ICANN69 | Virtual Annual General – GNSO: NCSG Open Meeting
Monday, October 19, 2020 – 12:30 to 14:00 CEST

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Hi, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Hello, and welcome to the ICANN69 NCSG Open Meeting. My name is Maryam Bakoshi and I'm the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat. I'll read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the Chair of this session. If you'd like to ask your question and make your comment verbally, please raise your hand.

When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you're done speaking. With that, I will hand the floor over to Stephanie, NCSG Chair. Stephanie, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you very much, Maryam. Thank you as always for working so hard to keep us organized. I would just like to introduce the folks who will be speaking to the various items on the agenda. Normally, if this were a real meeting, we would be going around the table and having

everyone introduce themselves, but I think that doesn't really work too well on Zoom. So we will doubtless see each other in the chat.

Our first speaker, Peter Kimpian, is in the process of logging on so we'll be hearing from him shortly. He's going to give some update from the Council of Europe on what's going on with privacy, human rights, and hopefully a little bit about the Cybercrime Treaty.

In terms of the leadership transition, we have Bruna Martins dos Santos who's taking over for me. Actually, I guess during this meeting, I can pass the torch to Bruna. So we'll have a little chat with her. Included in this transition, we have Raphael Beauregard-Lacroix who is taking over as the Chairman of the NCUC, and Raoul Plommer who's taking over from Joan Kerr as the Chair of NPOC. Now, Bruna and Joan will be doing updates on what's going on with NCUC and NPOC lately, just to give us an update there.

So now, we have as item #5 a discussion on the Design Phase concept paper which the Board presented to us recently just the week of the webinars, I guess. This is something we need to focus on. Our outgoing Strategic Policy Committee leader, Rafik Dammak, I believe will be on deck to speak a bit to the concept phase paper. I hope that's right, Raphael. You'll tell me if it isn't. And I think several of us have comments on that as well, possibly Milton Miller, who's on the call would like to jump in and talk about that a little bit as well.

Now, Raphael Beauregard-Lacroix is going to give us an update on the NCSG Strategic Review discussion that is ongoing.

Then for item #7, Julf Helsingius, who's on the line now but as toggling back and forth to the GAC meeting, which is going on at the same time. Julf Helsingius is our outgoing GAC liaison for the GNSO Council, and so we've invited him to give us his thoughts after three years, I believe it is, on the job—it seems time flies—and what that job entails. This would be the first time that an NCSG member has had that position as the liaison between the Council and the GAC.

So that's it for my introductions. Is there anyone I've left out that I should have introduced? No? Don't all speak at once? How are we doing in terms of getting—oh, I see a Peter. That must be Peter Kimpian.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Hi, Peter. Can you try? Okay, great.

PETER KIMPIAN: Can you hear me?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, indeed, we can. Thank you. Hi, Peter. Welcome.

PETER KIMPIAN: I allowed the computer to use my camera and hopefully you can see me as well. I don't know if it's better or worse, but there you go.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: There we go. There he is. Many of you folks will remember that Peter worked with us to bring the Data Commissioners, including the late Giovanni Buttarelli, to an earlier ICANN meeting in Copenhagen prior to the start of the EPDP, and the heads of the Council of Europe came as well, the Data Protection Unit. So he's going to give us an update on what's going on. So, thank you, Peter. Over to you.

PETER KIMPIAN: All right, thanks. Thank you, Stephanie. A very good morning to everybody. It's really a pleasure to be with you again. Thank you very much for having me today. I just wanted to give you a short update on what we have been busy with lately at the Council of Europe. But as a matter of a short introduction, let me introduce first the institution which is the Council of Europe, which sometimes it can be very confusing, even for those who are very familiar with European institutions and European structures, but this is to say that it is not a European Union. It is an international regional organization which has 47 member states from the outset. It has been created after the World War II, basically, to keep peace and stability into the continent and to promote and ensure the values that which are based on which is human rights, democracy, and rule of law throughout each member states. It has more than 200 conventions. Some of them are open, which allow us to work also with non-member states. And this is the case for data protection and privacy. So this is why we got connected with those, with staff, and maybe with your group, and the whole ICANN relationship but also build on that as our governing bodies. The Committee of Ministers have given us a mandate to get engaged in

discussions in order to help all those stakeholders that are presenting in ICANN to reach and to build in to the ICANN policies the standards that we had in our instrument.

Convention 108 is the instrument on data protection, as you may know, and it has currently 55 parties. As I said, we have open conventions. For instance, Convention 108 is one of them. Therefore, we don't only have 47 member states but also countries from Latin America and the African continent, and observers basically from around the world, from New Zealand, Africa, and the Asia-Pacific region, and also from Asia like Japan or South Korea. So we really have an outreach when it comes to global issues, to several regions and several countries.

I just wanted to start basically to give you an update on what the Committee of Convention has been busy with lately. There are several topics that are discussed in the committee, such as the facial recognition and its privacy implications. There is, as a second topic, a recommendation on profiling, which has been published in 2010 and, obviously, now it's time for an update. Therefore, the committee is also working and it's very busy on the update of this recommendation on profiling.

As a new topic, we suggested to the committee and it kindly accepted to start working on issues that are around digital identity and data protection-related issues. Again, a new topic, but very timely one is elections and privacy.

The next one is privacy in educational setting, which is something which is very unique as we haven't come across any major document or guidelines on privacy in educational sector. Therefore, we felt the need and the committee is now working on a guideline which could drive stakeholders in finding privacy-friendly and privacy-compliant ways in national educational systems.

Last but not least, I would also touch upon briefly on the work which is related to law enforcement and privacy. And most notably it revolves around the second additional protocol to the Budapest Convention. As you may be aware, the Budapest Convention is another convention within the Council of Europe, which is an open convention again, and it has even more parties that Convention 108 has. It has, to date, 65 parties from around the world. And I was working on the committee of the Budapest Convention. It's working on a protocol, namely, second protocol, which would be an additional protocol to this convention, which would allow law enforcement agencies to access data in the cloud or in a digital environment which will not be in their jurisdiction.

So there are very busy meetings and very busy negotiations regarding those topics. The Committee of Convention 108 also produced a landmark opinion on these issues, and in that they drew some red lines also and gave some very important recommendations on what should be inserted in this protocol in terms of compliance with Convention 108, because our baseline would be Convention 108 and we would very much wish to see that the new regime, which would allow an unprecedented power for law enforcement authorities that

the same level of protection is ensured as it is for other type of data under Convention 108.

With that, I would also like to mention some of the very important double [events] that we were paying a lot of attention to that and which also would or could lead to some additional work or some additional drafting access within the committee and, in a broader sense, within the Council of Europe, and this is the area of intelligence services and intelligence services-related privacy issues when they are processing personal data.

First, I would like to mention that we were following the latest court cases with a lot of attention, and it started in Germany in May during a very severe lockdown in Europe. In May 19 this year, the German Constitutional Court had a very interesting ruling which basically interpreted the German Privacy Act, which is, as you know, also based in England compliance with the GDPR which is the instrument for the European Union on data protection and which is fully applicable since 2018. The German Constitutional Court said in this case that when German intelligence services are processing personal data, they need to comply with privacy regulations and privacy rules. And even when they are operating outside of the territory of Germany, which was the cornerstone of the case and which was the new element that usually courts are ruling for their jurisdiction. But in this, the court emphasized the need to apply to very unusual actors, which are these intelligence services, privacy right legislation and privacy rules outside of the territory of Germany. It goes along the same line and it had more and it will have more consequences into European Union

member states, but also in a broader sense, I would say to global data transfers. This is the Schrems's two cases I'm very much confident that you have already heard about. Basically, this is a case which concerns an adequacy decision which the European Commission took with regard to the transatlantic transfer of personal data to the United States. And one Austrian data subject, namely, Max Schrems, have challenged this decision and second time already because he claims that because of some fears that he had about accessing data in the United States on or on the territory of the United States to the data that has been sent through Facebook from Europe to the United States, that some of his privacy rights has been violated. And the court acknowledged it and for the second time now—I don't have time to go very much in a very deep analysis of the judgment—but it is to say that the court now in this reiterated and claim that the data that are traveling from Europe to the United States doesn't enjoy the same level of protection that they enjoy in the European Union, guaranteed by the European Union, a key on data protection, namely, the GDPR and the law enforcement directive. Therefore, this adequacy decision, which the European Commission took, cannot be used anymore and cannot be relied upon anymore.

What was the main reason the court found in this case? Basically, three elements that it highlighted. One is the assessment of the implementation of principles such as necessity and proportionality. And it found that within the U.S., and especially with regards to the processing of personal data by intelligence services in the United States, it doesn't fulfill the criteria what the European Union Charter of

Fundamental Rights foresee for those kinds of processing, namely, to be necessary and proportionate to the legitimate [name] pursued.

The third item or the third element of the case was a lack of independent oversight, which again exists under European Union legislation. I also want to highlight that it also exists on the Convention 108. And therefore, on this ground, it invalidated the adequacy decision in question. Therefore, a free flow of data was impacted because one of the legal basis which served for an uninterrupted flow of massive amount of data between European Union and United States was declared invalid. So it immediately had repercussion on bilateral relations, of course, but I will not comment on that, between European Union and the United States, but which is more important if you'll have a very thorough and very, I believe, important consequences for global privacy issues.

Why am I saying this? And there are several assessments and several articles in this already on the Internet, which is very clear that it is the third adequacy decision or adequacy decision type of legal data the court invalidates. So namely, one was the EU Canada PNR Agreement and the two Schrems cases, it seems that the court will continue in the European Court of Justice which took this position, which invalidated a very important legal basis and very important legal instrument, that it will continue to apply those criteria in further decisions and it will enforce or their judgments will lead or will force the enforcers to better enforce and to better protect privacy rights of citizens. And not only of citizens but everybody whose personal data is processed under those rules and legislation.

Third very important court case in this respect is the one which came out on 6th of October, and also which reiterated this position of the court and which declared the Belgian, the French, and the UK intelligence programs and intelligence-related data processing invalid, and not in line with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. So we see this as a tendency and we see this as a global trend and an emerging trend now where the EU is by its core is really taking a very firm step, even with [inaudible] back to their traditional and historical and geopolitical allies to make sure that those rights that are enshrined and that are guaranteed under the GDPR are respected by everybody, even outside of the territory of the European Union.

And all that, I would also like to emphasize that for years an increasing number of voices were calling for democratic and efficient and effective supervision of security and intelligence services worldwide, basically, to ensure better protection of these rights and the fundamental freedom of people and of individuals. Some think that this instrument already exists. There is an ongoing debate around Convention 108, and whether it could be served as a global instrument, also which would direct national security services in their job and also which will enable them to uphold the rights to privacy of individuals. But also there is a discussion whether a new instrument wouldn't be on the specific topic wouldn't be desirable. Also for the parties, the community, and also for the intelligence community to be sure that they can also do their job accordingly but in respect of human rights and fundamental freedom.

So these are the discussions that are happening now at the Council of Europe. We will have a major conference on 11 November. I would like to invite you to attend. It is an open conference online. You will find all the details on our website; I will send you the link. Max Schrems will participate himself, as well as Sophie in 't Veld, who is an MVP of the European Parliament. American scholars will also be among the speakers. And the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe will be there to present her views on these issues.

So with that, I would stop the presentation. It took a little bit longer than I initially planned. I hope you don't mind it. I'm very much open to any questions and discussions for the discussion you may have on these topics. Thank you very much, and thanks, Stephanie, again for having me here.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much, Peter. I think it's always wonderful to hear from you. Have we got time to read the questions that we have? I know Milton had one. Would you like me to read that? I think I will just in the interest of time. The question is, are the European efforts to get access to cloud data similar to the Cloud Act in the United States? Did you get that, Peter?

PETER KIMPIAN: Can you repeat? I have connection problems.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Are the European efforts to get access to cloud data similar to the Cloud Act in the United States?

PETER KIMPIAN: I'm not an expert on the cloud. But as far as I understand, it goes even further as the United States also in participating in these negotiations. And they of course will implement the cloud with its bilateral relations. But the second additional protocol will be global and multilateral, so it would allow any party to this protocol to access data in the cloud. It will serve as a global instrument if adapted for law enforcement to process data in the digital age, basically.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. It's a bit self-serving of me to read my –

PETER KIMPIAN: I'm sorry. I didn't mention, but it has also a connotation or it has also some linkages with ICANN because, as you may know, and you know better than me, with the WHOIS discussions there is a high need or some claim that there is a need for proper legal base to access the WHOIS data by law enforcement authorities. And there is a discussion here in Strasburg around this as well under the second additional protocol to the Budapest Convention, which would allow anyway a legal base to access data held by private companies by law enforcement.

Sorry, Stephanie. What was the second one?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. Thank you very much. I think we could probably talk more on that whole subject, but never mind. My question was, to what extent will the European Court be influenced by the German Constitutional Court decision that you referred to regarding the interpretation of the Charter of Rights with respect to intelligence services? I mean, not all the European courts have jurisdiction over national intelligence services, do they? Or do they not?

PETER KIMPIAN: There, there will be no direct influence. Of course, I mentioned this case because it is a revolutionary case for European legislation or European law, if you wish, because no country on the continent, even though there is a very high level of protection and very strong protection for human rights and in occurrence for the protection of privacy, but no court to date took such a stand that those who are who are subject to the jurisdiction needs to ensure this protection outside of the country, outside of the jurisdiction. So if national intelligence services are targeting foreign citizens, not German citizens or not those who are living in Germany has a connection to Germany, they have jurisdictional link with Germany, but also if they are targeting Jamaican citizens or any other country in Australia or New Zealand, anywhere else in the world, they need to apply the same rules that if they were German. Nobody said that before. And of course there will be no direct influence in that. I can spend like hours on whether GDPR is applicable to national security or not, but it is to say

that there is a trend—and I wanted to make an illustration of a trend—which is here in Europe at a very high level and also at the very high court throughout Europe, which is moved from the previous position and the previous, if you wish, status quo that national security is purely national competencies. It is not anymore for Europe. And there is a claim for global standards or it is a kind of movement that law practitioners—and not only law practitioners because look, Max Schrems was not a little practitioner—even citizens are claiming standards to be established, even on the areas that haven't been established yet or haven't been regulated. And not only within the territory of the jurisdiction they're in but outside as well, which dramatically changes the scene for international relations for international data transfers and for digital economy, digital society, broadly speaking.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you. Thank you so much, Peter. I guess we have to draw a line here, although I'm sure we could talk for hours on this subject. Hopefully you'll come back and talk to us again soon. But thank you very much.

I guess we're now on to item 3 of the agenda.

PETER KIMPIAN: Thank you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks, Peter. Bruna, are you on the line and would you like to talk a little bit about our transition?

BRUNA SANTOS: Yes. Hello, Stephanie and everyone. My name is Bruna Santos. I'm here. How do you want to lead this conversation, Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, I think, basically, it's been a difficult year and as we've mentioned earlier in some of the discussions with the Board, we've tried to bring up the fact that it's rather difficult for our members to meet virtually and get to know one another and take over leadership positions. So we had both NCUC and NCSG put in applications for additional funding to cover leadership training and basically building on the training that you had been doing with the NCUC that's been taken on by ICANN and ICANN Learn. We find that people are still overwhelmed by the amount they have to know to get their feet wet and write comments or join some of the PDPs. So we were trying to help train. And it's coming to a bit of a grinding halt with the lack of meat-space meetings. I hope that the ICANN transcript can configure out I meant meat-space, M-E-A-T. Any thoughts on how we're going to move forward because it's becoming increasingly clear that there won't be any face-to-face meetings this year either, so we have to figure out how to do this virtually. Any comments on that, and your plans for moving forward?

BRUNA SANTOS:	Thank you very much, Stephanie, for the question and introduction. I do agree that these are difficult times but I think it's across the ICANN community. I don't see any part of this community doing outstandingly well, and it's part of the pandemic, which is starting to set for a lot of our reality. So I do hope that this is a time in which we all get to come back or even get to dedicate more time now that we have adapted our days and lives to this. But I didn't want to focus on this.

I just wanted to say that ICANN and DNS and the things we discuss here have always been that difficult, and bridging this part of the community with newcomers, with fellows and so on, has always been something that was a priority for NCUC or NPOC, and I just happen to think that it's not that the times are that much harder in this sense because the topics did not change that much. But still we could be going back to this mentorship/capacity building programs. And as you mentioned, we got NCUC and NCSG together. We got two ABRs (Additional Budget Request) approved, and they're both for some training in civil society advocacy and also trying to eliminate some differences between our community. So this is something that I would be really interested to hearing from our members and discussing with them further on in the future. Also because this is a plan and a resource, it has to be planned with NPOC and NCUC. So I see these two ABRs is a good opportunity to bridge us even closer together and work jointly in our—I'm not going to say problems—but work jointly in the questions that we have been trying to settle for this past year. I'm going to put it on the chat the information to the Additional Budget

Request so everybody's on the same page about that. But I hope I answered your question.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: No, that's great. Thanks, Bruna. Now, do you have anything you want to talk to about your plans for the next year?

BRUNA SANTOS: I think that, for starters, developing these two plans and resources will be something that I would like to work with together with the NCUC and NPOC and NCSGs. These are really good resources. We have worked on one for NCUC, the policy writing course that I'm hoping that benefited and helped a lot of the newcomers in their community. So I like this kind of capacity building program and so on. And I know NCUC is also really interested in bringing back the buddy mentor program as well. So I do think that dedicating some time to capacity building and mentorship will be a good thing.

But in terms of I think challenges or things we have to do in the beginning of the term, the whole strategic review is a good issue for us to work on—and I think Raphael is going to talk about that later on. I'm also seeing that the first two challenges will be replacing Rafik at the Policy Committee, finding a new Policy Committee Chair that would be able to coordinate all of our efforts in that sense, just as good as Rafik does, and also working with the two constituencies in completing both the Finance and the Policy Committee with their appointees as well. So I'll say that for starting this.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. Well, thank you very much, Bruna. Maybe that's a good segue into the next item, item #4, the NCUC and NPOC updates. I know Joan is on the call. Maybe we could toggle over to Joan and see if she would like to speak a little bit about NPOC and the transition there with our new leader of NPOC, Raoul. Oh, maybe she's not on the call.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Stephanie, Joan is not on the call. So, Raoul, you might want to speak to this if you prefer. Thank you.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes. I think you can hear me.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. It sounds like you're at the bottom of a waterfall but I guess you're just driving.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes, I'm on a car. I tried to show you a video but I guess we're more than 50 participants, so not that useful. Basically, Joan has been leading NPOC for the last three years. We've done a big transformation in terms of both the people and our charter. And I think we basically built up the platform for all new NPOC participants creating policy for ICANN.

I think one of the current things we're doing is to find a proper way to store documents for all NPOC. I think NCUC has theirs on Google Docs, but I think it might be worth thinking about maybe a common repository for all the documents we have. But I think we really need to start paying attention to how we can do work more efficiently remotely and to have sort of regular places where everybody can go and see what's the latest thing, like what documents are being worked on and so on.

Otherwise, I feel that I got some big shoes to fill in. Joan is a great people person and she's managed to find really good people for the new EC as well. I am feeling confident that we'll get a lot more policy done this year than the previous year.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, that's great. Thank you very much, Raoul, for jumping in there. I'm not sure what happened to Joan, but we'll try to get her later if she gets on the call.

Raphael, are you on the call? Maybe we could have a little word from you on the future of NCUC, since you're taking over NCUC?

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yes, I'm there. Hi, everyone. Can you hear me?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, indeed. Loud and clear.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Okay, good. Hi, everyone. Raphael Beauregard-Lacroix for the record, incoming Chair of NCUC or already Chair, I don't quite know when they transition officially happens. But in any case, the plan for NCUC—I mean, I just jumped in when I think Bruna was talking about her plans for in NCSG, and so there's a part of NCUC's plan which are related to NCSG mostly in the two ABRs that we've had authorized for this financial year. So obviously, we want to do something with that, despite the fact that most likely the ultimate things for this financial year are going to be remote. That's one thing.

The second thing would be to try in some way to make a better use of the different social media platforms and the other engagement platforms that we have, so the website, the Twitter accounts. On the website there was a time where we had, for example, blog posts on a regular basis, so that would be something good as well. And I heard Bruna talk about the mentorship program. That's also something that's important to me as someone who joined in completely on my own. I do realize that's not always a possibility for everyone. I can understand the value of having mentors.

As administrative matters, that's pretty much it. Yeah. Sorry. I kind of jumped in and I was not quite—I knew that I have to talk about the strategic review later but I wasn't quite prepared for that. So yeah, that's all for now.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks. I'm very sorry for putting you on the spot there, Raphael. Okay. Well, unless you have more you would like to say, Bruna or Joan, I think maybe we should move on to item 5, which is the Design Phase concept paper and other issues that we raised during our meeting with the Board the other day. We had a pretty active call and I know some of the members that were on that call are here on the call now. So maybe if we could move to that particular item.

I'm hoping Rafik would like to comment on the Design Phase concept paper. I would urge all our members to have a look at that paper. It was tabled very recently and tabled in the Canadian concept of tabled, meaning, put forward by the Board. It has quite a bit of impact on the way the GNSO Council will be handling its PDPs, in my view, just because the suggestion of financial thoughts. Basically, what would be a budget issue, if it were government, would be made by the Board after a PDP had evaluated the policy, which strikes us as a bit odd.

Rafik, if you are ready to speak, I wonder if you'd like to say a word on this. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Stephanie. And thanks to all for attending the meeting today. So maybe just as a background, that paper was shared a few days ago by Göran or ICANN Org with S0/AC leaders and he asked for input from the different groups regarding that paper. So basically, the suggestion is to have kind of a new phase called Operational Design Phase that's supposed to help the Board in terms of consideration of recommendation coming from PDP process in terms of the cost, the

implementation feasibility. We've heard many times assurance that it's not replacing implementation. That's not the place to litigate the discussion regarding the recommendation and rework them. The role of GNSO Council as manager of the process for PDP will be the same.

So that's what we heard but what we shared in terms of the question and comment to Göran and the Board is that we might understand the purpose and the goal to have such phase, but we also want to stress that it can open the door to the litigation about the recommendation. I think now it's the famous—what's the expression—the second bite of the apple.

Personally, I wanted to stress and to communicate to Board, in particular, around that even if there is something to improve in terms of the whole life cycle of PDP, which is not just about the working group deliberation and the policy recommendation but the implementation and the Board consideration of those recommendations. We should have such process or input at early stage to help the working group members in their deliberation to take into account the factors such as cost feasibility operational aspect, etc. and to be embedded in the whole process, and not just wait at the end or after the approval by GNSO to do so. Also I tried to emphasize that we have already some mentioned in the PDP manual regarding those aspects and we should just probably elaborate more and get the resources.

We can take the example of the EPDP itself. It was the EPDP team and the Chair who asked it for ICANN Org to share the rough estimation

about the cost to implement SSAD system. And so it's something that can be repeated in other PDPs. So it was made also clear that it's not to be applied to all PDPs but those who are going to end up with complex proposals, so EPDP or also the SubPro for the new gTLD.

So I think from our perspective as NCSG, we are for defending the remit of the GNSO and the GNSO Council as the manager of the process. And if there is any area for improvement, we can work on that and should be led by the GNSO Council and to add that to the existing PDP. In fact, if you read the existing PDP manual or working group guideline, you will find things that should be done. It's just a matter of planning. Because when you have a charter asking several questions and taking too long, sometimes we can take shortcuts to try to deliver. But also it's about resources. And something that now was experimented in EPDPs is to have ICANN Org and the Board having liaison to the EPDP. It's not about to participate and trying to influence the process, but to give any input and useful input from the beginning and not waiting at the end when it's too late, because it won't be effective or efficient that a recommendation to go back to the GNSO Council and then to PDP Working Group.

So what I would like to ask is that we, as a group, we need to submit our comment, work on those few polls, but also to elaborate more and to make concrete proposal—it's not just about raising concerns—and to push that if there is something that you have to work on that should be at the GNSO level. And also I would like to ask that at GNSO Council, we push to have a comment from the GNSO Council itself and not just from the stakeholder group and the constituency.

I want to also take the opportunity, it's not just about this paper. In fact, in his communication—I mean, Göran, his communication to SO and AC, he [inaudible] that you can find verbatim about the fuller consideration of the PDP life cycle, and we have no idea what he means exactly with that. So he talks about the participation of other stakeholder groups, I think, like the GAC, etc. So we need to kind of to pay attention. Is something coming? So it's not just about implementation, but it's really about the whole process and life cycle. And so we need to be aware that something is coming. So it's not just the talks about this paper. I think it's important to stress and reiterate many times that the GNSO Council, acknowledging the rest, there are things too that need to be improved, and that's why we had the PDP 3.0, that PDP 3.0 is not always going to fix all the problems. It's not aimed to be the silver bullet, but at least it's something more like within the remit of the GNSO. It's not outside or pushed by ICANN Org or Göran. So it won't be easy. It's a lot of work probably, but it's better to have it within the space that's managing the gTLD policy and not trying to do it outside that space on an ad hoc basis as what's proposed by Göran and ICANN Org.

Finally, I'll just say we should review that paper. I did my own but it's important to have a different review. And if we want to be involved, there are some suggestions. For example, like having the vehicle. I forget the exact name but a kind of group represented by different SO and AC persons. I see it as kind of an IRT on steroids. With that, we end up, I think, with discussing what was agreed before, as we saw in other

PDPs. So anyway, I think we should put this as priority for submitting comment. So I will stop here.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you so much, Rafik. Is there anybody else that would like to speak on the subject of that concept paper? I look for you to raise your hand or say something in the chat. I must say that I myself now that I am officially passing the torch to Bruna in terms of chairing the NCSG, I hope to have a bit more time to help out with the comments, which I haven't done anything useful recently. It's hard to be everywhere, unfortunately. However, I feel very strongly that this paper needs a comment and I would be happy to start a Google Doc on it. I am in the process of reviewing—I see Bruna says, "Only on the 22nd." Well, okay, that's like three days, isn't it? Three days. Feels like three days—only in the context of the PDP 3.0, which I'm reviewing. I'm really glad to see increased discipline in terms of the financials on the work we do at ICANN in policy, but I think it has to be an iterative process. And so if we can get a little more management accountability at the front end on these PDPs so that we have a frame then we develop, then we go back, we look at the financial frame again and the legal frame perhaps. I think it would have been very useful to have done a privacy impact assessment on the PDP work. Any kind of a risk assessment at the beginning of a process is going to bring up finances because there's no point in designing something you can't afford to buy.

Anyway, I'm happy to volunteer for this and if there are any other volunteers that would like to help out, please join us. Because I agree,

I think that we have to respond. We did give Göran a little bit of a lecture on the use of this word "centralization" I think the other day on the Board call. So I'm not sure we're going to pick apart word by word, but if you've already commented, Rafik, please share that when we get the Google Doc going and we'll see. We'll try and pick apart the ones that we have to probe.

Any other comments here on that paper? Anything else that anybody want to raise in terms of the discussion with the Board? Amazingly, we appear to be almost on time in terms of the call. I'm trusting that Maryam will tell me if I'm exaggerating and we're not on time. Because then perhaps we could save ourselves five minutes and pass the baton over to Raphael to discuss the NCSG Strategic Review Update. Anybody else? Yes, we are, Raph. We're five minutes early, which is amazing. I'm very pleased. At least my last meeting will be on time from the looks of it. Too soon to say that. Okay, over to you, Raph.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Thank you. For those of you who were in the NCUC call, we had a similar point on the agenda, so I'm not necessarily going to repeat every single thing that I've said in the same words. But as an overall thing, so you probably have seen the call for volunteers for the Strategic Review Working Group. And I must apologize for the terminology issue, it's been called Constituency Review as well. So we, as the leadership, are going to make up our mind soon, hopefully, on a definitive term for this thing, but in any case.

So you probably all remember the discussions this summer on the mailing list about what was then called merger. So discussions on the solution, the discussion also about the different problems that we are facing as both stakeholder group and the constituency and, to an extent, some of these problems will be associated with the fact that we are a stakeholder group and two separate constituencies. So what was decided in August by everyone in the leadership was that the best way forward was to have a written document that would outline the problems and focusing specifically on the problems and not on the solutions. In order to inform the discussion on the solutions, this has been the plan. It is still the plan now.

There were not as many volunteers who actually applied for the Strategic Review Working Group than there were people who enthusiastically debated on the mailing list, but that's fine. We still plan to go forward with that, although maybe there weren't as many applicants, but also at the same time, the point of this was never to have a group of 15 or 20 people because that would probably have been too many. So the point again—and I repeat myself, but I will keep doing it—the point of this working group is to produce a written output that will outline, give details on the problems, leaving open the question of the solutions, whether some people favor or disfavor or hate or really are in love with a certain type of solution that could be a merger or anything else. That's not really the point. But of course, if you are in favor of a specific solution, it does not mean that you cannot join that working group. On the contrary, you are so much

welcome to come and give a bit of your work power to this kind of fact-finding and problem laying effort.

And the deadline for this working group—this working group will be relatively tight now. We still haven't technically or officially closed the call, although it kind of closed itself by virtue of the wording of the call, but we haven't made any announcements in that regard. But that will come very shortly after this meeting is concluded. We will proceed with the election/selection of the Chair for this working group, and then they can start their work. And the point would be to have the written output within relatively a few months so we can still take late in that sense in terms of weeks probably, so we had to have the output ready in terms of weeks, and so that we can kind of move forward with that, whichever direction it may, in the end, take.

I think that's pretty much it for what's going on with this. So I suppose we have a bit of time. If we have questions, comments, and so on, obviously we again as a leadership and me, personally, as incoming NCUC Chair, I'm always interested in having our members' opinions on that. However, the point right now would not necessarily be to rehash the kind of discussions we've had on the list before. We don't really have the time for that. And the point for this is just to also give you a general information as to where that is going. Thank you.

So I'm just going to jump back in. I'm reading your comment, Tomslin. It is a bit disappointing but I think that's a very standard feature of volunteer organization work. I suppose it isn't the expectation. Yes.

People are still allowed to send in their applications. Yes. So that's not a problem at all. You can join.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. Thanks, Raphael. I'm joking when I typed into the chat that I have a reading list of material on GNSO reviews that I think people ought to read. But I'm only half joking. I really do think people need to have a more strategic look at our own group, what we're striving for, and who we represent and how we're actually representing them because I think we need to get going.

Oh, I see Joan has joined. I wonder, Joan, can we toggle back to you? Do you have a few words on the NPOC update that you would like to make to folks? I don't want to put you on the spot. I know it's early but we missed you on item 4, so we would love to hear you doing the transition discussion. Thanks.

JOAN KERR: Sure. Thank you, Stephanie. Can you hear me okay?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, we can.

JOAN KERR: Great. Oh, wonderful. Well, thank you. Sorry about that. As everybody knows, I'm not an early morning person. I struggle to get up. So I'm here. And thank you, Raphael. I'm glad I heard your presentation. I

would like to be part of that group. And I just heard the end of Raoul's speak, but I would like to say that I am now not the Chair of NPOC, and this time it's actually not involuntary. So I think that it's been great to work with the EC, and I think the new EC is just fantastic. And I think that the whole focus is to work a lot more closely with NCSG because I think everyone has identified that we need to cooperate more, instead of having individual working groups. And working, we can identify what are some of those issues that we can both tackle as well.

I'm happy to work with the Membership. I'm going to be working with the Membership Committee with Caleb and develop it the way we had intended for the last few years. I hope that our new Policy Chair is a lot more involved than we've had for the last three years. Certainly, it's been a challenge. So I'll be there to help her in the background as well. Very, very experienced in terms of ICANN and so aware of some of the issues. So I just want to say congratulations to the new EC, Stephanie. Who is the new Policy Chair? Hmm. Her name is Jacqueline Morris. She's from Trinidad. Sorry? Somebody was saying something.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Jacqueline is from Jamaica I think.

JOAN KERR: No. She's from Trinidad. She lives in Trinidad.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Okay, okay. I'm sorry.

JOAN KERR:

Yeah. I've known her for a number of years. Anyway, congratulations to Bruna for being elected. To Raphael, to Raoul. And, Stephanie, thank you for all of your hard work. I know that it was a challenge for you as it was for me, but I'm not going to compare us for sure. You had so many working groups.

For me, I'm on to other things that I've been so busy doing and it's going to be a very, very busy year forthcoming, even busier than this year, which is kind of exciting for me but I'm glad I don't have the stress of having to chair as well. I think I will be there to support Raoul and the EC, certainly, and I love NPOC and I love not-for-profit. So there it is.

And to publicly also thank Maryam for all her support. The only other thing I'll say is that I would like to join the Strategic Group because I think that we really need to flesh out some of the issues and come up with some working solutions anyway from this community. So there I am. Thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to speak.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thank you very much, Joan. May I just say that it's been an absolute pleasure working with Joan and with Bruna over the last couple of years. We have really tried to collaborate sometimes in difficult times, and it's been wonderful to be able to discuss things and work things out amicably, which sadly has not always been the case in our group. So I really want to thank you both and I really, really wish all the best

of luck to the new team. And since both Joan and I are hanging around, if there's anything we can do at any time to help, I know even though Joan is going off to do more gardening things and things like that, they're totally different from ICANN and I too am going off to do other things that are not so different from ICANN, we're still around and we're still eager to help and we wish everybody all the best. So I think that's enough from me.

Now, do we have Julf on the line, or is he –

JULF HELSINGIUS: I'm here, but Milton actually has his hand up for 10 minutes.

MILTON MUELLER: Hello?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Sorry, Milton. I didn't see it.

MILTON MUELLER: I'm still on the Strategic Review agenda item, and I don't think that was discussed properly. So you're asking why there weren't more volunteers. I'll tell you why. When I saw the scope definition that I did not volunteer for this group and the reason is that you have no real agenda. You're basically saying, "We're going to conduct a thorough fact-finding operation aimed at identifying the problems related to, among other things, low engagement of the membership and policy

activities, effective use of strategic group." So basically, there's kind of a open-ended discussion of anything related to NCSG and its constituencies.

And if you recall, the reason we started to form this group in the first place was because we were talking about the possibility of merging the constituencies. I am disappointed that the charter or the scope of this group does not simply say we're going to look at the possibility of merging the constituencies. I know there are people who are against merging constituencies, and that's fine. They can discuss that, they can advocate for that position on, and they can explore the facts related to that position. But the idea that we're going to have a working group which basically dodges that question rather than opposing it directly is not a good thing. And I think we just have to face that squarely that the issue before us is some people believe we would benefit greatly from a merger and others don't. Let's face that issue, let's redraw the charter of this thing, and say that's the issue we're going to face. I don't even believe we need to agree and all members of the committee, whether that should happen or not, but I do think that we need to understand the issues related to a merger. Some people said we would lose certain kinds of resources from ICANN. Well, let's find out. Some people say it wouldn't be difficult to modify the charter in a way that would allow a merger. Well, let's identify how would the charter need to be modified if we were to do a merger. But just to have a task in the working group that does not even mention the possibility of a merger tells me that this working group is, in effect,

a stalling tactic or in an attempt to bury the issue rather than an attempt to confront it.

So that's my two cents. I would happily volunteer for this if we have a meaningful and focused goal. If we don't, I'm going to sit back and watch it fail.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Do you want to respond to that Raphael, or shall I?

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: I can go. Thanks, Milton. I guess we're kind of at the same point where we're at during the NCUC meeting. I don't think that we have such different approaches as your intervention make it sound like. I think that it's possible within the framework of that group to identify concrete solutions and explore the different things that may stand in the way of such solutions. At least it's never been in my mind to close that down completely. We said we want the focus to be on the problems for the benefit of the general discussion and in order to be able to involve everyone, have as many people as possible in the discussion. But it's not completely foreclosed. So what you were saying, let's say that you are in favor of the merger, so you want to be able to actually figure out what's in the way of doing that, I think that's something that you could do within the framework of that group. At least I didn't mean it to be foreclosed. Maybe it sounds like it or maybe the way it's written right now, there might be some issues and I would be glad to discuss that maybe off the call if things need to be adjusted.

I personally am very open to it, but at the same time, this is a discussion that we also need to have with all the three ECs. But yeah, that would be my main point here.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Bruna, you're next.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you, Stephanie. Just to point out that I actually agree with Milton. I think that while writing the charter or the call for this working group, Raphael and myself, we tried to avoid taking any conclusions, whether that will be a charter amendment or whether that will be constituency mergers. So that's probably why the call looks 10 steps behind of what we're trying to do right now.

But maybe this can be the first task of this working group, reshaping the charter and reshaping the proposal of this working group, because I think we both are thinking the same things. When I say an assessment of the resources, but when Milton says, "Understand the resources in NCUC, whether or not we would lose them," I think we're looking at the same things. But it's most likely just a way of saying that might have been a little too introductory in this call. So the call is not a charter yet and this is something that the working group can most definitely work on, and just to point that out.

Also because I think many of us will be either on behalf or against this merger, or everybody will have its own opinions around this issue, but it's something that would also be up for the membership rather

discussion. So once the group has a solution then—and the fact that there's so many of us in doubt about the merger, it should not be any impediment to or anything in the way of this group happening. So let's make this group happen and let's make this group work on the charter and the charter amendments and work on also looking into whether or not the resources will be kept and whether or not we should be merging them, but let's not stop this from happening. Because I think it's going to take a little time, and instead of us discussing the very beginning of it, it will be better for us to start it. That's just my thoughts on this.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. Over to Joan. I believe she was next, and then Tomslin.

JOAN KERR: Hi, Stephanie. I think whenever you're going to look at any issue, as Milton and Bruna and Raphael agrees, you have to look at them honestly and you have to be open-minded enough to look at possible solutions. So that's the nature of consultation.

From my recollection, when the suggestion was originally made, there were strong opinions for and against it. But what I thought that this group was about was to start to explore some of the issues, identify them, and having community involvement. And I like that process because then it's coming from the members. It's not just a group dictating what should or should not happen. And that's why I wanted to be part of it, it is to actually discuss those issues that we can more

efficiently work together and do the policy work instead of both of us doing it. So I'm all for discussing and identifying, honestly, but I don't want to go into a group that already has made a decision. This is what we're supposed to do because then there is no discussion. Thank you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Tomslin, you're next.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. What I wanted to say was to mention something regarding what Bruna said, and that was her saying that maybe the first task for the group will be to come up with the right wording for the charter. I wanted to ask or wonder aloud whether it's better to have that charter worded properly so that more interested people are drawn to the group or leave it as it is and people who've decided they cannot be part of it because of the wording of the charter be left out. I'm thinking it'd be too late then to reword the charter because people will already be left out. So that's a comment and a question, I guess. But in my opinion, I think we should word it correctly now rather than later so that we attract people today before the group begins its work. Thanks.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. I'm going to put myself in the queue. We tried to avoid inflammatory wording in that charter and I think that people should not fixate too much on the charter. In my opinion, we're striking a working group rather than having a discussion on the list. Because

then we can each divide up the research and do the work, bring it to the table and discuss the issues. Don't call them problems if you don't like the word "problem" and don't talk about solutions. But what were the issues that Sam outlined so well in the paper that kicked off this discussion on the list? There are a number of issues. Quite frankly, I understand what Tomslin is saying, but we've got a tight deadline on this. We could be playing with the charter until Christmas, when what we really want to do is roll up our sleeves and look at the issues. I mean, if somebody wants to rewrite that charter, that's fine. I want to get on with what are, in my view, really difficult issues that we have to tackle. So that's my two cents.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Hi, it's Raoul. Can I say something here?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Absolutely.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think it'd be good enough to now have the working group, which is already together and just see first if the merger is viable, look for those issues, and then give that same working group another—I mean, if it looks that, "Yeah, we should do it," if it is viable, then we'll just give it its next mission to make it happen. But I think we really need to do this first phase first. I don't really agree that it has to be one way, only that this merger has to happen and it has to be in the charter. I think it's

more important to see if it works and that can be enshrined in there. Thanks.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. I see that we have quite a queue now. I'm going to put Benjamin, then Bruna, then Milton. I think that's everybody. Ben, Bruna, Milton.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Good afternoon. About this review, what I'm thinking is why are we mentioning measure? We have all identified that there's a problem of engagement and participation or better use of resources. We want to find out what the problem is. I think that the way we should address what is bothering us and go with open mind to the issues and identify them, be open to identify these problems. And also, if possible, to paint the picture we like to see. But every time somebody mentions a measure or measures on pre-defined solution they already want, to me, it looks like an agenda that some persons are cooking up from somewhere, and I'm saying that generally.

So if a volunteer for the group and if that's what we want, if we really want to identify how we can strategically position our constituency for more work, more engagement, more visibility, and to be more effective, we should go out to ask the research questions that is making us not to succeed at this time and overtime work through the maze on whatever solution we find, we should stick with it. But if we start plugging in some issues like measure and all that, I, as a person,

would think it will sure change some individuals or some opportunities for some selected groups. That is the way I see it. So maybe we really need to look at what the issue is that we're trying to address or make that clear and smart for people to be able to jump in. Thank you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you, Stephanie, again. I think maybe this two-phase approach— I agreed something I considered for a time but using all of our time, our limited volunteering time for ICANN and for a lot of the things we do for a group that will just stop at an assessment of resources might be a little useless at the very beginning. I won't be in this group because I'm the incoming Chair so I feel that there will be a conflict for me to be in this group, but I would highly recommend that this work should be split into two. So half of it would look into shorter amendments and what will be a possible avenue for a proposal that is on the table and has been on the table for at least three months now. Then have this group also liaising with the Chairs of the constituencies and the stakeholder group for this resources assessment. Because all of us, we know what resources NCUC, NPOC, and NCSG have, it's a list. You can delegate this job to the Chairs to be in conversations with the ICANN staff and the ICANN Org to see whether or not people would lose it.

I just see that having this amount of people and dedicated and talented people to be discussing resources might be a duplication or loss of time or anything like that, but it's just a concern I have. Because if this group only goes to do an assessment, I really don't see a point for us to have it. I would also say that if any of you is joining this group as an attempt to halt any discussions on a merger, this might not be ideal because you're biased in joining this group. So just maybe a note for everybody to keep their minds open for this merger and so on. And this is just a discussion that membership still has to approve so nothing is definite here. Just this.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Milton? We have permission to go up to 15 minutes overtime so we can continue this important discussion and then hear from Julf. Thank you. Over to you, Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay, thank you. My main objection here is very simple. The charter does not include the word "merger" as something it's exploring, and that's a mistake and it's very easy to rectify. It says, "Conduct a thorough fact-finding operation aimed at…" and now I would just insert "identifying the issues related to a merger of the constituencies." For people who changed that to "low engagement of the membership," I know perfectly well why there's low engagement of the membership. It's because it's hard work to learn about these issues, it's hard work to spend time getting up at 6:30 in the morning and going to meetings. It's hard work to read these documents. And

unlike some of the business constituencies, none of us have a direct economic benefit or interest in the outcome of many of these policy discussions. So of course, as a bunch of non-commercial volunteers, there's going to be a hard time getting people motivated. This is obvious to me.

The only interesting issue that we have to discuss is whether a merger would make that better. Again, by mentioning a merger in the charter, we are not pre-concluding. We are not deciding that a merger is the answer. I think a lot of people have this mistaken notion. The whole point is to explore what it would mean to merge in terms of resource allocation and other issues, what kinds of charter amendments, and then we can decide. The group doesn't even decide whether a merger will happen. The group simply says, "Here's what would have to be done to make it happen," and then the membership will decide. So even if you're against the merger, let's accurately identify what it would require, and then we can vote on it and find out whether we do it. That's all.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you, Milton. As long as we're being accurate, let's recognize that we already have a merger because we have a number of members who are not members of constituencies, they are only members of NCSG. So we don't call that a merger but they are participating and they're NCSG members only. Ben, I'm assuming that's a new hand. Did you want to speak again? Benjamin?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Sorry. I left that up. No, I'm not saying anything again. Thank you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay, fine. Thank you very much. Any last words on this? Again, everybody's welcome to join this group, I gather. Okay. I don't see any hands. Oh, there we are. Tomslin has a hand. Tomslin, over to you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think there's a delay for the hand to come through. I was just going to say that I agree that the keyword here is "explore". Therefore, we need to include that word in so that the group actually gets guided by that charter and does explore the questions that are included in the charter. Because if they are not there, they will not be explored as experience has taught us. Yes, I definitely agree that we should include it in the charter so that we will be able to explore it.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Great, thank you for that, Tomslin. Okay. I'm going to hand the microphone now over to Julf, who's giving us a very brief update on his experience as a GAC liaison. For those of us who were around before as this GAC liaison got going, things have run a little more smoothly in the GNSO with the outreach to GAC and the early interventions and everything. So over to you, Julf, to tell us about it. Thanks very much.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. I hope my mic is working fine. Can you hear me?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, we can. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Great. Thanks. I had to start by saying that I am one on one. So it's only NCSG and not member of other ones. I'm going to be very brief because we are running out of time. It is an interesting and kind of special role. The first thing when I saw, the starting job was trying to find an actual formal definition of what is expected, and even that turned out to be rather hard. Because there is no single clear document specifying that what you have to do is you basically have to go back and look at the discussions of the GAC, GNSO Consultation Group on GAC early engagement in policy development. In there, there are a bunch of things that kind of define the role. Some of it is very formal. It was very interesting in the Standing Selection Committee when we discussed whether we could actually change the job applications of wording and we're told, "No, you can't because that was formally decided upon by GNSO and GAC together so it's frozen," stuff like that. Then there's a lot of things that are not really documented anywhere and it's just part of the job and you figure it out as you go.

So that I don't forget it, I really want to warn you against actually having one of you guys take that role because it has been a huge handicap in terms of actually representing the non-commercials. Because the liaison has to be neutral and has to represent the whole GNSO, and especially in any of the working groups where basically

there's a disagreement between the GAC and the GNSO, you have to take a very low key neutral role. So that has really held me back from actively participating in working groups. So in a sense, it will be one resource off from the ones that can actually fight for what we actually believe in. So that's just a sort of small warning.

It has been slightly less challenging with the virtual meetings for me because with the real meetings, I had to physically be in two rooms at the same time all the time. It's slightly easier to do virtually. I did get a lot of exercise. The hard thing with the virtual meetings is that so much of the job was actually corridor talk, finding out what the real issues were, talking with the people who had issues, trying to self-consolidate them and understand them, which is very hard to do virtually. As I said, I don't want to take too much time. So I'm happy to answer any questions, if there are any.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Really, thank you very much and particularly for that point. It's something that I think some of our members have not understood. When Rafik became the Council liaison to the EPDP, some of our members did not understand that he had to be neutral and represent the EPDP to Council on behalf of all the different parties and stakeholders. You can't take sides. I absolutely agree that we should discourage our members from coming forward and volunteering for this, because we don't have enough fighters left that we can afford to send one of our good people and neuter them. I think it's a really important point. I'm almost feeling very bad about ... I'm happy for

Tatiana that she is the Vice Chair of the GNSO Council but that means we've lost a Council member. Just saying. I mean, sure you can take your hat off, but in some jobs, you can't. As you point out, you sure can't when you're the GAC liaison. You can't take your hat off and suddenly start acting like an NCSG member.

Are there any other any questions for Julf? Any other further comments? Okay. Well, thank you so much for doing this job, Julf.

Thank you, everybody, for attending the meeting and for helping me get through my two years as the NCSG Chair. I know, Bruna, I think she's not taking over until the 22nd, but I'm signing off now. Bless you all. Thank you very much to Maryam, in particular, who has just been such a support and a help. I wouldn't have been able to do the job without her. So thank you, Maryam. I don't need to leave out all the other help from ICANN staff, you've been wonderful. Thanks very much. Bye-bye, everybody.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you very much, everyone. Thank you so much, Stephanie. It's been fantastic working with you. The meeting is adjourned. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]