

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona
GNSO – NCSG Meeting Session 1
Tuesday 23 October 2018 at 1515 CEST**

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:
<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Hello everybody. This is Farzaneh Badii speaking. We need to start the meeting. We are 15 minutes late. There is the CSG open session ICANN 63. Maryam, do you want to do a roll call?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes please.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. So, if we can go and do a kind of introduction and then we will go straight to the agenda. So we'll start from Shahul. Shahul, go ahead.

Shahul Hameed: Shahul Hameed from India, NCUC.

Collin Kurre: Collin Kurre, NCUC, NCSG.

Bruna Santos: Bruna Santos, NCUC and NCSG.

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman. I'll try a different affiliation this time. Princeton Center for Information Technology Policy; where I am for this year.

Rafik Dammak: Affiliation. Rafik Dammak, NCSG and NCUC.

Olga Kyrlyiuk: Olga Kyrlyiuk, NCUC.

David Cake: David Cake, NCUC and NPOC and Electronic Frontiers Australia.

Ayden Ferdeline: Hi everyone. Ayden Ferdeline represent the NCSG on the GNSO Council.
Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin, outgoing Councilor on the GNSO Council, NCSG.

Joan Kerr: Joan Kerr, NPOC, NCSG.

Ron Andruff: Ron Andruff, observer.

Tim Smith: Tim Smith with the Business Constituency representing my own interests.

(Stephan Pilipherich): (Stephan Pilipherich), (unintelligible) participant.

(Florin Supe): (Florin Supe), NCSG.

Farell Folly: Farell Folly, NCUC representative to the NCSG Policy Committee.

Varsha Sewlal: Varsha Sewlal, NCSG.

Ore Lesi: (Ora Leshee), NPOC.

(Yurin Estopadi): (Yurin Estopadi), NCUC, NPOC and Fellowship currently.

(Male Voice): For the record my name is (Male Voice), NCUC.

Amr Elsadr: Amr Elsadr, NCSG.

Christina Kalogeropoulou: Christina Kalogeropoulou, NextGen.

(Gene Hurlio): (Gene Hurlio), NCUC and (unintelligible) too.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Great. Thank you very much. Farzaneh Badii speaking. So welcome. We are going to - today we are going to have - well, by now we're going to have an hour and 15 minutes to go through NCSG goals and strategy and then talk about our meetings on the second segment.

Why I put NCSG goal and strategy there? Because I leave - I'm going on the outgoing Chair. I'm not going to be the Chair of NCSG at the end of this meeting. And Stephanie is going to take over.

So I thought that as my last will and also we should work on our positions a little bit more and also I know what we are going to do and cover during the year. So I decided that in order to come up with our strategies, we should look at our positions and also Board priorities in 2019, which are very interesting.

And one of the ICANN's is global public interest. So they want to open that issue again. So after this - after that in the second segment, we are going to have the NomCom implementation.

So NomCom had the review and there is a implementation team that is going to look at how to implement the recommendations. That's very important for us and I will tell you why when we come to that agenda.

And then the Security, Stabilization, Resiliency Review Team has started - restarted its work and I also will tell you why we should pay attention to that and then we are going to have a meeting with ALAC. And we are going to talk about our commonalities on where we diverge on issues.

Now can we put - no. And if I could ask anyone who's on a computer can you please go to the Adobe room and just to keep company for like remote participants.

So what do we do at NCSG? These are the values I thought I'd just put them up there. So we protect freedom of speech in domain names system and how do we do that? We prevent intellectual property interest and government interest overreach when it comes generate domain names.

We prevent ICANN from becoming a content regulator. We try to keep the definition of the (NSRPs) limited to that technical definition because there is a lot of - there are a lot of efforts to make this DNS abuse definition wider than what it is and put copyrights and frame copyrights (of) DNS abuse so that ICANN become a content regulator by some stakeholder groups.

But so I would care about privacy. We want to bring privacy to domain name registrants. In Whois and also global access to domain names by which I mean that they should be - domain names should be cost effective and also they should be accessible so because of ICANN jurisdiction they should not be - access to domain names should not be (hampered).

So if anyone wants to challenge me on this set of values and what we do, please say now. I'm not going to ratify anything so don't worry. I'm just - good. Okay. Great. So can we go to the next - my...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: I think one of the very important things that we've been doing in policy work over the years as well is make sure that transaction costs that are relevant to other actors like trademark owners, government law enforcement are not shifted onto non-commercial domain name registrants. That's very important.

Every special interest group has costs to its businesses. And they try to - they're always seeking to decrease those costs one way or another. And very often in the domain name space this involves shifting those costs onto other actors and it's usually us. It's usually non-commercial registrants.

And so this is something that I think is very important. We always have to keep an eye out on that when it comes to policy development.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you very much Amr. I have to capture it. Can you please write and send it to me?

Amr Elsadr: (Sure).

Farzaneh Badii: Thanks. And Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Just in following up on Amr a little bit but this whole due process I'd put that in as well that we work really on a due process mechanism. And somehow it seems to fall on our shoulders although everyone should care about it.

That things should not be taken down. This, you know, if there's an allegation there has to be the ability to respond. Also I would edit the first bullet point a little bit. Preventing intellectual property interests and government interests overreach when it comes to generic domain names.

I know what general top-level domain names are. I'm not sure what a generic second level is. So I would say dictionary words, common names, non-commercial uses as well. Dictionary words in domain names - in second level domain names as well as last names and common names.

Farzaneh Badii: So by - actually I meant this is what I - we've been seeing that the pronouns like (an) and it and these like pronouns are at the second level are being claimed by the government because they correspond to their specific TLD. So that's what I meant. But the points that you made are important too. And we will take note of that.

Okay. We go to the next slide. Can I do this?

Woman1: (Yes).

Farzaneh Badii: Oh. Oh my (goodness). So what are our values and positions? So we like we defend civil liberties, human rights interest, freedom, privacy, non-commercial interests. And then I put public interests there.

It is in our bylaws. And I'm going to tell you more when we get to the Board's priority for this year. Because we have to discuss public interest and we what we want to do with it. And keep ICANN transnational and have an interoperable Internet.

So what are our positions? Domain - yes please Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. Just wanting to insert in here there's a kind of fundamental position that individuals have a right to have a space on the Internet and not be forced onto platforms. And you kind of take that as part of participation in the DNS. So I think that belongs like right up front. Thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: I suggest you write that down please. Thank you. And send it. Would you like to say something Collin? Okay. If these are not values or goals and they are like strategies or something else and you want to re-title them and change the name, you are welcome to do that.

But we need to get these things right especially when we go around and tell people what we do. We need to relay that we have this set of values and we will not budge.

Collin Kurre: The one thing I would suggest is maybe once we do have additions and things we can toss this whole list to the whole - well the list to the list so that every newcomers can kind of engage with these ideas and then maybe old-timers can also revisit them and as a community we can kind of agree upon our shared vision for what our goals are.

Farzaneh Badii: That is a very good idea. And I think we should do that and we should send it to the list and talk to the members. But some of these are longstanding values and we do not budge. For example, ICANN becoming content regulator is not negotiable, so. Elsa.

Elsa Saade: Hey. Elsa for the record. Would it be worthwhile to maybe link up these specific phrases or words to an example so that it would make sense within the ICANN remits or ICANN scope?

Farzaneh Badii: This is great. This is great suggestion. (Unintelligible) told you to come up with examples and we will look at it.

Elsa Saade: I'm more than happy to.

Farzaneh Badii: That is great. So can - Maryam, can you action item of the - write the examples to the (items). Okay. So our position, and this is really important because this is also can be like a guideline for people when they want to get engaged with PDPs.

So domain name registrants' privacy should be protected. I don't have - if the wording is correct but this is what we think. Intellectual property overreaching generic names should not happen.

Now some might not know what intellectual property overreach is. It might be a good idea to make examples. But and then government overreach in generic names should not happen.

Sometimes people disagree with me on this point because they think that - and this means that when I say government overreach in generic names should not happen that means that governments should not just own certain names just because they correspond to some region or they like have a city that has that name. And this - anyone wants to...

Kathy Kleiman: No. But what you just said -- this is Kathy -- is perfect for what should be like in the next line in parenthesis. Because it really explains what it is you mean. And so I think each of these lines may have something in parenthesis and then the link that Elsa said to some examples. Because to those who haven't been living and breathing this, it may not be intuitively obvious; but we want it to be intuitively obvious.

Farzaneh Badii: So ICANN should not become a (concentrated later) again and again. And then DNS abuse, security, stability and resiliency should be interpreted narrowly. This is very important because if you - as I told you about - as I said on the other slide, if you do not have limited and technical definition of DNS abuse or security, stability, resiliency, then there will be content regulation at ICANN.

And the human rights should be considered in policy development processes. And that I have a question mark in the end. So these are our values and positions. I'm going to put this on the list. We can add to it. We are going to have - actually I'm not going to be doing this. Somebody is going to finalize it (of course).

So fantastic. Okay. And we just add to it and we put them - we can put them on our Web site and also on the membership - the application of the new members.

Kathy Kleiman: This is Kathy. So this might go up on a Google doc with everybody having suggesting privileges and so we can see the original as well as the suggestions.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. I put a question mark there because I was not sure if people had comments on it because we might have - and we did discuss a viewing NCUC session a little bit. So we can go back to the Google doc, one we created, and discuss. Okay. So...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: ...all right. So I want to go to Tim (or sorry). I don't want to put you on the spot but I thought you wanted to talk about content regulation.

Tim Smith: Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. Go ahead. So tell us why - tell us.

Tim Smith: Hi. This is Tim Smith and I am with the Canadian International Pharmacy Association. And I'm here just to give you a little bit of an update on something that I've report to this group in past.

And but I'll start by just - I'm going to read - I'm going to talk to you about something called the Brussels Principles, which is a project that we're working on. We're invited work on at RightsCon two years ago.

And I note some similarity between some of your values and what we've been working on. So I think it's - I think it's a great connection. And but to give you some background, I represent a group of pharmacies that specialize in mail order dispensing to people who live in other countries.

We started originally as a Canadian pharmacy selling to U.S. citizens. And over the past 16 years has developed into more of a global business. So we now serve people all over the world.

So we were invited to come to RightsCon a year ago when a fellow we knew wanted to put together a panel on access to affordable medicines - medications as an essential component to the fundamental human right to health.

And so we contributed to a panel in Brussels. And what came out of that is what we now refer to as the Brussels Principles on the sale of medicines over the Internet.

And we are really excited about the project and first reported to this group in Johannesburg. And then right around that time the UN Human Rights Council also introduced a resolution that the right - for the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health including access to essential medicines. So it made the work that we were doing all that much more relevant and all that much more important.

So we went to RightsCon this past year in Toronto and assembled a new panel with a number of academics from Toronto, University of Toronto and York University who have worked with the UN and worked with the World Health Organization as well.

And we were fine to the Brussels Principles. And I'm pleased today actually to tell you that brusselsprinciples.org is very shiny and fresh and just launched actually earlier today and there's still some aspects of it that are still being refined. And I'm hoping by the end of today it'll all be up in its full glory. But yes.

Man1: Sorry. Could you just repeat the Web site?

Tim Smith: [Brusselspinciples.org](http://Brusselsprinciples.org). Sorry. So it's - and really what it does is it strives to set out some basic principles obviously for safe dispensing over the Internet. And we all understand in this room of course that there's mischief on the Internet and what we're trying to do is we're trying to develop protocols or from the principles we want to develop protocols that will be a good guide for the sale of medicines over the Internet.

So our plan over the next coming months is to actually start to form standards of practice, standards of operation for the Brussels Principles. And we hope

to engage with a broad group of people at the Munk School of Global Affairs next January, February in Toronto.

And we'll try to find, as I say, a broad cross section because this is something that truly needs to be broadly vetted and discussed. And we're hoping to move the Brussels Principles from there to drafting of aspirational legislation I suppose one would say at the global level. And we hope to do that next summer, next June.

So I just wanted to update you with that information. When the Web site is fully formed, it will have an opportunity for people to endorse the Brussels Principles.

And certainly I welcome your review of the principles when you take a look at them on the Web site. And once the signup form is there, the endorsement form is there, I would certainly welcome individuals in this room or organizationally you to support the Brussels Principles. Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you very...

Tim Smith: And I'll take questions if you have nay.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you very much Tim. Stephanie, you have a question?

Stephanie Perrin: No.

Farzaneh Badii: Oh really? I'm sorry. I thought you - okay. So we can discuss whether we want to endorse but this is something that I think Stephanie should follow up on.

Ron Andruff: Ron.

Farzaneh Badii: Ron.

Ron Andruff: Don't worry Farzi. You're almost done. Ron Andruff for the record. I just wanted to say that -- and as Tim started out -- when I was hearing you go through your values, you will read those values in the principles.

That's what I found so amazing because it's just real overlap in the way - the whole point here is to actually provide safe and affordable medication and also in a way that it's really reaching the human rights aspects.

And so that's where we really do overlap a lot. And we'll be at the IGF this year talking with the World Health Organization and UN. So it turns out the academics that we had working with us lead working groups for lack of a better word at the UN and at the World Health Organization for falsified medication and all those types of things.

So these are the people that are working on these types of things. So it's not that we're sitting in the back room ginning stuff up. So what you're reading is what they're coming up with.

And it's really interesting to see that that group of people in that environment are saying things exactly what's happening in this room. So I'm very pleased about that and I just wanted to bring that to your attention. Thank you.

Collin Kurre: So Collin Kurre for the record. And thanks so much for being here. And I had the pleasure of meeting you guys yesterday when you came and engaged on the human rights issue there.

So I think that this is an interesting thing to tease out because as we move forward, you know, there are increasingly a lot of things - abuses that happen online that are not necessarily DNS infrastructure abuses that are being presented at ICANN.

So I know that there's a lot of people in the room that would believe that ICANN only has within its mandate the obligation to be concerned about infrastructure abuses as they relate to the coordination of unique identifies on the Internet.

So I'm wondering how if we make this jump or if we begin to draw the line in different ways how we could start dealing with the issues that you're bringing to the table without going down our, you know, concern number one, which is the slippery slope into content moderation.

Farzaneh Badii: Milton.

Milton Mueller: Yes. Milton Mueller for the record. I think Collin raises a very good point. But I do think it's connectable to the ICANN mission because it - their problem centers on the domain name.

So while we may not want to endorse the Brussels Principles in their totality, I think the case of .pharmacy is something that is very directly related to the mission.

In fact when Farzi was presenting the values, I was thinking that we might also want to include a kind of a anti-monopoly consumer choice thing in our values.

Again, of course, that would need to maintain - either stay within the remit of sort of the domain name system to be relevant to the NCSG. But they have shown how the control of .pharmacy is being used to essentially to try to exclude and monopolize online pharmacies.

And it's not just like they're setting up .pharmacy and saying here's the way we're going to do it. They're trying to prevent other Web sites from being able to distribute goods and services on the Internet.

So I think there's a economic freedom issue here as well as a domain name kind of a regulatory issue. Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you that. So if you could send Maryam the exact wording so it's a kind of freedom issue and also like it's anti-monopoly stance. If you could send that so that we have the right phrase. Thank you. Go ahead. Go ahead (unintelligible).

Woman2: Well, (unintelligible) I would like to challenge this a bit. I would like you to really elaborate because if we're talking about access to domain names is one thing, right. But now we are talking what is going on (after), right. Like access to (unintelligible) service no restriction.

So basically you mean that we have to do something on the level of ICANN. So access to domain name registration would be condition like (fast) services and (fast) distribution, consumer choice would be a part of these?

I mean how are you going to extend our mission or how are you going to put this into our core values? If this is outside of what ICANN can control right now or am I mistaken here? Could you please elaborate?

Milton Mueller: Yes. I'm not sure I understand it then. These guys can jump in a bit. But so I'm not necessarily against a closed generic domain like .pharmacy. What I see happening here is the linkage of an exclusive control of the pharmacy domain to attempt to get blacklisted any online pharmacy that is not within that domain. Is that correct? Is that what's going on?

Rom Andruff: Yes, if I may. This is Ron for the record. You're going down the right path Milton. And what this is a shadow regulation in a name. It's basically what they're doing is they're taking the .pharmacy domain name and they're using it to legislate insomuch as they're blocking all paths to access to key words on Google or Bing, access to having a merchant account with Visa or

MasterCard unless you have a .pharmacy domain name. But we're not going to give you one.

Farzaneh Badii: Stephanie and Rafik, you want to.

Rafik Dammak: (Sure).

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. Yes. I think this raises a really interesting issue because I see it as an unfair competition trade issue. It's a restriction on trade through the use of a domain name.

And while we are the non-commercial group, we don't want to see unfair restriction on trade. And we want to see maximum - I mean everybody else talks about consumer protection. What they mean is, you know, no privacy for consumers.

When we talk about consumer protection, we want, you know, full rights access through a -- it's been a long day -- through...

Man2: (It's only) Tuesday.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. It's only Tuesday. Through a free and open Internet and that includes not having these kinds of hidden restrictions that are an impediment to trade. So how we frame that in our core values I think going to be tricky but I'm sure we can do it.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. So I find Milton's (call was) a good language. Thanks. Maryam, can we put that in the action item? Okay. So - and also I wanted to mention that in our new gTLD registries like .pharmacy that are based in the U.S. they have a sanction clause that does not allow certain countries to register domain names.

When I raised it some said that this is not a big deal; they can just register another domain name. But then the problem is that we don't know whether - we have actually worked on the matter of jurisdiction of ICANN and how it might affect access to domain names because of their sanctions and we have provided recommendations to get like a general OFAC license. Sorry. I sound like an alien now.

A license that would allow registrants in those countries to register domain names. But registries will not go and get an OFAC license themselves because it's costly and they just simply don't care. Go ahead Ron.

Ron Andruff: Just because I know your time is limited, I thank you very much for giving us this much time. But just by way of background of what I was just sharing with you. I wrote a circle ID post on - it posted Saturday.

So it says the title is Enough With Blacklists; How About a White List. And it does give you a lot more detail on the background on what I've just shared with you. Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you very much. Okay. So we can move - yes Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy. To the point that was reached earlier about how this fits, I think Stephanie. You know, in our overall - this is going to open up the door to lots more discussions because we've got lots of really anti-competitive stuff going on in a lot of top level domains. So beware. The slippery slope has started and you guys have gotten us on it. Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Thank you very much. So you don't want to stay for amazing privacy...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Perfect. Okay. So these are - so the Board shared a document about its actions and priorities for 2019. And one of them of course is expedited policy development process.

I think we talked about that in NCUC session. And then their unified access model. So the Board is telling us that I am focusing on the unified access model and my take action.

So the (techs) are developing a possible - an access model means that access to domain name registrant personal information but by interest groups. So because ICANN had to redact the data of personal data of domain name registrants after GDPR came into effect, it believed that that issue definitely give access to legitimate interest groups.

And so it wants to come up with this unified access model. Well it wants to provide the framework and the guidelines for the uniform access model and of course the community is going to be in charge of coming up with a policy.

Now so the Board said that if the Board is closely working with ICANN org to seek more legal guidance and certainty for all parties with which they took possible access model to review sort of legal risk for contracted parties who offer Whois services.

This is astonishing. I mean I wish I had - I want - I did not want to raise this during our Board meeting today. But if you look at - so they want to reduce the risk for - the legal risk for contracted parties at the expense of privacy - of protecting privacy of the data registrant - a domain name registrant.

And I think this is just wrong. It just shows that ICANN might not be willing to protect the data of the - and personal information of the domain name registrant. So I don't like this for action item. Stephanie, do you have any - do you want to add on?

Stephanie Perrin: Not (unintelligible) - your question? Your question?

Farzaneh Badii: Do you want to say anything about this?

Stephanie Perrin: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: So you see the Board says that it wants to reduce the - I mean it doesn't say but a possible model that reduces the legal risk for contracted parties who offer Whois services.

Stephanie Perrin: So how many have I got? Three hours? You're on. Okay. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Basically - and I do apologize if you've already tuned in on this particular discussion and you already know what's going on.

But the expedited policy development process for the replacement for Whois so to speak that will replace the interim specification that registrars have now as a contract, the goal is to see whether that spec is worth keeping or whether it needs tune up, more material and whether it's GDPR compliant.

And we worked on a very narrowly scoped charter for the EPDP to make sure that stayed narrowly scoped. Unfortunately we could not win in the fight to keep the issue of access to personal data out.

And so it got in and what we predicted unfortunately has happened. We've spent most of the last however long we've been working on the EPDP, probably since August I think, most of the time we've been discussing access.

We have not been able to address the charter questions that were in our carefully scoped charter. We have an agreement that we were not to address the access issue until we finished the charter questions. That is out the window. We've been talking non-stop about it.

And now there's a parallel process going on whereby the community has been discussing notably on Goran Marby's data protection page where they seek community input. The IPC has had a couple of models of the UAM, the unified access model, up there.

And there have been various counter proposals. And ICANN has embraced it. And now we sent in a document this week, which is up there - up - where is it? It's on our Web site, right?

Man3: (I think).

Stephanie Perrin: ICANN correspondence page. Thank you. On the unified access model expressing our objections to it. Preliminary objections. I mean I think they've got a lot of objections coming. You know, this could be a serial. It could be a long running soap opera. But...

Man4: (Unintelligible).

Stephanie Perrin: ...yes. It is. It's a very long running soap opera. So how's that for a brief...

Farzaneh Badii: I am very impressed. Thank you very much. Very impressed with the timing. Okay. So now. And (Bert) also has announced some priorities, which the global public interest caught my attention. Maybe we can concentrate because we don't have much time.

So maybe we can concentrate on the global public interest especially because I mentioned back on the first slide that we actually mention public interest in our bylaws.

And I wonder - I mean in our charter. So I wonder if we want to do something about this because so the Board said that the Board will develop - so this is one of these priorities for 2019.

It will develop a consultation paper on the global public interest topic. In addition to the Articles of Association commenting in ICANN serving the public interest there are several specific mentions in the bylaws.

So they are talking about public interest commitments, which it's almost these public interest commitments are very - we are very worried about. Some of them are about a copyright I think sometimes.

So and then there are several specific mentions in policy development process is used to ascertain the global public interest. However, our community has never reached consensus of what is this global public interest and related to the specific issue of the policy development process.

So I don't - I think the Board wants to reopen the global public interest issue again. I think Fadi actually created a department based on this at ICANN. And we are again going to reopen this issue and we are again going to - but because their public interest is not necessarily (seen that right or) privacy or anything like that. Go ahead Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Yes. Fadi did indeed decide he was going to fix this global public interest, which has never been defined but is in the Articles of Commitments, isn't it?

And it was referred to when the PICs were developed, the public interest commitments. And those are the public interest commitments for the new gTLDs.

So if you had a certain type of gTLD you had to make commitments that you were going to basically do some shadow regulation to ensure that the public interest was looked after.

So we were very concerned at the time. We do not have consensus within the NCSG on what this means. It's very difficult to define public interest.

People like humpty dumpty they have it mean what they want it to mean and courts have been unable to define it in the telecom context. I'm looking at Milton because he's well versed on this.

So I'm very worried about this one arising at this time because of course there is public interest language in the GDPR and the law enforcement community are of the view that it is in the public interest to have easy access to personal data for law enforcement without due process so that they can (speedily) deal with the problems that arise on the Internet.

So that is one potential possible -- I'm theorizing -- motive for them to reopen this can of worms at this precise time because it's not like we don't have a full plate at the moment. Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Milton.

Kathy Kleiman: Do we know - is this definitely on the Board's radar? Is there any way to postpone it and have them push it off? Because overall we kind of decided over the years that not defining it was probably better than defining it because everyone who gets up to the microphone here at ICANN says they're talking in the public interest.

Actually in the U.S. and other countries we have - courts have defined public interest and have worked with that as a concept certainly in the United States. And it's certainly not what every telecom company says it is. All sorts of stuff has gone in the public - we can talk about that offline.

But not here. And so we decided it was better not to define it because if we did define it, we're not going to like where it goes in terms of both fixed definition and I think that's what you're saying. So is there any way to keep - continue to keep ICANN from trying to define it?

Farzaneh Badii: I don't - I hope so. I mean I - we will never get consensus on public interest. But the problem is that the public interest commitments that are in the registrar's contract are very concerning. This is - it happened. Yes.

So for example, the thing that we are worried about like for example, content regulation is one of the - sorry. I'm getting too technical. But I think overall public interest commitments have not been really good for the rights of the domain name registrants. So Milton, you want to say something?

Milton Mueller: Yes. I think it's perfectly understandable why ICANN is raising this issue. It - I don't think it's specifically related to GDPR but it is a claim that vastly increase the discretion of the Board. And that's classically how it's been used in regulatory economics and regulatory processes at least in the United States, which I'm extremely familiar with the birth of public utility regulation in the U.S.

You know, the word public interest convenience and necessity came from that. And essentially it did come down to a discretionary statement that we're going to give you a broad authority over this industry and you the regulators can decide in any given instance what you think is in the public interest.

So it - for an organization that wants to kind of strengthen its authority and give itself a higher status in the world, of course they would favor a public interest mandate because it would give them the authority to just, you know, decide in any case without any kind of binding constraints.

And how can we stop this? Well I think the - in some discussions I had to some group - I can't even remember. But I think the best way to do that is to say that, you know, there is no public interest in some kind of absolute sense.

What you can call the public interest is whatever emerges from a bottom up multistakeholder process that the community will agree on is in everybody's interest. Right.

So that - the whole process of trying to come up with a definition is going to fail and should not be encouraged. We should instead define it as within ICANN's mission, within its constitution whatever the bottom up multistakeholder process defines as the right policy is equated with the public's interest.

And I think that way you don't have to get into a fruitless debate about what is the public interest and what is the correct definition because there inherently isn't one.

At the same time you emphasize both the constraints of ICANN's mission and the requirements that go through a process in which all stakeholders are involved so that the public is involved as much as possible in determining its own interest.

Farzaneh Badii: Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. I don't think we can escape from a discussion because it seems that the Board put it for its fiscal year 2019 and that's - you can find the information in blog that was posted last week.

So just we need to prepare for that discussion and I think that what we are doing here. There was a (thought) before to do that. And now it's just (Cam) and the Board put it as one of its high priority in addition to previous question we had during our meeting with the Board this morning.

Woman3: Just to note that it's also in our - the list that you put up with a question mark beside it. So just for the sake of getting us back to the mission, it might be actually tricky to put it up there.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. Farzaneh Badii speaking. I'm sorry. But everyone has to tell - say their name when they speak for the transcription purposes. Yes. I agree that

having that up in our (unintelligible) might be problematic. But I just wanted to have a conversation about it.

We don't have much time and I want to cover a couple of other things. So David, your - if you want to make just short comment and then we go to...

David Cake: Yes, yes. Just wanted to agree with everyone that this is about the - the only thing is I agree that attempts to define the public interest have been failed in the past. I agree that it's a problem, you know, there were some concerns about why they might want to do it.

The only thing is we made about having the undefined to leave it open to abuse, which is being done frequently within the system. We may want to - I don't think we'll ever get to a definition but it would be nice maybe - if a process does stop, we can at least try to add some clarity in particular PICs, the public interest commitments.

Pretty much people make up what they think is in the public interest. They often put things that are explicitly - that are obviously not in the public interest and things that have been explicitly rejected as being in the public interest by policy processes elsewhere. So it's open to such staggering abuse at the moment is an undefined concept. Okay. Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Thanks. Ron Andruff for the record. I just I'm smiling because I've sat with you guys two and three years ago talking about the PICs. And you remember the battles we were fighting.

And I just want to bring back with Donuts if I recall. They put up like ten public interest commitments and they said you can apply all of these to our 22 odd regulated industry strings that we just got. And oh, by the way, if we find it commercially non-viable, we will - we have - we can unilaterally cancel our public interest commitments.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Great. Thank you so much. And a final note on this; we should closely monitor what the Board wants to do on this and their consultation document. Also this is again opening another issue while we are busy solving the other issues that have reopened. So this is very frustrating. So okay. I do not have the slide.

Man5: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: I know. I am going to just read it from the slide there. Okay. So one of the - I'd like to - I will give you a shorter break because I really want to cover these things that I want to cover. And but, you know, you can (relate so). It's okay. I'm not that bad.

So the Board activities that - they said what they are going to focus on. One of them is the domain abuse activity reporting. And this is why we mentioned it this morning in our meeting. It's not working. Okay. Sorry. The slides don't work so I'm just going to read from...

Man6: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: They work now? No.

((Crosstalk))

Man7: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: All right. So I have to go uncover - I have to cover the slide with - I'm sorry it's not in front of you. But so anyway. So one of the activities that they have considered is doing their abuse activity reporting, which we talked about.

And the only important thing for us and, as Tatiana mentioned today is that they can - the domain abuse activity reporting is assigned project. But there are redlines. And Tatiana, would you like to cover (the third line)?

Tatiana Tropina: Yes. Thank you very much Farzaneh. Tatiana Tropina for the record. I didn't have enough time actually to cover during the Board meeting but apparently it was just a tiny part of it.

And I believe that there was some people in the room who were shaking their heads when they were listening to me. So just to clarify here for us, where do we stand on this?

Domain name reporting. We're not against the project itself. ICANN has a mission. ICANN is responsible for security, technical stability. But the problem is that some of the part of the community want to prove their interest strongly through the domain abuse reporting saying that if ICANN has central database of older reports, right, it could be used for a greater good, you know, than just seeing the trends (investors) of attacks in cybersecurity incidents.

That ICANN or at least some ICANN community (and usages) can make ICANN - can make registries and registrars doing something about the incidents reported to them or incidents they see.

And apparently we see here the danger of ICANN getting into the content regulation because that's where the magic words of child abuse material comes up. That's where the magic words intellectual property (violation) comes up, always getting lumped in together with the protection of children, fake news and so on and so forth.

And we do believe that whenever this debate comes up we have to stand firm and say that we have to strongly separate. And if registries and registrars won't take any initiative and to report to the police and to react and to remove domain name of content to see something, whatever, they can do it.

They can have gentlemen agreements with law enforcement. It is their business. ICANN should do neither. Neither ICANN should encourage this. But I do believe that that side of the coin ICANN should not, you know, kind of regulate in any case. ICANN should only collect statistics.

Kathy I - yes, yes, yes, I see that you are disagreeing with me maybe. So I believe that any ICANN initiative in this field is going outside of the ICANN remit. But of course we cannot - we are not in a position to plead with them to do something if they want to. It just shouldn't be done through ICANN. That's it.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Great. Thanks so much Tatiana. We don't have time to discuss this further. But it's very important and we should discuss it on the mailing list. And so there's the - and the important Board's activity is anti-harassment issues, which they're going to have this - implement the anti-harassment resolution that they've come up with.

Some of our members sent a statement to the Board about anti-harassment issues and they have not received a response. It's been six months. But we got a response from Board for another letter within a day, so. Elsa, go ahead.

Elsa Saade: Thanks Farzi. Elsa for the record. So what's happened within Puerto Rico, Farzi, Bruna, (Robin) and Varsha and I were in the public forum and we spoke up. And then we sent a statement. And Cherine Chalaby actually said that they would do their best to reply to the statement and to make changes.

What you've seen so far is that there are more banners, there's more talk about harassment. However, if there is being more talk about harassment within ICANN, how come we didn't get a reply?

I think it's very important that we push for a reply to our statement. And I don't know if it's a good idea but I was thinking of going out there again on the

public forum this time and speaking again about this situation and really asking for a statement from the Board about this issue.

I do know that there has been some talks with some of our members with ICANN staff and the ombudsman. But I really do think - my personal opinion would be there shouldn't be any further work until the Board replies to our statement. So that's my personal opinion in this. And I'd be happy to talk more about this.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Thank you very much. So they also like - I think it is very important to look at the accountable and see implementation plan and make sure that those plans - those things that we care about like jurisdiction transparency they go through.

And also there is the - that's about it. I do not care about the (constant) stuff at the moment. Sorry. We don't have time but we can discuss this on the mailing list because it's very important for the (support item).

So now. The second segment of this meeting we are going to have the NonCom Review Implementation Team. Now this is like the team that decides how to implement the review - the recommendations that were put forward after NonCom was reviewed.

Now what is NonCom? Nominating Committee it appoints - it's a committee that appoints eight - I think eight Board members to the Board. And it is very important for us to do - to see that these recommendations go through and get implemented. Because as you know, last year we had a - first of all, we are under represented on NonCom. We only have one representative and that's the NCUC representative.

We don't have an NCSG representative. While our friends in Commercial Stakeholder Group have multiple. How many do you have? Three?

David Cake: Four.

Farzaneh Badii: Four. How did that happen?

David Cake: They managed to convince them in - that they needed a separate member to represent small and large business. And yet we do not have one that - for each of the two constituencies. We, you know, no. We don't have a separate one for every constituency and it's just been ignored every time we bring it up.

Man8: And having served on the Nominating Committee and also being Chair Elect, I can tell you that we fought long and hard to get NPOC a chair - a seat. There's no reason why we should have, you know, one lost cousin in the family not coming to the table.

That we should actually have representation for all bodies. So when this comes up, that's the fight I would fight. Just absolutely needs to be restructured that way.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you very much. So don't forget to say your name before - yes. So and the other reason I invited them -- and I - well they asked to present and I allocated half an hour -- is that the NonCom last year wanted to change its operating procedures on a whim.

And there were some transparent stuff going on. And then it kind of wanted to hide behind NonCom as this independent committee that should be - that has the right to be hidden and no one should know what's going on inside, which is not true. Only and only the deliberations about the candidate is confidential. So this is - also we have to see how they are going to approach that.

Now the second segment is the Security, Stability and Resiliency Review Team. This is the SSR2. If you remember, we had a meeting in Abu Dhabi

last year. And we invited the SSR2 at the time and there were some major problems with the scope of the team.

And this is very important for us because if you go outside of the technical aspect of security, stability, resiliency in the review, then we would be in trouble. Then there will be content regulation. There will be - there will be problems.

But I don't think I have time to go over their scope now. I think their scope is okay. And they have very, very solid technical expert as the Chair. And I don't think that what we saw that happening SSR2 before it will happen in this team.

So and they will be here. They will talk to us about their work. And then we are going to meet with ALAC. We are going to talk about our convergence and direction. Go ahead (Jack).

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Farzi. This is Rafik speaking. About SSR2. Just want to make comment. We don't know really what happened exactly even for the SO/AC either who (handled the issue) after the review team was closed.

There was I think kind of a anonymous survey to the members to try and (discern) what's happened and that's - also they brought a facilitator to help them to assume the work. But for the community don't know what happened exactly. So I don't think we should make any assumption at this level.

Farzaneh Badii: Farzi. Totally I agree. I was just giving a bit of a very bias background. It was my impression. I'm always paranoid. So but that I think we are just going to hear from the team. And yes, that's it. You can go and have a break I believe for 15 minutes. What time is it?

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Oh. We have 15 minutes. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Great. So we could talk - well, now we can talk about the transition and when Stephanie becomes the Chair and what you expect from her. And or we can talk about any other business or we can talk about the issues that we did not cover because we didn't have time. Anything you would like to talk about or do you want to have like a half an hour break?

Man9: Maybe the letter.

Farzaneh Badii: Oh the letter.

Man10: This is (fine).

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. So I do know the letter is - as you know, we sent a letter...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Oh. I said that it was - you approved? The Policy Committee approved, no?

Man11: Yes.

Man12: Yes. (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. So we could talk about our letter to the Board if we want and their response. If that's not a issue. Do you want to talk about that? So, you know, and also there's that other thing that I need to tell you as the NCSG Chair for the past year. You are inactive.

Man13: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: I request for comment. I ask for Board questions. And I mean we are a bunch of volunteers of course. We do not need - we cannot do like really quick responses. I do not expect that.

But the third time I asked about the Board's questions, then there's no way - I do not receive any; then it gets a little bit frustrating. So we need more activity. We also have members on PDPs that - we have a lot of members on PDPs but they are not active especially on the SubPro.

And on RPM for example there was a survey. Once I contacted the members. There were like 15 of them. And we did not get to do the survey. And so we need to step up a little bit.

Now I'm not being - I'm not being demanding. Really. And I'm not going to be the Chair, so don't worry. But what I'm saying is that we need to know where the - really the problem is for - it's not a problem.

We have to just improve our participation. We have been - because of Rafik doing so much good work and being so active, we have filed I think the most public comments in NCSG history this year.

And also we need to - we need to have like higher participation on PDPs but hopefully under - when Stephanie's the Chair we can also address that. Is there any comments? No? Ideas? No.

Man14: No turned out here too, right?

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Okay. Well I - Stephanie, go ahead please.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. I was thinking maybe I'd keep Farzi on as the enforcer for this massive pile of work that you've just laid out here very ably. Thank you.

I do think that I have one suggestion. In terms of the comments, it does seem to fall to a few people to be generating comments. And we've had more participation than you to Rafik and thank you to all the volunteers that have picked up a pen and jumped in.

The thing is you can't really write a comment in the kind of time delays we've got unless you've been following the PDP or the whatever it is you're commenting on, you know.

So if you haven't even looked at a PDP, then when it comes for the report, 160 pages for instance like the RDS review that's on the table at the moment, it's Greek to you.

So that's why we keep pushing people to follow the PDPs because if you don't, then the poor soul that is following that PDP gets stuck writing the draft of the comment.

And that's not really a good outcome because obviously they're on the PDP, they've been fighting the good fight. It's better to have fresh eyes informed by the observation of the other person but, you know, they've already been doing a pile of work.

That - in my view, that's my take on it. So any comments on how we can help more people get engaged on the PDPs would be most welcome.

Farzaneh Badii: So Rafik and then Amr.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. Rafik speaking. Maybe we need to add the clarity because we talk about public comment for PDP. If you observe most of the public comments we got lately, they are not necessarily for PDP. And so there is no way that someone will know what it's about.

For example, when the staff or the Board would public comment about the reviews, there is no really background. Have to read the paper and discuss. Usually what they try to do when make the call for volunteers is to - even if we can get newcomers or people on staff for first time to draft, also ask to get let's say who's all involved in the PDP or they are familiar with the issue to help them.

And one approach (erected) that was done by (Robin) when we opened this to (unintelligible) was a subsequent procedure. The (unintelligible) was not well attended. We didn't have so many people to attend because the time.

But I recall the time (Robin) went through all - she highlighted the issues. So she give a kind of insight in the 300-page report without the area that we should cover.

With regard to the PDP involvement, yes, we need more because it's where really things happen and we should not wait for the public comment to make changes but we still have to cover that.

The Chairmen know if you chaired the different level for the PDP, it's hard really to join. For some it's still possible. But for others it's really a complicated job.

So we need to do a lot of effort how we can encourage people to join and support it because it's - the expectation they have to catch up a lot. It's not - I mean it's a lot (to free up) so and so. We need to think how we can support. It cannot for example just be the policy committee or other council or something.

So we need to find a way that's how we can - I will - let's say mentor the people to join this working group. We can identify them. It's easy just to go through the project list from the GNSO Council and you have list of all ongoing activities that people can join.

But if (we sit) in the middle, they need a lot of support. So personally I'm not sure how it can be done. I think the idea is you need to support them but how I'm not sure.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yes. I'm sorry. I have a bit of a more - well, Amr for the record I guess. I have a bit more of a grim outlook on this. I don't think we can support our members on PDP the way Rafik describes. I don't think it's easy to identify where we need people and to somehow, you know, fill the empty slots with names.

There's a bottom line to participation in PDPs. You have to be able to commit the time and effort it takes to get yourself to where you can be effective on those. If you can't do that, then no level of support or assistance from other members is going to help.

So, you know, we could have 15 members of NCSG on the RPM's PDP. It doesn't mean anything. If we have one or two members who are willing to put in the time and effort, that would make a world of a difference.

And to be very honest, those of us who are involved in policy work we're already swamped. Personally speaking, I don't want to spend time helping newcomers on policy work unless I know there's going to be a return on the investment of my time and efforts.

I don't want to help newcomers who will - who I will spend additional time assisting knowing that they won't help me later on in pushing our policy positions forward. I'm sorry. I'm being really blunt here. But this needs to be said.

The (PP3.0) report that the GNSO Council is going to vote on tomorrow includes one recommendation on the cooperative teams I think it's called. Right? Where they want to form a core group of very active PDP participants to help bring in - to help bring like new members who are joining late or who need to catch up to help bring them up to speed.

And you should see the level of dissent on the GNSO Council to this idea. It's the same principle. Saying okay, you have a few members you want to put on a cooperative team who are already putting in a lot of time and effort.

You want to add to their burden to help other people who decided they don't need to really work because they know some other ones are going to help them catch up. Yes. So I don't think - I don't think we should sugarcoat this. I think we should be very honest and blunt in what we need in order to get this done correctly.

Farzaneh Badii: I thank you Amr. And it's Farzi speaking. I actually - I have to say that I was into capacity building and courses and mentoring, you know, for the past three years. And we even got budget from ICANN. We did a capacity building course.

And I don't know what the outcome of that was. But that was a lot of money that was spent. And I don't know if it was really - if it was really effective. It was - it's always effective for like two, three members. I mean that's fine.

But we also like had the public - writing course at NCUC. But I think that really helped because it was very concentrated on what they were supposed to do.

So maybe we should change the approaching how we ask for - for what programs we ask for and instead of asking for travel support, we ask for, for example, like these courses that are like concentrated or - but I'm not - it's

targeted about an issue. But I'm not really sure if - who wants to talk? Oh, you want to...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: I'm not...

Man15: (Unintelligible) done.

Farzaneh Badii: I'm not really sure - I'm not really sure how much the mentoring because it helped. And because if you don't have the time and you don't have the enthusiasm and then it's not going to work. Go ahead Bruna.

Bruna Santos: I think I'm going to need to align with - this is Bruna for the record. I was just going to bring back some thoughts that Stephanie shared with us on NCUC Constituency Day or one of our meetings in Panama.

That the idea - we were discussing NCUC's buddy mentor program and how it sort of like failed because we didn't have as much time to dedicate to the whole thing.

But then you brought a great deal, which was for us to improve our way of bringing up the memory of our job and this like working group. So by keeping better records or maybe go bring them in a better place or keep - sort of like mirroring the - all the efforts that were done with the onboarding program but (with the PDP).

So this is a way - maybe this is a way forward like with less of the time in doing things that we are already doing. So whatever like me and Elsa, we started doing the public comments for the SubPro. We can try to like try to strategize a time on how to do a public comment from there or like something like that. Just food for thought.

Farzaneh Badii: (Highlighting) these are all very good ideas Bruna, which we should implement and follow. Who was - Amr and then Collin.

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: I'm sorry. No. It was actually Michael.

Michael Karanicolas: (Unintelligible) because if we argue over who's next that will - it'll be (sorry). I just - so I just in response. So like I really feel the frustration and I really understand where you're - this is Michael Karanicolas for the record.

I really feel your frustration and I understand where you're coming from in terms of being swamped and in terms of feeling like you are pouring time and energy into an area and not necessarily seeing return from that and the frustration of that.

But at the same time, we have to have a system of onboarding and mentoring and training new people to participate because that's the only solution to being swamped is bringing additional new people in.

So maybe in terms of finding avenues forward we should be considering ways that this can be done with a minimal impact on the people that are already participating.

So rather than having like oh we'll do a mentorship and you guys just can have calls once a week and you can explain everything to him; you could structure it more like a shadowing type of exercise where it's less about focused training and more about, you know, be by my side while we're having these conversations.

Like personally in the RPM's group I learned a huge amount just being around Kathy and just listening to the way that she interacts on those issues. That's enormously helpful.

And so, you know, probably similar with Collin on human rights. And that's probably potentially a way to do it, which is less intrusive, which is less time intensive and might provide results.

Farzaneh Badii: Kathy. So we have Kathy. Bruna wanted to talk as well after...

Bruna Santos: No.

Farzaneh Badii: No. Okay. So Kathy and David and then Rafik (and me).

Kathy Kleiman: So Kathy. So to follow up on what Michael was saying, another way we've done, you know, RPM work sharing is that Michael's been - we've had a bunch of proposals. We've had 33 individual proposals.

And Michael summarized a whole bunch of them and shared that with the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group members so that when they went into a meeting - I'm Chair so I'm reading the summaries but I also am listening to the whole debate.

But Michael summarized them from a Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group perspective kind of does it help due process, does it help freedom of expression; and then shared that with the other Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group members. That was a very efficient way to do it so everyone came in with more preparation.

(Farrell) started a comment on God knows what because it was like a year ago. But he started it. And because he started it, he didn't do all the writing. He created a framework. He created an outline.

And I was able to go very quickly into that comment and say I would add 13 more points now - actually three more points and kind of write about this and there's some history there that might be useful.

And then (Farrell) shepherded it through the editing process and out to -- which I didn't have time to do -- and reconciled the comments, kind of did the final editing and got it out to Rafik.

So there are ways that people can - I've already drafted someone here -- raise your hand please -- to read comments in the subsequent procedures so that - so we can start divvying that up and kind of understanding it. Brand new people can do lots of stuff if you're ready to jump in deep into a small area.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So I know the arguments (formality) because we - that would be a discussion for many times. But I understand what she's saying here is we can help people to get involved with. We can give them some tasks. But there is some level of autonomy that's needed.

So nobody should expect that they will get kind of mentorship for like kind of (unintelligible) for a long time. Is really that we need to get people to be autonomous to participate in the working group.

So we can give advice. We can give some hints. We can give some tasks and so on. But the expectation that they - they should not expect like a really mentor that will be available throughout and so on. So it's - we need to find how people can get more autonomous in the way they can participate and become a full member of any working group.

I mean it can happen through a different (stage). You can join and listen and take some tasks. And one thing about any involved in working group in ICANN is it's a lot of reading.

I hear many times that people expect kind of material to make things simple. I understand the reason for that. But in many working groups things happen so quickly that you cannot expect somebody to get too really involved.

If, for example, in PDP teams there is no way that you will wait for something - like somebody to help you to understand. It's just after one or two calls we are already moving to something else.

I cannot speak for other working group but it's the same. The base is too high. So it's just - it's about really commitment and to be organized and sometimes that when you get just to review to listen and so we can get confidence to participate.

I mean I don't expect for someone to join one working group to become too active and full participant. But it can be a learning experience so to prepare for the next working group. So I don't share the same decision like Amr but I understand his frustration. And I think that some hints to do.

And just to respond also to Farzaneh. I don't think the (classy) wording were used. I think the words were to respond to needs expressed by the members. And it's - we - I think even for me, I know that some of them they were really helpful.

So there are things we can use and we can put that as material for any new members or they can use them in future. So let's not be that negative. Let's say can we see that we can be constructive and we can (agree) in whatever we have and can always improve things.

Farzaneh Badii: Farzaneh speaking. There is - we have David, then Elsa, then Amr. And then it will be a break and then we have to have the meeting start at 5:00 pm.

David Cake: Okay. Thank you. David Cake. So we do - I do think that to some extent we literally just have a bad period for this at ICANN. We have a small number of

enormous working groups several of which are kind of - several of which are - have, you know, 10 to 20 years worth of history involved and may involve a lot of specialist work.

It used to be that you would often start people on a smaller working group and the veterans will be there in the really tough ones. There aren't any small ones around at the moment really.

And only the SubPro is really broken out into separate groups so that you can come in and join at things. So to some extent it has been a difficult year but I don't think we should panic about it. You know, the weather's been bad basically.

But we do need to - it doesn't look like that problem is necessarily going to go away. There'll be a few other, you know, we can see other huge processes looming on the horizon and we can see these current ones going on for years.

So maybe we need to rethink the way in which we do it I mean both as a institution but a whole - that's the whole PDP thing will be hopefully rethinking some of the way we structure PDPs and things like that. But also how we expect people to participate.

Maybe we actually need to get a, you know, find ways to do the useful things and do things like have people who just keep, you know, who's part on the working group is to help manage documents or help, you know, keep track of what we're doing rather than everybody just sort of charging in and leading the debate. I'm not sure.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Thank you. So Amr, if you want, make that last comment and Stephanie if it's not too...

Stephanie Perrin: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: No. Amr is the last person on this issue. And then we go onto break. I'm sorry. We don't have time. And I need you to be back at 5:00. Okay. Go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Sorry. Thanks. I'll keep it short. Just for the record, I don't believe I'm being pessimistic. I don't think I'm being optimistic either. I'm trying to be a realistic and pragmatic as possible.

And when I said what I did, I didn't mean to take anything away from the folks who work very hard on the public comments that the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group has submitted.

But I do want to point something out. That a lot of these comments weren't on policy work. I'm speaking specifically to policy work; gTLD policy. If it's about reviews, if it's about issues like the IRP, that is not policy work.

If you want to understand the context of the comments we submit on policy work, maybe you should take a look at how the reconvened working group on Red Cross and Red Crescent protections responded to our comment.

This was a reconvened working group that had no participation from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group but we submitted a comment. They didn't like our comment. They ended up ignoring all of our recommendations and said, you know what, if you didn't participate in the work, then tough luck. Thank you for the comment. We've considered it. We're refusing your recommendations.

This is the context in terms of policy work. We need to be there. We need to participate. We need to have - we need to make our point and push for it. We need to make sure that these working groups do not have consensus when we disagree with it. I just wanted to draw the distinction so that it's clear. Thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you very much. So we can start the break now and we will come back at 5:00.

END