here is ATRT4, for example, as the platform to address the review of reviews, or a tightly scoped review of reviews, or a new procedure or platform to do that.

RAFIK DAMAK

I mean, so bring back, I mean, to start ATRT4 and that will be its scope, kind of to work on the review of reviews. Anyone else want to give a short like to see what we see? So, what's your question exactly here? What do you want to ask, exactly?

KATHY KLEIMAN

What do I want to ask? First, hello, Chris. And thank you. Thank you and the Board for listening. We really appreciate it. I don't think people say that enough. So, let me say it again. Thank you. What you got with the comments on the independent specific reviews across the community seemed to be we're going too fast. And it sounds like with the review of reviews, we're all taking a step back to look at everything together. So, that's great.

The other thing you should know is that the Board's been thinking about this a lot more than the community's been thinking about this. We've been working very hard to finish the New gTLD Guidebook. And I don't know if you know how many meetings a week those groups have been having. And everyone's been participating actively here and in other communities. There were four sets of comments on that. Now we're in a fifth round of comments.

So, our community has been busy pushing out the New gTLD Program and the Applicant Support Program and all the work associated with that. So, now we're taking a big breath. So, I think mentally, everybody, there may be two different places on this. But the review of reviews, so here's my specific question, and I'll frame it. In the last round of comments on the specific reviews, a very specific set of ideas was put forward, and I think we're moving back from that and saying, no, let's do a Holistic Review. Has ICANN Org, or the ICANN Board, particularly the ICANN Board, kind of put out any ideas to frame the discussion of the review, of reviews, or a big picture of what it might look like? Is there anything we can look at

that reflects the fact that you've been thinking about this for a lot and just kind of where your big picture thinking is as a starting point?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

So, yeah, thanks for that, Kathy. And I do, I'm very aware of the huge amount of community work going into the Next Round and how much time that takes. So, I very much appreciate it and I'm grateful for that.

In terms of the boards thinking, I'm not sure this is quite what you're looking for, but I do think even in sort of the resolutions that you've seen come out recently, there is a recognition that the CIP work is addressing one element of what ATR3 identified as not working optimally, and the Board sees that work as progressing in the way that it should. It is productive. It is leading to a new status quo of how the organizational reviews are done.

When it comes to specific reviews, I'm not sure we have quite the framing yet that you're talking about. And I think part of this process is to get to that and particularly. So, yeah, ATR4 is now the sort of the issue that is very much front of mind for everyone. But yes, there are other specific reviews and they are also so currently in deferral, pending resolution of what came out of ATR3, pending resolution now of the ATR4 question and discussion.

I think that's possibly at this stage what we have for you and hope to sort of build, and I absolutely agree with you and share the desire

to have a sort of, even a sort of sketch in mind that we can work to, or work away from, if we decide, it's not what we need. Yeah. Having a straw person, let's say, would be really useful at this point. Maybe this week is an opportunity for us to get to something like that.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks, Chris. Yes, Tomslin, please go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Yes, just to repeat the question I'd asked. I understand it wasn't clear. So, the question was, considering that there are other parts of the community that are insisting on ATRT4 starting regardless so that we're not in violation of the Bylaws. The question I was asking is, there are some others who are now considering whether we could use ATRT4 for those review of reviews that Chris mentioned, or should we go with not knowing what we're going to do? But just going to those conversations, community conversations of how should we do the review of reviews without having a specific proposal of the how or where we should have those.

So, that's the question I was trying to pose, whether we should use the existing ATRT4 or we should be proposing something else for the review of reviewers.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks, Tomslin. I can give it right here. Question and comment, because first, I'm not sure if how we can scope for the ATRT4, if it's that review team itself will make the scoping, or we will give them directly from the beginning. So, I don't have that answer. So, I'm not sure if we can do that or not. So, it's something to clarify.

The other point, and this is more response here. I would really encourage the Board to avoid bringing any new creature or new vehicles, or new something to do. Please, let's avoid that, because we will spend a lot of time just to discuss the best procedure, who should be there, etcetera. And I don't think that's the best usage of our time. So, ATRT4 is there for some reason, even before the IANA Stewardship Transition. In terms of the accountability, so that's maybe the right vehicle. The question here is more like, we need to clarify how we can do the scoping. And it should come from the community, not from the Board.

It's really from the community, like how we want what they should review, and then we can add that review of review. So, that's my kind of comment here, but yeah, it's more seeking for clarification, see what's feasible.

Anyone else want to give it a try? Okay, I have maybe a question to Chris. So, we understand that the Board took this decision after long thinking, but you were enough aware of the risks when you took this decision about the impact in terms of violating the bylaws, but also that can trigger some process to remove the Board. I mean, you were really clear about that, I mean, because

we don't know how you reach this position. I know, we know that there are some discussions but or dialogue. But so, I'm just really sure how, how you could reach such position, because one personal take for me is, in many times the Board, it's not this Board, but for many years, that kind of trying to take some liberties and how to interpret what is really the public interest or how the fiduciary responsibility. So that says just wanted to be sure, like how we reached this position and understanding about the risks.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

So, I think, well, there's a couple of points that maybe are worth stressing. I mean, one is that this decision, this most recent resolution, is not what brought us into lack of compliance with the bylaws. We have essentially been out of compliance with the bylaws in relation to the ATR4 a number of years now, which is not a great argument for anything, I should be very clear about. But we find ourselves in this situation and I think the Board is looking to ways to resolve it. And with a sense that simply starting ATR at this point would not help the overarching situation of addressing the fact that the existing review mechanisms are seen by many in the community, not all, but many, as insufficient or lacking in some in some regard.

I can only say I think, yes, we are very aware of the risks involved, we're very aware of what may be a result of these decisions. And it was a question of balancing those risks against how do we steer

this discussion, steer this process towards the resolution that was mooted and identified as necessary in ATRT3.

So, I think we don't see this as out of step with what the community has expressed as a need. We now find ourselves in some degree of conflict with elements in the community as to whether this is the right path to take. And that's a very legitimate discussion and something we're very open to talking about, not simply to say this is the way, this is what we're going to do. I think we're looking for input from the community and guidance here. But, yeah, in terms of balancing the risks, I think we as the Board, we're very cognizant of the risks involved.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks, Chris. Okay, let's see if there are any other comments or questions. Checking the Zoom. Manju, go ahead.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you, Rafik. So, can we conclude or agree that when we're meeting with the ALAC, we can say that we sympathize their anger. But are we willing to kind of work together if they're asking to, for example, co-sign a letter or whatsoever? Are we happy with considering this? And should we be presenting the idea that we think it's better to not do a review of review out of nowhere? We should use existing vehicle, which was, I think it's a good idea for all of us to agree on. That would be our points when we're discussing this too. Are we okay with that?

RAFIK DAMAK

So, we still have chance maybe to discuss more tomorrow, But I will reframe it as more that we don't have necessarily final decision or position, but we are open to those options. And not just empathize, but tell we can share some of the concerns. And so, we just to kind of open the door to work with them and see, also to hear if they have any other specific point that can interest us, but I think here just we reframe it in the way we are open those option we heard and something we are thinking about and see if they are for or not. But doesn't preclude us to go on our own way later on.

If we find common ground, that will be great. Okay, yes, so we have six minutes left, so maybe we can just cover the other one about the SOI. I think this is less controversial because we are in a strong, violent agreement here. But just here, maybe what do you think, Manju, how we can be more concrete on this just than a kumbaya, or we say that we're all on the same page?

MANJU CHEN

Sorry, actually here, I think we are strongly agreeing within the say order group, but I don't think ALAC is so much aligned with us in the sense that they kind of have their own understanding of what it means to have a transparent SOI. So, I guess first we really have to hear what they have, what they think of the updated document that's provided by the Board. I think within NCSG, we are happy to see the updated one because it added the enforcement of how to

enforce the SOI and the kind of in a sense, penalties, if you don't apply if you don't follow the rules.

And I mean, that's the best we can get, I guess, in a sense that we don't have any legal system to do any more penalties or whatsoever. But I will be very interested in what they have to say.

KATHY KLEIMAN

And as long as we're saying, "thank you", I wanted to thank Manju on this issue, because you led this at the council level. You were the chair of this. And whatever happened at the council level, the issues were raised and brought forward in a way that allowed them to continue to be forward. So, you were the leader of NCSG and in the GNSO, in the community. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks, Kathy. What happened in the council doesn't stay in the council. Okay. So, yeah, Manju, I think it's a good approach to hear to avoid any misunderstanding, to see what they are thinking and what their position. And again, we are always open to see if there is anything we can follow up. If not, it's good to know what they think, since here, it's the expectations to what's the community input for this, and then it will come back to the Board. Okay, any comment on this? So, we have three minutes left, I don't think we can really have enough time to cover the rest. But still, we will continue tomorrow with. That will be then managed by Tomlin.

And so, we will go through the rest of the ALAC session and SSAC and the CSG.

Okay, so maybe we can wrap up here. Sorry, maybe there were some confusions that we had to rearrange things. So, no plan to resist the first contact with the enemy, they say. But I think we kind of did well in terms of covering several topics from our first session. And we'll try to kind of get any input, your reaction, how we can improve, like this common session with NPOC and NCSG. So, next time in Oman, it will be kind of more, hopefully, the whole day. And then we'll try to use each session as kind of a time slot as a blog. So, we'll try to find, maybe by theme or to organized with the two constituencies. But other than that, I want to thank you all for joining us today and looking forward for this week. Thanks everyone. See you later.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]