

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN64 Kobe
GNSO – NCSG Policy Committee
Monday, 11 March 2019 at 13:30 JST**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Okay, hello, everyone. This is our NCSG Policy Committee Meeting. So this is the opportunity we have before the Constituency Day to discuss some policy issue and topics.

Usually we try to go through the Council Agenda in particular if we have a motion. We don't have for this Council Meeting any motion. Yes, I think there is maybe Council Agenda if I'm not sure now.

But we don't really have something substantive for the motion. But we have several topics for discussion that may be of interest depending of what people think here.

But we will also allocate more time to discuss about other policy matters like EPDP next steps or hearing from those involved in PDP Working Group. Since we have the Constituency Day so we try here to focus on the policy matters and I guess any other topics of interest would be covered tomorrow if I'm not mistaken. I think that's the case, right. Okay.

Woman 1: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: So I just was saying that for today we try like the policy only but if there's any other topics that will be covered tomorrow hopefully on the Constituency Day.

Okay so (Erin) can you please share the Council Agenda?

Okay, I advise you to check in your own Adobe Connect because it's hard to read from the screen.

Woman 1: We can still (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: She can give you that. Yes, that's good. Okay, in the Council Agenda there are only two topics or two issue or two matters. So one is just really we will confirm GNSO Council the (unintelligible) the constructive party of (Wiki) to receive Number 15 for ICANN vote. So we have really nothing to say here.

The next is adoption of the - yes. Wait, so I can finish, please? The Customer Standing Committee (unintelligible) Review Team Final Report, we commented on that one a few days ago and you didn't have an issue so it should be okay.

Yes, Elsa, what you wanted to ask?

Elsa Saade: I actually just wanted to point out that in the operating procedures there's no Number 14 for the non – for the NCPH. So I was just wondering where that process is and if we're actually interested in adding it to the operating procedures.

Rafik Dammak: As far as I know we discussed with (liaison) on that one. And we developed a procedure. And we asked I think GNSO staff to add it so but so the person who followed closely this issue is (Roseanna). But as far as any number, we already – we agreed on the procedure and we asked her to add it so can just follow-up with the staff on that matter.

But should be added, I think we have since change on the operating procedure. Maybe you need to go through the Council. But it should be okay.

Okay any question? No, okay.

So the next one is about privacy proxy service, actually it's an issue in Implementation Review Team so this is because we have the letter from (GTD) that was a few days ago.

So we know that many of the Review Team were on hold because the work we are doing in the EPDP. So this is we just received a letter from (Sarah) (unintelligible).

I don't think we have specific action from us here. But just, yes, I mean I'm not sure if you had a chance to read the letter or not. But this is something that we have to move forward on it.

So I think Stephanie you are in that IRT so I'm not sure what – how much information you received from this matter or not.

Stephanie Perrin: So the IRT in EPDP or the IRT for the...

Rafik Dammak: The PPSAI.

Stephanie Perrin: I have indeed been monitoring that IR (unintelligible). Thanks. Can you hear me or I am too far away from the mike?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Jolly good. I am on the IRT for the PPSAI. I've been monitoring basically. It has been slow as molasses in January. And they've more or less stalled now because of the EPDP and the resultant issues.

I have raised concerns from time to time. Namely that ICANN has put the accreditation fees so high that it has priced proxies more or less out of the market. And we still need proxies for various reasons.

So the mere fact that we are suddenly having a better WHOIS experience does not mean that we don't need proxy registrations.

So I'll be watching it. The registrars I think are fairly aligned with our views on this. So of all the hats I wear showing up at every retched call has not been a top priority.

But I think when it does start moving into gear again we need to pay attention. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks Stephanie. And we have an echo. So also checking here it's related to the question about the work. I mean there is dependency with the transfer of policy here for the PPSAI IRT.

So can be tricky for us I think here because we – particular I think transfer of policy is not something we really follow it or get involved with closely.

But I guess we'll hear more during the Council Meeting. I don't expect that we'll agree on specific action. But specific action, but we will see maybe what contracted parties will face.

Okay, any question or comment on this one? I don't see any and also on the Adobe Connect. Okay.

So we can move to the next. It's a council update about PDP 3.0 implementation. And I am supposed to keep this update to be really short one since in my meeting there wasn't agreement on the – by the Council that to have small team to continue the work on the implementation plan.

So we had just kind of discussion by email to kind of to set up a meeting for this week and also maybe to start thinking and how we should proceed.

So we're not expecting to have kind of chart, a formal chart or something like that. But we will work by consensus. And if we have an issue we'll bring back to the Council for guidance and to resolve that.

But I don't expect any significant issues since it's really about implementation and not reopening the recommendation that we discussed last year.

So it will be quite short update and I expect this topic will be in every kind of frequent agenda item in the Council Meetings because we have also the expectation that we need to finish the work by next IGM so we should not really go for a long time here to finish the implementation.

So any question or comment?

Yes Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. Yes, I went through the documents. Again the latest one on PDP 3.0 and it still doesn't reflect any or it doesn't have any mention really of the GNSO's role or the Council's role more specifically in monitoring the work of Implementation Review Teams.

If we're talking about, you know, effectiveness and efficiency and improving those of the GNSO's policy development process that needs to include follow-up on implementation. Because if implementation of policy recommendations that are coming out of the GNSO and adopted by the Boards are not done according to the intent with which they were developed then this is – this to me is a big problem in the efficiency of the GNSO's PDP. It's not a big issue. It's not something that is currently problematic.

But it is one that needs to be mentioned and captured in this document I think. I raised this a few months ago I think on one of the NCSG and monthly calls. And I think it might be worthwhile for us to bring that up in the GNSO Council discussion.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry. Amr, when I talk about the PDP 3.0 I think maybe Amr talk about consensus for its implementation framework.

Amr Elsadr: Yes. PDP 3.0 is about making the (PP) more efficient, isn't it? Yes.

So the consensus policy implementation framework already includes this.

But PDP 3.0 in terms of making the PDP more efficient, part of the efficiency of the PDP is following it up and making sure that it results in the implementation that was required of the PDP. If Implementation Review Teams are not reporting back to the GNSO Council through the liaison because IRT's Implementation Review Teams have liaisons with the GNSO Council, this is to me affects the efficiency of the process at large.

So there needs to be some mention. My personal observation is that there is always a serious disconnect between IRTs and the Councils following up on them. You know maybe the PPSAI IRT Team might be an exception just because it's a very high profile one. But it's not the only one out there.

So I think it's worthwhile to mention that, you know. All right (unintelligible) wants me to stop.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. No, no. I understand what you are saying. But just to clarify here. If you are working on the implementation of the recommendation they will approve it.

So what - we are working on the implementation of plan of what was approved as a recommendation.

So we are – what you are suggesting here that's a new kind of area that I don't think that it was covered in the PDP 3.0. And as a small team we

cannot add this. I understand what you are saying. I'm not disagreeing. But in term of process it's that this is not where we can add.

However I think we can bring it back that there are some few recommendations that were not approved in this (same) discussion. And I guess we can say maybe we need to continue discussion in general about the PDP 3.0 kind of maybe next phase to add more as you suggested. Because I know for like (CPI) that we come back as a review. But we can add.

It's just I want to clarify why it's maybe not – I mean it's relevant, important. But maybe we cannot add it to this. I mean it would be really hard.

But one area maybe we can add, it can be specific I think is we expect also the liaison to be maybe reason to IRT to be more empowered. And something here maybe we can try to work around. I'm not sure how much but yes. Is it, I mean just trying to respond to?

Yes Stephanie. Please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. I don't really – you're going to say this is off topic. But I just want to say that I've been watching with some concern and alarm of the increasing load on liaison officers at the GNSO Council. And I think generally like so for instance I'm not on Council anymore. I am on that IRT. Nobody else is going to join the IRT that I can see in the immediate future.

And we had the issue with the auction proceeds where we need, you know, we need me to get officially off so that you all can take that on.

We're really, really reaching burnout point. We need to get people to do more work. And I'm going to take some strides forward to do that. I'm just throwing that out there on the table. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Stephanie. So okay, I think you brought up two issue here, the liaison in general and about the IRT, the participation in IRT.

The problem with participation in IRT, you need in first place to have people participating in the Working Group. Because an IRT is – and maybe Amr can confirm here, there's not space for a newcomer.

So you need really to help participate in the Working Group so you can follow how it's implemented and it can be even trickier because it's when getting into implementation and the operation.

So we have to fix the issue in the beginning. It's more about participation in Working Group so we can find the pool of candidates for people to participate in IRT.

About the liaison that's fair issue. I can speak from my own experience. It seems that thing, we are going from an extreme to another extreme where the Council is putting more expectation from the liaison in term of reporting and driving issue and being at the point of contact if there is any problem in the Working Group and so on.

But because this is the model we choose when we set up the Working Group model, before it was, and I think that there was a time when (Robin) was in the Council. The Council was doing the policy.

And when they selected to move to Working Group the liaison was supposed to be the link. But now we kind of that link, we are putting much more work there.

So the question here is if we follow the recommendation we have in PDP 3.0 maybe we need to think about how we can balance about the workload and the expectations.

Yes Elsa.

Elsa Saade: Thanks Rafik. This might not be as relevant as the points that Amr and Stephanie raised. But today when the Board was discussing the strategic plan for 2021 to 2025 they mentioned the multi-stakeholder model. And I'm wondering if PDP 3.0 is – might be affected by that or that might be affected by PDP 3.0.

And what would our stance be in terms of how we want the multi-stakeholder to go forward. I just wanted to point it out if it is of any relevance or of any interest. And yes, that's it.

Rafik Dammak: Amr and then Tatiana.

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Just some insights on personal insight on Elsa's question. PDP 3.0 became necessary because a number of GNSO PDP Working Groups have been come extremely problematic. The GNSO has always prided itself on being very transparent, very open to participation, very accountable in the way it develops its policies.

So traditionally PDP Working Groups have been open to full membership by anyone who wants to join them. You don't even have to be a member of an ICANN SO or AC to participate fully just like anybody else.

And your participation and your participation not just in developing the recommendations but in the consensus amongst the Working Group counts fully just like anybody else does, however part of PDP 3.0 is more towards limiting this. And this might in a way affect the multi-stakeholder model. But again, you know, the Council's job is to try to make these processes as efficient as possible.

And when you have PDP Working Groups that spend years getting very little done, this is probably a bigger problem than, you know, than limiting participation.

So I think what the GNSO Council is trying to do is trying to find a balance between the two aspects of, you know, maybe PDPs are becoming less open than they were in the past. But we're trying to make them work better.

So the two prime examples of PDP Working Groups that have gone pretty wrong recently, one is the Next Generation RDS PDP Working Group which was terminated because it didn't get its job done in time. The other one is the review of the RPMs which is taking forever. I think that one PDP spent about a year and a half just fixing the charter questions without actually addressing the policies.

So a year and a half to begin working on policy recommendations is just insane and whether you're an ICANN community member or whether you're not a member of an SO or (SU) there were a number of those on both these PDP Working Groups. It just doesn't work.

So the GNSO Council is doing its job and trying to make this more efficient. And it's a valid point but it's not one that is lost on the GNSO Council I think.

Woman 1: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay so just want to this point before to Amr. I mean the RPM is like one year off from its supposed deadline for the Phase One so that's an example of how things are really.

But yes, add something to that Tatiana.

Tatiana Tropina: Thanks. I completely agree with this. However I will echo Stephanie's point that it is valid about us bringing out and that was very evident in the EPDP.

We have very limited members who are capable of engaging in certain PDPs I'd say.

So as much as I do agree with you Amr about importance of maybe fixing the model in a way where it's more efficient, at the same time I'm thinking of NCSG and our capacity in delegating people in certain PDPs with expertise related to it.

And I don't know if that's also a valid point but I'm just sharing my thought on this.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, have...

Amr Elsadr: Very short response if I may.

Rafik Dammak: Amr and short response isn't working. At the same time...

Amr Elsadr: I'll do my best. I'll do my best.

Woman 2: (Unintelligible).

Amr Elsadr: I promise I'll do my best. We've had a lot of problems over the years in terms of passing GNSO PDP Working Groups that are opened. The one example where the GNSO has moved away from the open Working Group model is the EPDP where it's a team instead of a Working Group.

And the GNSO, the PDP Manual, the operating procedures and the Working Group Guidelines have always allowed for other models to be used. So this isn't anything new. It's just that it's never been used before.

But on the EDPD because it's closed the NCSG actually has better representation.

Woman 2: Right.

Amr Elsadr: Because it's factored in, you know, when drafting the charter on a limited team. It factored in the representation issue.

So I think the EPDP Team we've had far better representation than we've ever had by any GNSO PDP Working Group.

And speaking as someone who's been involved in PDPs for a number of years I found it extremely refreshing to work with a bunch of NCSGs on a policy recommendation instead of trying to work on them alone so.

Woman 2: Yes very (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: And I guess that's a shift in your thinking Amr.

Woman 2: Oh.

Amr Elsadr: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: We've got that before. Okay, later on, and Tatiana.

Amr Elsadr: If I have an opinion then – see evidence that I might've been wrong I will change my mind. I have no problem.

Rafik Dammak: No. Because you – okay, that's a topic for later. But he knows what I'm talking about. Yes so Tatiana.

Tatiana Tropina: Oh well basically – it's Tatiana Tropina for the record. I think that Amr actually pointed to the issues I was going to – to the points I was going to make. That for me the interplay between like develop multi-stakeholder, the model and EPDP 3.0 is that EPDP 3.0 it does formalize and limit the multi-stakeholder model.

But they're necessary changes because of RDS, because of some other Working Groups. About the amount of the volunteers, I hear, hear, hear. I understand what this is about but at least to really mobilize the NCSG to participate in EPDP.

And I remember that we had the same for example with our accountability process where when we did have a deadline. So we had nothing, no choice but to join like (Robin) was represented and some others.

So when you really have to supply a number of volunteers and you're – and you know that this process is critical for you and for our goals we will find people probably. And if we don't well we wouldn't have formed them for open policy process anyway. I think so although I do have my concerns about like the formalization and participation especially for the call's consensus.

But I really think that Amr is right here, you know, and I have been concerned about a lack in gov participation. The groups have always been open. It's just what I don't – what I never liked is moving to more, you know, towards kind of CCWG call consensus. But if it's necessary well I'm able to live with this.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so I think I'm not sure. I have Stephanie or...

Stephanie Perrin: Ah.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Stephanie and then (unintelligible).

Stephanie Perrin: I just wanted to announce, Stephanie Perrin for the record, that it's Maryam's birthday today so.

Rafik Dammak: And that's nice from you guys for...

Group: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Guys.

Group: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Guys, guys we – yes, it's nice.

Stephanie Perrin: So we're having a great big party for her tonight.

Group: (Unintelligible).

Woman 3: You're all invited.

Rafik Dammak: Okay guys, guys, guys, okay, so happy birthday Maryam. Sorry birthday girl that you have to work with us today but, okay so. Yes, so hang on one second please.

Tatiana Tropina: Yes. So Tatiana Tropina for the record, I was actually wondering. It just came to my mind just for the purpose of informing like broader membership and engaging them into the discussion might be sharing some point that Elsa made to the main release and ask what do they think about kind of the interplay to envision that.

But I think that to really start these discussions we need a good starter. Not just, you know kind of simple points but something more substantive like this is happening. What do you think about this? And that's how we need to shape it somehow if we're going to bring the discussion to the main release.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Tatiana. Okay because I think the – we will talk about the 3.0 implementation planning and we move to talk about committee stakeholder governance model I think. That is the Board, they are supposed to present on Thursday. They have investigation. And they don't give – and I don't

think they give any details about what they are thinking. They just say that they want to do something. Okay.

Woman 1: So.

Rafik Dammak: I don't know (unintelligible) so just to hear, maybe summarize the thinking. Yes, Elsa sorry, do you want to – go ahead with comment and...

Elsa Saade: Yes, Elsa here. I don't know whether it's still relevant or not. But on Amr's point I want just to ask for clarification if you may. Did you mean that it's because the EPDP was close that we had better members there or did I hear it wrong?

Amr Elsadr: It's not about better members. This is Amr again. It's that because there was a limited number of members who are allowed to participate from the different ACs as well as GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies that we have a better ratio of, you know, relative to the whole of people participating.

So for example the Next Generation are the SPP Working Group had over 200 members. And we only had maybe eight and then Stephanie working on that and David on the Leadership Team. So when you think about 2 of our members amongst 200. That's about a 1% representation of NCSG as opposed to 6 of our members amongst how many are there, like 30 some on the EPDP.

Yes. So obviously that's the relative number of NCSG representation is much higher on the EPDP Team because that it's close. And that was what I was trying to convey.

Rafik Dammak: Okay and I remember the point I want to make. It's not just about taking one PDP as a standalone in term of participation issue. The issue that this team would have to deal with how many (partner) activity you can have, I mean in

the same time. Because you will still have a bigger issue of how many people you can get involved.

And I think GNSO Council did a big, big mistake when they had like three heavy Working Group. And at the same time it was what we can call end of statement wishful thinking. And with largest call and so on and that we are surprised took forever for some of them.

Yes Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: We also had – Stephanie Perrin for the record, we also had Review Teams going on at the same time. I was stuck in the RDS Review. It went on forever. That work was in my view mostly irrelevant because it's going to nuked out of the way by the GDPR. We couldn't get that thing stopped for a lot of money. I wrote about it in the statement that we put there.

But I mean these things just creep along. And I was the only pro-privacy person there. So if I didn't show up, the stone rolled down hill. I shouldn't say that. Volker Greimann was there. But he was really busy because he was the only contracted party. And we had four ALAC businesspeople there, you know. And we had all the other GNSO reps were businesspeople except for me Volker.

So it was – and then we had a huge GAC contingent, you know, with Interpol there so boy that was a stacked deck.

So we're getting stretched too thin by this. And we need to figure out a way to pace the work better. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Thanks Stephanie. I think this is even discussion, was start by GNSO Council. It's how we can do a better planning on our side at least knowing what's coming and try to take that into consideration.

But I think we are still far from doing that yet. Yes, Tatiana.

Tatiana Tropina: No.

Rafik Dammak: Oh okay. So if there is no further comment or a question I guess we can move to the next agenda item.

So the next, I think this is why not exciting topic. Okay, guys I'm sorry, I'm not sure I can entertain you a lot today. So it's the discussion on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy or IRTP, Policy Status Report.

So this is something new really. Plus in term of PDP we do the PDP in term of policy recommendation and then we have the implementation of this recommendation. And we added this step to review those, I mean how this policy will – if this policy were implemented and how much it were effective.

So this is a new thing coming. And I think we had the report from someone from (GTD) a few weeks ago. And there was a public comment about the report. And it was a report and survey trying to see the experience of registrar with transfer policy.

So I think here what is interesting really to see how a policy was really effective because we spend so much time discussing and trying to predict and assuming that is the best solution but maybe here we see it wasn't really the response of the issue that was supposed to fix.

Again it's more really just to get an update here and to see maybe if there is any action from the Council or any of the Council need to give guidance. I'm not familiar with the process because it's – I think it's the first time we are implementing it, I mean we are using it, the review.

But we could – we can expand. There is more – there are more issue to come, more policy reviews to come. So just here to avoid any confusion, this

is different from the specific organization review. This is policy review of what they were – consensus policy coming from GNSO.

Any question or comment here? No. Okay. So I guess we can move to the next agenda item. And I expect this one and we would get some comments, if any, which is the next issue related to ICANN for series of handling queries, conflicts with a privacy (unintelligible).

Woman 1: I'm going to save it.

Rafik Dammak: I know. So this one was kind of on hold even if we discuss it last year but we were – we put this on hold internal calls for volunteers to – for the – how do we call it? Implementation Advisory Group. Because the work on EPDP and we know that all attention and the folks would be on there.

So now we have to discuss again when we can resume the work on this effort. And so we need to check if there is any, I'd say, impact from the face of EPDP on this review of the release procedure.

So Stephanie I think you are the most familiar with this issue. And you were even in the first Implementation Advisory Group.

So here I think is more a question for the Council and how to deal because we put on hold because the EPDP. But we need to discuss or decide how we will re-continue or how to restart that effort again.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay, Stephanie Perrin for the record. I was indeed in that original IAG Implementation Advisory Group.

And all we were looking for in that original IAG was a trigger that worked and we didn't get one.

And I explained many times that this was not the way data protection law worked and it wouldn't work and, you know, nobody listened.

So we will need a WHOIS conflicts with law procedure. I think because I expect that there will be some elements of data protection law in some jurisdictions that are going to be different from what we come up with in the EPDP.

But we're not going to know what we have come up with until really the implementation, the IRT finished.

So I mean I'd like to put the WHOIS conflicts on hold until such time as we actually need – can usefully revise it. I think that would be the sensible thing to do. There's no point in revising it now and then coming up with an IRT that is going to prompt further revision.

Anybody feel differently, I'm prepared to listen though, you know. I know that Keith Drazek wanted it. He was never very clear about why he wanted to get it going again. What, you know, comet striking the air is he expecting? You know I don't know.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Stephanie. I think that's helpful as a guidance because for this topic it's good for us to know if we need to kind of get some inputs in term on how we deal with this so that's I think an argument.

But I think we need also good answer, I mean good rationale to say that we're not trying to hold this forever. So I think because we're already holding so you are suggesting that we keep holding it.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: So I guess we need to bring the rationale to explain why the reason behind that.

Yes, Tatiana.

Tatiana Tropina: I'm sorry. I'm Tatiana Tropina for the record. I'm probably missing something here. So as far as in December because I was against the charter and these resolution about WHOIS and then conflicts but Keith and someone else convinced me that that might happen that GDPR compliance and EPDP and will tell we will have because at that moment we didn't know what we were going to have. We just knew that we might have something that it will not solve every conflict in every country because there might be some with laws and whatever.

So I believe that there is a rationale for this. But it was Keith who was pushing for this group. Are they still trying to get it or are they trying to wait until EPDP is finished because I believe that if they tend to wait until the solution is formed for the second phase for EPDP or at least implementation default phase before they start this group so they can at least see how it's practically, you know, managed.

So I believe that maybe it would be worth to put forward the argument on the Council that why would you start this (partly) until you implement the first phase of EPDP.

So if I can bring this argument forward. I remember that I was fiercely against this evolution. So it would be just a continuation of this discussion if necessary or unless you want to do a phase, something else.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie again. One of the reasons that I kept reinforcing that we shouldn't focus only on the GDPR but that we have to focus on other laws is so that we can get language in there that allows people to comply with other laws in which case we don't need a WHOIS conflicts with law policy. We can do it through the policy.

The reason we – the WHOIS conflicts with law policy was the only WHOIS policy we had apart from the contract, right. So basically it was a get you off the hook on your contract if you could prove there was a law.

Now we can do that in the WHOIS policy as we, you know, and avoid this whole messy ugly thing, you know. The only problem will be if somebody runs into a difficulty. In the meantime they have a crummy system there.

But the temp spec solved it for now. And I suppose looking back I guess the reason I bought Keith Drazek's argument was, you know, what happens if the temp spec evaporates and we have nothing then we also don't have a WHOIS conflicts policy that works.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Stephanie. Okay so we have Tatiana and Elsa. Oh sorry, Amr, Amr first.

Tatiana Tropina: I think Amr was before me.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Amr first, yes please.

Amr Elsadr: Okay, thanks. This is Amr. I may be wrong about this but I don't think I am, you know...

Woman 4: That's a shame.

Amr Elsadr: Stephanie just said, you know, the temp spec fix this for now. She's right. The policy recommendations we came up with that the Boards will hopefully adopt might also fix this for now. We all hope they will. They might not. The work we do in Phase Two might provide further – a better fix. They may not.

The WHOIS conflicts with the privacy law is not a policy. It's a procedure. They're procedural steps for contracted parties to take to notify ICANN that there are conflicts...

Stephanie Perrin: Right.

Amr Elsadr: ...between the policies that are in the contracts, in the RAA and the Registry Agreement. And they're basically asking for waivers to some of these obligations in order for them to not comply. Not have to comply with them. And so they can comply with their privacy laws.

We don't know whether they're going to need to use these or not. But it would be a good idea to have this procedure, not a policy, in place no matter what kind of consensus policies we come up with.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay.

Amr Elsadr: General – their procedures just like the GNSO Operating Procedures, it's not a policy so we need to separate this from...

Stephanie Perrin: And actually Amr and I argued with them all throughout the time when I was trying to write my dissertation because they alleged that a policy decision had been made by the GNSO and that that we would acknowledge WHOIS conflicts with law. And that they called a policy, that decision. And then staff would write the procedure which they did.

So I'm going okay, where's the record of that policy decision?

And I never found it. And I forget. I can send you what I wrote about it if you're interested. But I take your point. We need this thing, whatever the heck it is.

And that there's another part to this saga and that is the data retention waiver because if you're in a jurisdiction that will not allow you to do that data retention you need a waiver from that. It's a separate procedure. But we need both because countries are bringing in data retention requirements.

Amr Elsadr: I mean having said what I did I'm not sure that right now is the right time to work on it. Everyone is really busy already.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: So whether we – whether the GNSO proceeds to work with staff on setting up these procedures or fixing them, I don't have a strong view on that. But speaking for myself I'd rather not get involved in that right now.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Amr. That whole discussion why, that's we brought this because just for the context. Where we made decision I think it was in January so during...

Woman 1: 2018.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. During (unintelligible) I think. And we had the action like we delayed the call for volunteers.

Woman 1: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Yes but then to (ensure). So we had action item and this is kind of now for more one year. And every time we are bringing and look at we say maybe we need to wait for EPDP Phase One. It's ended so we have to move on. So that's why we have the discussion.

But so Tatiana and Elsa.

Tatiana Tropina: A brief question before I make my intervention. But as Keith was person for this, are they still keen to do this? Do we have an intelligence (unintelligible)? They really want this group now?

Stephanie Perrin: God. Who's going...?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry.

Stephanie Perrin: ...to staff it? That's what I'm saying.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry. Can you be more clear who are the – who I mean (unintelligible)?

Tatiana Tropina: So don't know if registrar – registries or Keith personally want to convene this group any time soon in the future because if they don't then they will be ready and willing to postpone this to the end of the Phase One, the implementation of the EPDP. I'm sorry, I realize I'm probably not making myself clear. I'm trying.

Rafik Dammak: Well let's say it's not (unintelligible).

Tatiana Tropina: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Probably (unintelligible) to have (unintelligible).

Tatiana Tropina: Oh sorry, yes. Okay.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible) they have no idea. I mean I have no inside (unintelligible) formation or...

Tatiana Tropina: A group.

Rafik Dammak: ...something we discussed if that's about at leadership level.

Tatiana Tropina: Oh so then I stated that – okay it's just what I'm saying now based on what was happening in (LA) when we were passing this resolution and when I saw that they were not willing to proceed with this either before they see the outcome of EPDP. I'm not sure that either they or us or whoever have any people to start this group with.

So I do believe that they would be willing to postpone it further till the EPDP Phase One implementation. If they are not well we can play it by the ear and just put forward the arguments that who's going to do this actually. How we are going to find the volunteers and I believe that we already made this argument before, if I'm not mistaken, it was all the same arguments like (unintelligible).

So, we can just do the same and see how it goes. I believe that no one would actually mind, that this would (respond further).

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Tatiana. I guess we would know it during the meeting, so I'm not worried really about that. Elsa?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: No, Elsa (unintelligible). Go, go.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Okay, guys, guys. Guys.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Yes, yes. Amr, please.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, this is Amr again, and just one very, very quick point. This procedure has nothing to do with us. This procedure is strictly for contracted parties.

Technically speaking, even our participation isn't necessary. Once the procedure is in place, it doesn't affect us in any way.

And there's no reason why we need to really – well, if we are interested in making sure that contracted parties have the ability to seek waivers to their contractual obligations then that's fine.

But eventually we will never use this procedure. It's only for contracted parties. I just wanted to make the very clear so people know what – the content for the issue.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Amr. That's a really good point. And, of course, we – a few minutes ago, we were discussing about our workload and how much we can focusing our efforts on some policy or something that's not really of high priority for us, we should not really worry about.

Okay, any other comments or questions on this one? Okay, I see none. So, the next thing will be even of more excitement. Yes, I'm trying to keep you entertained.

So, it's about the EPDP phase two work. So this is kind of the (continuing) – (enforcement team) – we didn't have that much time during the – yesterday or Sunday meeting to discuss about the next steps, why we had some discussion in the last council meeting, the extraordinary meeting, on last Monday

So, it's basically – we'll continue the discussion here and it's more really to give guidance and the extraction to the EPDP team. The EPDP team had the meeting in – Saturday.

We started to brainstorm about – and getting input about the workplan as we asked for. And so, this is more – I hope we will get more specific guidance on the council in terms of expectation.

And then also we can talk about it from EPDP – PDP team, bring back some of the issues that may need to be resolved. So, it will be kind of an update

and continuing the discussion on the next steps. Okay? Anybody in the queue? Yes, Elsa?

Elsa Saade: It's not really related to what you just said, Rafik, but it's related to this and something that we discussed. I think Ayden mainly also mentioned it in our chat.

And it's about the people who will be in phase two, and if there will be a need from NCSG members in the EPDP to drop and then add someone else.

And then we also discussed that Stephanie maybe could also have a small privacy related – I want to say training but it's not training. It's, like, guidelines for people in our Webinar, a set of Webinars, or whatever, to our members.

So, I'm not sure where that is. And if it's still on the table for us to discuss and take forward given that it's going to come our way soon. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, I think I can respond to the first question. And I like to remind people that we have that thread in the policy committee (base) about the replacement and confirmation of our representative to the EPDP team.

So, (first we need) to (configure who we) want to continue there. So, I understand that Amr, Tatiana (unintelligible), Farzaneh, (Newton), Stephanie, too.

No, I didn't hear yet I think from you and Ayden. You – I said, you, so Ayden, I guess – yes, (I said it). So, also I think David, you confirmed it as (an alternate).

David Cake: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: And since we have Collin here – so as an alternate, if you have to continue or not. No. Okay, so pending on confirmations for – yes, Ayden just – pending on confirmation and, I guess, just to (field any thoughts).

So, I put this in the – and we don't have a date line, however, it's better to get a replacement as soon as possible depending the familiarity of whoever will be at that point with the phase one and the continuation for – to be effective on phase two. Okay, Ayden and then Farzaneh.

Ayden Ferderline: Thanks. But for those people following the thread, I was going to make a new point.

Woman: (Unintelligible). So, I just want to understand the timeline for this because you want to issue the call.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I mean, I want to issue the call first when I have kind of the confirmation wo wants to resign or...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: So I have those who want to resign, they should decide, like, next week.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes.

Woman: Yes. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, we kind of tried to put that in the readout for the policy committee. If we need to do that call for volunteers, we can just tweak the old call and to do it as possible. Yes, Ayden.

Ayden Ferderline: Yes, this is Ayden. So, the conversation is going to come to the council soon, whether this is tomorrow or in the future, is going to be probably around a few points.

It's going to be, does the charter need to be amended? (Keith) is being pretty clear that we like the existing charter, and I think that's a position that we support.

We certainly don't want to get into a situation where we're potentially adjusting the membership composition, so I'm happy about that. But there is going to need to be a workplan that is developed and that will also come back to the council and to ascertain our satisfaction with it.

And I did notice on Saturday in the EPDP team that we didn't seem to have as the NCSG sort of a uniform position on all of the resourcing requirements that we think we need or in what the work commitment we thought was.

And so I thought perhaps we want to have a discussion around how much time as the NCSG are we really looking to put into this? Because for some people I noticed it was 90 minutes a week.

For some people it was three hours a week and then there were differences between whether people wanted there to be one extended call or two calls per week or sub-teams.

So I'm wondering if we wanted to get on the same page there so that we are just advocating for the one message there.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Ayden. (In terms of time), I guess I'd be you all, guys, in terms of time commitment is by large. So, okay, these are good questions. I think there is some - I think there is some agreement that we cannot go at the same pace.

But also we would need to be careful to not go down too much. So we have to find the balance. We need to be careful, so to not give kind of any (ration) for other groups to kind of freak out.

I cannot speak more here now because my - the new hat, but just is - my feeling is we need to find a common ground and regardless of NCSG position. Just - that's my thinking.

Okay, just to double check about the queue, I'm not sure, Stephanie, you had your hand raised or not? Okay, you raised your hand. So, sorry, I think now Amr and then Stephanie.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you, (Unintelligible) for the record. I think that for some of the points, I think some of us had very strong positions like, for example, no work tracks, no small teams.

And if we have a small position - if we have this strong of a position, we can just make a list weekly, like, remember that no small team, no work track was one of the very strong positions that we're going to allocate for.

Not starting earlier than - and the (unintelligible), I think, was pretty strong position among us. And some others. And then they would love to see if we are (available about this) or not.

I don't know if, to do it at this policy meeting and taking into account Rafik's new capacity and new hat or better to do it on the EPDP mailing list because, I mean, I don't know whether we can decide now if we make strong positions right now. Just, you know, check the boxes. Yes.

Rafik Dammak: So, (unintelligible) to the queue. So, Amr, Stephanie and then Farzaneh.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. I think I agree with what you said, Rafik, on you know, trying to achieve some sort of balance. It's not just take other group's views into consideration.

On one hand, I don't want to continue to work at the pace and intensity that we've been working on since last August. That was just insane. There was a clear need to do that before. That need doesn't exist anymore.

So that should be off the table. On the other hand, the balance, I believe, is required because I don't want this to drag on for another two or three years. I don't want to spend another two, three years working on this either.

You know, if we can wrap this up in a year maximum, I would love that. So I think that, to me personally, you know, not from a stakeholder group perspective or anything is much more important than trying to accommodate other groups.

On the other hand, I'm not sure we can do that without using small teams. I think it's impractical to even consider that this would be possible. I mean, I agree on work tracks.

I think work tracks should not be used because I think they're distracting. I think we've already tried them in phase one. They haven't worked. But if you think about it, you know, first of all, there has to be another legal committee or the existing one needs to continue.

So that, in itself, is a small team. And needs to get - it needs to work. It needs to continue to do its job.

When we come across new issues like we have in phase one, such as natural versus legal and geographic differentiation of registered name holders, the small teams got a lot of work done in a really short period of time which, although the EPDP team ended up not agreeing on the recommendations of the - the small team didn't agree.

And eventually the EPDP team submitted those recommendations with diverging views. So we didn't reach consensus, but the small team that that work done in a really small timeframe.

And very little was added to it in the subsequent discussions of the plenary. So I think having the small teams is practical. I think it will - it might be easier to work on them this we have fewer calls.

So we don't need these, you know, two calls a week which were two hours and then three hours and then that last call where we were trying to get everything done was like four hours long.

You know, so those will be necessary. So you have, like, a one, 90 minute call or a one, like, 120 minute call the week – yes, so...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Amr Elsadr: It's - all right, but the - at least is not two of them, right, because we had two - yes, we had two of those on Tuesdays and Thursdays. So, if we have just one call per week for plenary and use that to get them plenary's work done and then, as needed, small teams come up, I don't think we should oppose that.

I think we should agree that these might be necessary and that might help us get the work done more quickly. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Amr. I just want to be clear here since we are - everything is recorded. I have no position here. I need to be careful. And just let I tried to explain this we have to find a balance even if I'm coming from NCSG.

As a chair, I have to think about other - I mean, to be sure that we reach, as a consensus, so just to confirm, it's not about we need to try to satisfy the group. It's - we have to work as a team. This is important.

So we need to find the common ground for everyone that can get things done and really reasonable amount of time. It's an important thing. I'm waiting for when someone actually takes over this EPDP team.

And if the workload gets quite high or something, we have the same problem (unintelligible), so.

Amr Elsadr: If I can just respond to that very quickly. Also to be cleared, I appreciate your reasons for what you're saying and I agree with your reasoning for the reasons.

All I wanted to say is that my personal perspective, I agree, for our own reasons, for NCSG's reasons, which are not the same as yours. So, just all sort of be clear on things.

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Parrin: Okay, my turn. I'm going to be clear here. Yes.

Rafik Dammak: I just need to double - to confirm about the queue. So it will be you and then (Farsaneh), but I don't see any else. So this also try to do some time check. So, Stephanie, please go ahead.

Stephanie Parrin: I tend to think that the small team is going to kill us. I agree with (Tat) on that. I understand Amr's point. But I was having six-hour days because I was on the workbook team and that was a great team. I had (Sara) and (doing Flicker) on it. I can't member who (was doing Flicker) - you know, (Alan).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Stephanie Parrin: Yes, the legal team, we've already more or less agreed we need that and we need more people on it. And, you know - but I don't want any more six-hour ICANN days, and that's not counting all the other stuff, you know.

I'm just raising it all here to say I wish people would keep track of their time because I'm trying to come up with an KPIs and metrics and it would be really, really useful to know how much time we are spending.

I mean, I had to do it on a spreadsheet for my dissertation advisor because I was spending all of my time on working on ICANN and not on my thesis.

And so he made me do it on an Excel spreadsheet and I was shocked at how much time I was spending because that's - clearing a few emails when they're coming in by the hundreds, you know.

So if somebody is really handy with an Excel spreadsheet, mine sucks. It really, you know, I'm horrible at it. I mean, it worked for the was so painful. And if somebody knows how to do it really neatly, easy to annotate, then we can all do it and we could say, hey, we just spent, you know, X hours on this.

The other thing I wanted to point out is don't forget that lesson IRT. The IRT is going to start and we need tons of people on that because that's where the dirty work is going to get done and we have to watch them, you know. So I think we're going to be super busy. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Stephanie. I don't need the spreadsheet. I calculate it by the number of hours of sleeping that I don't have. So...

Stephanie Parrin: I'm old. I forget that unless I write it down.

Rafik Dammak: So, about - yes, but the IRT, this is another - something we are discussing, I think (unintelligible) in terms of impact and dependency. But I understand, it's more like from NCSG perspective, this is and how to manage it.

So, I think this maybe probably you can discuss with other contracted parties. For example, how we're planning to do so that they have the same issue. Okay, just to be sure, we have Farzaneh and then Elsa's.

Farzaneh Badii: Thanks. Farzaneh speaking. So, there are two things I want to consider - preparation, participation. (I think we) have too many calls. We are not prepared.

And that's why I don't think we should have so many calls. The other thing that I wanted to mention is about the small team, really popular with some people here.

But with small teams, the problem with the small teams is that (they are under sourced) and some of our members join various small teams. So I don't think that - so the same member joins, like, three small teams.

So, I don't think that that would reduce your workload. So, I think that we need to prioritize and prioritize what issues - with EPDP group, prioritize what issues first to tackle and then we just tackle them and then go to next.

That's what I understand. I have another comment. So, you know that we need to submit a public comment on the final report about issue because - is this the right time to talk about it this far, I mean, after this?

Rafik Dammak: As you may know, I sent a call to (Elise) and we have two volunteers. One of them is here. So, yes, I think it's a good time in terms to start - at least addressing and to see have wants to participate. Yes, so, if you want to say something now or...

Farzaneh Badii: About that but is this the right time to?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Sure. No problem.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, so (unintelligible) discussed about what the potential approach could be, but I asked her to also reach out to the EPDP members and the NCSG members to discuss how we should answer this public comment.

I'm not experienced and when (board) - I'm not experienced in - because another we want to (unintelligible) the report, the recommendations and whether I - we're not very sure and how to phrase teams to ensure we have full support but also raise some of the issues that we want to (that was).

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so will the expectation from (unintelligible) public comment is really for the board to get input from the community. But it's just because the board is overseeing the process.

So it's really, I think, it's to - about the process, if we think it was, we can support that it was okay, that we could participate and so on. Other groups may choose to talk about the substance.

I don't think this is the intention from NCSG to talk about substance more. Maybe they support the outcome, if I'm not mistaken.

Farzaneh Badii: Sorry, just one - I'm sorry, so just one point because I remember, like, what we were brainstorming, I thought that maybe it would be a good idea because there are two groups that say that we did not compromise on a lot of issues and got our way.

I thought maybe it would be a good idea to mention what we compromised and what we are not happy with but we went to contract (cost). This is just a suggestion. I just wanted to see if this is like the right venue. Okay.

Rafik Dammak: That's okay I think. I mean, it's up to you guys. It's just my role is to then ensure that you deliver on time. Good luck, (Luis). Okay, so – yes, Louise - okay, so we have Elsa and then you. And, yes, go ahead.

Elsa Saade: So, some of the things I want to mention I'm not relevant anymore. But I read the public comment. I think your statement, which was attached to the vote, could be a good start for the public comment because it does mention what we are not happy about but also what kind of things we let go of so that the consensus would be reached.

And another thing I wanted to ask in terms of the public comment, is it a valid space for us to speak about what we want about phase two or not? No?
Okay, that's good.

And my second question is when will you know longer be chair, interim chair, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Until we find another victim.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: The thing is - deadline for expression of interest, if I'm not mistaken, is the 22nd of March. Then it will be – to the GNSO Council leadership and SSE leadership to make a selection.

But it's possible of we are not okay, we may extend the call or something. So, the date is the 22nd but let's say we aim by efforts to have everything done and also to think about some discussion to allocate some time for whoever to be selected.

Okay, yes, so that - as you heard, today as an anniversary in Japan so I have to read a script here. So on the 11th of March 2011, at 2:46 pm local time, a 9.1 magnitude earthquake tracked in the Pacific Ocean on the northeast coast of Japan's (Honshu) Island.

The earthquake, (unintelligible) Japan earthquake (unintelligible) massive tsunami with waves that rose to heights of up to 14 meters and traveled up to 10 kilometers (on land).

This was the most powerful earthquake ever recorded in Japan and the fourth most powerful earthquake in the world. An estimated 20,000 people were lost and close to 500,000 people were forced to evacuate.

In remembrance of the lives lost and the fact that (unintelligible) Japan earthquake, we will now observe a moment of silence. Okay, thanks everyone.

Okay, it's not really funny, (Martha). Okay. Okay, so, let's go back to business. Thanks everyone. Yes, so I explained the timeline for getting a new chair. So, Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. I was going to make a comment to support Farzaneh's suggestion earlier, but then Elsa said a comment which kind of many think I need to say something else.

But, yes, I think it would be a good idea to point out in our public comment to the board that there were areas that you made compromises and they need to know this, that, you know, the compromises were made in order to try and achieve consensus.

And we might not have succeeded, but the compromises were made and they need to know this. We need to point it out to them just in case this is misrepresented by other groups.

Having said that, I would be extremely surprised if the boards don't adopt these recommendations. I think it's highly unlikely. They're in the same bind everybody else is and they need the temp spec replaced just like everybody else does.

Whether they like the recommendations or not, I think they're going to adopt them and it will become a consensus policy. In response to Elsa's suggestion, I don't agree.

I don't think our comment to the GNSO Council should be the basis of our next comment because this comment was designed to address the council's role in managing the PDP, and that is not the ICANN board's job.

That is a job for the council and so we made to design a new comment for a different purpose. Having said that, I have to say that I was extremely disappointed in the statement we ended up attaching to our vote.

It was changed at the last minute. I wasn't able to participate in that call for listening remotely at the time it was taking place. But there was a very important section in that statement that outlines some important rules that allow for an expedited policy development process to be used.

And the whole point of the statement was the point out to the GNSO Council that it made mistakes in how it managed this process. This whole section it's was taken out of the statement.

To me, that repurposed the statement completely and we missed the very important opportunity to point out something that the council needed to hear from us.

The opportunity is gone. So I just wanted to put that on the record. I was just extremely disappointed with the statement that ended up being read into the record on that council call.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, let me go will check. I think it was Louise and then Elsa.

Louise Hurel: Hi. Louise here for the record. Just a comment on a comment. Yes, as I said to Farzaneh as we were talking about this, as I really think we need to just be careful and I really count on your help with this especially the folks that have been hands-on, on this.

That while we try to point out what are the areas that we compromise, we don't open up space to the interpretation that actually we're reopening things.

And I do think that is something that we have to be mindful of and I would really want all of you really to just help me with that. I think it's crucially important so we don't end up in phase two with a good feeling or a bad interpretation that we are reopening things.

Because I know this is something that people sometimes say, so, yes, just wanted to note that. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, guys. But – yes. Elsa and then Stephanie.

Elsa Saade: Thanks, Rafik. I just - I agree with you, Amr, that is not entirely directed to - it's not valid for the board at the moment.

But, at the same time, there are parts in the statement where we kind of highlight certain consensus goals that we had a problem with and I thought this was - it could be of value for Louise, for instance, who is not directly in the PDP team, for instance, to take a look at it.

You know, and it could be a good start for her just to have some ideas going forward or to ask the EPDP members as to why we mentioned this in the GNSO Council call and how she could shifted into a board directed question or whatever.

So - and I would be more than happy to help Louise, as well, go around and ask. So please, count me and if you need any kind of help.

And, Amr, of course, I think your points are extremely valid and if you could help also with the public comments, I think that would be a very good thing going forward. Yes, thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Elsa. So, also Louise just (unintelligible) have another person who volunteered. So, I mean, we would follow as usual. It's better, we can have drafting teams so anyone can join and have the comments as soon as possible. So, yes, Stephanie, please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. I would just like to respond to Amr by saying I don't think that it's too late to comment on the process because we're going to have process problems again.

We can write a letter to the council. We can, you know, get something on the record indicating that, you know, our discomfort in the way things were handled. Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Sorry, this is Amr. I didn't say it's too late to comment on the process. But it is too late to attach a comment to our vote.

Stephanie Perrin: Right. Yes, agreed. Okay, I'm - you know, that rush at the end was insane. I wasn't able to keep up and, like I said, I was still putting in my six hour days. But, I have been working on an annotated version of the document.

And I think it's perfectly legitimate to, without opening up, you know, because if there something that one of our other colleagues wants to open up, they will use us as an excuse open it up.

But you can still annotate and save you think something is illegal, if you think we have met the standard, if you think, you know, blah, blah, blah. And I think there are a few spots in there that we absolutely have to explain.

There's also the risk of that research that we're going to do, legal person versus natural person. That's a can of worms. And already had that horrible piece of, you know, piece of supposedly a research that was turned in on the BPSAI.

That was, you know, a terrible thing and I expect we're going to see some version of that surfacing after this study. So I think we need to, you know, comment on we made a compromise here, and this is what we would be looking for in terms of rigor on this process. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: I don't think so. So, yes, I'm going to go...

Collin Kurre: This is Collin Kurre for the record. Stephanie, I think that that's a really great idea and I think that it's - but maybe instead of submitting it as a standalone document, they could be used to make some sort of canned responses.

Because if you submit it as a standalone document, and people might not read it or they might not - it might not go over so well. But if you had, like, specific points - this is just an idea here.

But if you had specific points flagged so that you haven't prepared if they mentioned this or if they say we didn't compromise, then you can have already this kind of evidence preidentified so that one or all of you could, in tandem, say actually, we have this and actually we have this.

So have some sort of consistent and canned responses. That way your message is constant throughout the process.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, any further questions or comments on this one? Okay, I think (unintelligible) you have an idea. Anyway, we will discuss what we have a draft for review and I guess we'll do any necessary amendments then.

So, that was the last agenda item for - hold on please. So, that was the last one. What's in the AOB for the council, I think it's just really administrative manner.

It's just – but (ICANN's concern is that the new) (unintelligible) chair election timeline is changing because the travel submission. So it's not anymore 90 days, but 120.

And further then, I think you'll recall that we discussed with our colleague in the CAG regarding it, so - but it will - so we need just to check if our procedure can support that.

I mean, we didn't set the specific 90 days but it can support 120. Okay, sorry. What AOB one stat?

Elsa Saade: Yes, so, I just wanted to make two points. And one is that (unintelligible). So I think to engage – so the (council) of this meeting, we have a face-to-face meeting that the NCSG policy committee meeting, so some of our members have the impression that this is close then only for policy committee members.

And they don't - so that's why some of them are not here. So I think that if we could change the title to something like a policy meeting, NCSG policy meeting.

And the other thing that I think we need to address is kind of getting more members who get funded to come to ICANN meetings, to come to these policy meetings because, you know, they have a commitment.

And, yes, that's (unintelligible) and they also want to make a second point about council members, are councilmembers relation with the NCSG members and the broader NCSG members (personally) so that I want to be more informed about what is going on in the council.

I know that time is - you have limited time but I think if you could - you do distribute the workload (unintelligible), but if someone is working on an issue, for example, if Elsa is working on, like, procedures or (unintelligible), if you can just brief us as we go along and the NCSG mailing list, that would be great.

Because honestly, some (fam) members don't know the council, GNSO Council, so.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, (does Stephanie) want to comment?

Stephanie Parrin: Oh, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, so regarding the report, I'm sorry I didn't write the report for the last meetings. Yes, so (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay, I mean, it's fine. I'm just explaining...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Regarding the first comment, I think before we used to send, like, a whole schedule - I used to do that, the schedule, and explaining and also that we (comment) is open to everyone.

I think the problem is with the current schedule format. You cannot really indicate – no, the schedule that we are using. You cannot indicate it's open to everyone. It's missing information that we had before, but point taken about changing the title, just policy.

I mean, at the end, it's clear it's open but maybe not everyone really would like that. Okay, Stephanie, please go ahead.

Stephanie Parrin: Stephanie Parrin for the record. Somehow when you advertise a travel slot, everybody agrees that pretty darn quick. But they - you know, you're very good about inviting people to policy meetings.

It goes out. So, anyway, that was a joke. I just wanted to let you know, under any other business, but (Bruno) and I met with Maureen Hilyard of ALAC and also (Marina Mall) and colleagues Raiche and (Joan) came as well.

And we're basically looking at things other than things outreach that we could do with ALAC in a substantive way. So we talked about metrics and we talked about outreach and education on cybercrime.

You know, we put in an ABR to get some of our members more aware of cybercrime issues. They care about that. So those are two fairly neutral and policy things that we can do with them.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Stephanie Parrin: Okay, well, cybercrime is not neutral, yes. Neither are metrics, believe me. But - and that's kind of the link to this discussion of not showing up that policy committee.

I want to write procedures that detail what the expectations of people who come to meetings are. I don't want people taking a slot and only showing up for two days. We need a way to deal with that and we don't have the procedures to deal with it.

We're kind of - I mean we maybe could do it but we need to be crystal clear that if you're taking a blessed slot away from somebody else, then you are to be here.

You're not be on the beach. Show up at the policy meeting. And if you don't know what GNSO Council is...

Woman: There is a procedure. You have to enforce it.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. You're looking at the...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Stephanie Perrin: Okay. And I talked to Xavier about metrics and then made a comment in the third year, or three year plan, or five-year plan discussion and - what's his name – Ron Disilva seemed pretty excited about the idea that we would be coming up with our metrics.

And to people who think, oh, what on earth is she on about, we're facing cuts. Either we measure ourselves and make ourselves accountable or somebody else is going to do it for us. Now, I'd like to have control of that. So that's why we're doing it this way. Okay?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, just the time check here. It's already over 3:00 pm. So - and there is the GDPR session at 3:50. Wait, guys. I didn't adjourn the meeting yet. I just did a time check and I see people wanted to intervene. So, Elsa and David, but you have to really be quick and brief here.

Elsa Saade: Very, very, very, very, quick. Elsa Saade for the record. I don't mind writing a report and I already have a very, very brief outline which I sent Rafik already about some of the discussions that we had at the GNSO Council. So I would be more than ready to write a report.

On another note, which is also related to cybersecurity, I know that we're meeting with the global commission on cybersecurity tomorrow. And I really think that we should seriously talk about this.

Not now, but we should definitely talk about this before we meet with them because that meeting with the Council for affordable. I'm just saying. Thanks.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay, guys, guys, guys...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Okay, no. Yes, David, please.

David Cake: All I wanted to say - to follow up on what Stephanie said also, the NPOC policy committee meeting, yesterday we met with global stakeholder engagement staff and the specific topic was about doing stakeholder core security issues. So I think everyone seems to be pretty agreed on that. And we should all work together.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, there are many things to cover but not enough time. Okay, thanks, guys. See you tomorrow, I guess, for the NCSG meeting.

END