

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona
NPOC Policy Committee Meeting
Saturday, 20 October 2018 at 13:30 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
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

David Cake: Hello. Welcome, everybody to the NPOC Policy Committee meeting. I think we'll start with introductions. And I'd like everyone not just to introduce themselves and also any particular role they may play in - within ICANN but after you introduce yourself, talk a little bit about your policy areas of expertise or interest. So I'm going to start.

My name is David Cake. I have a long experience in ICANN. I've been a counselor and vice chair of the GNSO Council. I've been a few other things here and there. I've been on a review team, chaired some working groups, all that sort of thing.

My particular - and I for a long time was also the Chair of Electronic Frontiers Australia. And my particular areas of interest include free expression and privacy but also Internet - cybersecurity issues, security issues of all kinds and security instability issues.

And I think we'll start with Juan and work our way around.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Okay. Morning, no afternoon. My name is Juan. I have not too many policy related experience but I'm interested in security subjects, more of them. And I've been - I was policy committee member of the NCSG.

I am still there but I'm just - I am - come to you with some comments and some statements on the RDAP on now is the consumer trust comment. They want the - I remembered it. I don't think too much to add.

Martin Silva: I am Martin Silva. I am from Argentina. I am a lawyer. I am also finishing my MBA so I'm a strange lawyer. I have a - strangely, I have a law firm, I'm a lawyer that has a private practice. I do business law consulting mainly but that's only one side of my life.

In the other side, I also founded and I'm the director of an NGO that deals with technology governance. I've been working for the last, almost, yes, 10 years on human rights issue, beginning with genocide and truth - right to truth issues. And I want to - my other field in technology is not related to genocide.

I mean, ICANN, I've been around since 2013 so five years. I've been a fellow. I started my work in the NCSG. I joined NPOC and this constituency is a not for profit operational concern constituency.

I became the Secretariat in 2014 I think. I was the secretariat before we had Maryam. It was the pre-Maryam time and I had to do a lot of that work, not as good, not as much as Maryam of course, much crappy quality but I tried my best.

And I eventually - I arrived to the council last year after being Secretariat and Vice Chair of NPOC. And now I am just a councilor on behalf of NCSG, sort of informally represented (unintelligible) NPOC, not for a formal statement but because of my experience with NGOs in particular because...

Although I do teach, I do research but I do have a background on management of things more than other people of the NCSG that are more individually working on projects or something like that.

Inside the council, I would say inside the NCSG, I do have a leadership role towards right protection mechanisms which are specifically relevant right now because we have the Right Protection Mechanisms working group where we are reviewing all of them.

It's a working group - they sort of left over on the issues because, I don't know, not many people want to be part of it. They hear the word trademark and they instantly say, I'm not a lawyer, first; second, boring; third, who cares.

And the truth is, the people that are involved are pretty much there. It's a group of constant 30 to 50 people that is always on the call, is always on the list. It's very IPC oriented of course because we think (unintelligible) the issue. And the group of the non-commercials is very, very low.

So over the last two years, I've been trying to organize us more so we can share opinions, strategize towards okay if we have a common goal, if we have a common opinion or if we don't have one, either way, we should try to coordinate ourselves to better address right protections concerns.

And to put that in plain English, we are trying to make the process that protects trademarks to (unintelligible) towards other rights, in some cases even right of business itself. So large business don't abuse small businesses. And overall a sensitive issue of course if try to watch out that in the name of protecting trademarks and protecting commerce and having a healthy economy we don't go over individual rights or NGOs.

I would say that's right now my main expertise area but of course being on the council, I see a lot of things going around so I can talk about other issues.

Raoul Plommer: My name is Raoul Plommer, currently the Vice Chair of NPOC, being a member of the Pirate Party ten years ago, since ten years ago. And that's when I was pretty much woken politically and we've actually tried to do some public policy on issues that are important for the part of the agenda, like

privacy is one of the most important ones as well as like freedom of speech. And I think that experience is actually somewhat relevant here in the ICANN environment too.

And then sort of in 2011 I think, I joined Electronic Frontier Finland. I've been a board member for a couple of years now as well as being a board member for the Open Knowledge Finland, which is part of the Open Knowledge International group that basically has open (unintelligible) records around the world. And their main goal is to (unintelligible) data for people to use and businesses as well.

Here at ICANN, I haven't done policies that much at all, which is - it's been sort of meaning to happen but hasn't materialized. And I think we've really needed a sort of good lead on the Policy committee because I think NPOC has not really done policy ever.

And I think we are now in a really good position to start the work on policy because we've - previously we've just had like two people in the Policy committee. That's including the Chair. So you can see that it's hard to be even motivated as a Chair to run a committee like that, where you basically have to do at least half of the work.

And well, of the issues I have been interested in, ICANN, the policy issues - yes, well, actually yes, that's not a policy issue but I'm currently involving myself with the NomCom review. There's a NomCom review session in this meeting as well. I'm intending to go there and have been in Panama as well. I'm trying to seek for NPOC to get there feet at the NonCom table. We don't have one at the moment.

And, what else? There was a policy issue that I did feel quite interested about but I'm sure that will come to me. (Yoanna)?

Ioana Stupariu: Yes, hello, everyone. My name is Ioana Stupariu. I'm from Romania. I'm doing my TC data regulation at - in Hungary, (unintelligible) University. Currently I'm in the U.S. at Columbia.

I also work as a Data Protection Officer and - for several companies and I've been working as a consultant before that on different technology regulation and policy matters.

I also - some NGO work. I coordinate an NGO address (unintelligible) and Europe and I'm - I'm also board member of several other debating associations in my country.

And I'm a recent addition to ICANN. This is my fourth meeting, fourth consecutive meeting so basically I've been - I started last year in Abu Dhabi and this is my fourth meeting. I started as a fellow, I'm also here as a fellow.

And I just joined NPOC last meeting after Panama and I haven't done much policy work because I just started to figure out how things work around here, just contributing to some public comments or some public documents within NCSG and that's it.

And I'm not really sure yet what particular topics I want to get involved in. Of course, I have privacy expertise but I think I'm more interested into accountability or transparency or other topics, not necessarily one that I'm dealing with on a regular basis with my other work. So - but again, I'm also into whatever is needed and whatever is on the table. So I really look forward to working together.

Oreoluwa Lesi: Hi, everyone. I'm Oreoluwa, Oreoluwa Lesi. I'm the Secretariat of the NPOC Committee. So my day to day, I run a nonprofit organization. We focus on closing the gender gap, the technology gender gap. And in terms of policy areas I've been involved in in Nigeria like broadband access, so I worked on

the team that put together a broadband plan for the country. And then also different issues around gender and teach us all inclusion.

In terms of ICANN, I am also really new. I mean, I've technically been a member for a while but not really active. So my first meeting, I came for intercessional in January in L.A. but I'll say that my first real meeting was Puerto Rico. And so yes, so this is like my third meeting, so yes, second meeting.

So in terms of policy within ICANN, I'm also, you know, pretty new and also just, you know, planning to just learn and find what areas I might be interested in.

David Cake: Yes.

Joan Kerr: So my name is Joan Kerr. And I just want to say, four years ago today, I joined NPOC, yes. And I often tell the story that I came in to do one thing, which was to help with the membership database, and fortunately or unfortunately, I'm not sure which, things happened and so I'm now the Chair of NPOC, which will end I guess in June or next year because it's two terms.

David Cake: Unfortunate for us.

Joan Kerr: Thank you. In terms of my expertise, I'm a self-employed person. I've always been self-employed. I have never applied for a job because I - everyone calls me and gives me work. So it's a great way to live because I can pick and choose between projects. And I can tell you working at home it's both the meetings and projects that excites me all the time.

In terms of expertise, I'll talk about that in a second. I'm not a policy person. I spent the last 13 years fighting policymakers, just for the record, because I often thought that policy hinders people from functioning. And many organizations use policies to block innovation or inclusion.

And I've spent my life fighting those things, so it's interesting being on the other side of the coin. But usually you'll see me asking the question, how is that helpful or why would we do that, just to have that part of it. So happy to be on policy to learn it from the other side as well.

In terms of expertise, I do not work in this area. I tend not to ever go on a volunteer board or committee of any work that I do so that there's never any ever - it doesn't affect me. It affects the community because I don't really need to do that because I have my work in hand. So I totally - I feel that I am usually totally impartial when I make decisions and it's for the benefit of others, not for myself.

As far as expertise - in terms of this, ICANN though, I did suffer from my - one of my domain names being stolen and it was a high profile name. And it was a huge impact on a project that I did that actually won the (unintelligible) and many awards, yes. So it was a high level, high, like I mean - and the registrar stole the name.

And you can imagine how devastating it was. And I had no idea of where do you go. This was 2004. Where do you go? I was not from that industry. And so that led me on a path and then what - that must have - must happen to other people.

So I have a personal story in that because it really - it wasn't just the Web site. It was an actual international corporation Web site. And we didn't get the name back for seven years, which at that point, you know, no big deal. So big expert on that.

But I'm happy to be the Chair for NPOC, and I think that we're a wonderful constituency. I'm happy to be here and I'll be helpful in any way I can.

Dina Solveig Jalkanen: Hi. I'm Dina Solveig Jalkanen so a Finnish name. My friends call me Thomas. And I am the Vice Chair of this committee. My main function is to assist David in chairing this and act as chair if he is otherwise occupied at some point.

So my status at ICANN is work. I'm interceding all the data and privacy issues on volunteer basis. I also spot technically a number of human rights projects information liaise. And especially. I'm also interested in cyberpolicy of different places around the planet, not just the, U.S. for instance everyone seems to talk about.

Yes, policy (unintelligible) has some sort of interest to me. Another point of interest is secure vulnerability disclosure, which I think needs to move forward with ICANN put a word about this into some public comments that they've made. But it hasn't moved further than that, I'm sorry to say. I'm also a member of (unintelligible) of the Foundation Europe and I'm a member of Chaos Amsterdam, which is a chaos computer club of South Amsterdam.

And what else? I am also relatively new to ICANN. I really started at the same meeting as (Yoanna) in Abu Dhabi. And I've been involved in the NCC about maybe over a half year before that, participating in public comments work. Policy stuff interests me.

For some time, I've been on RPM too. I realize I'm not a lawyer. It was a very fascinating group but I have great respect for people who can, (unintelligible) say, extend themselves and then say something which is - has to be interpreted. I feel (unintelligible) ever since.

David Cake: Most humans have.

Dina Solveig Jalkanen: But I can learn. That's pretty much it.

David Cake: Thank you, everybody. And I think it shows we've got a really interesting range of experience. And there's a few issues that we have at least a couple of people interested in, including human rights, including privacy, including sort of cybersecurity issues generally and some specific things.

And I think that's an important thing. We've got to understand what we have and look at the ICANN situation and where could - we can make a difference where processes that are ongoing but also where we could maybe help start.

I just wanted to sort of go through what is sort of on the plate with ICANN this week first and that way we can - and work out if there's anything we urgently sort of need to help with. But I'm not sure there are all that many so this might be - this part of the meeting might be quite quick. And then I would like to sort of concentrate more on how the NPOC Policy Committee is operating generally.

But just in terms of what we do have sort of on our plate before us at the moment, obviously the - usually one of the things we do when we look at policy at one of these ICANN meetings is work out what is actually our pro vote on the GNSO Council.

And then we might work out if there's anything there we may need to go to and talk to of our constituencies or other - parts of other stakeholder groups and see if there's anything. But I don't think there is anything particularly huge looking at the...

So, I mean, Martin, you're on council. What is - what have we got coming up for us? Do you want to - mind running through it?

Martin Silva: Do you have the agenda to upload it? Not let me...

David Cake: Could we hook up on the?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, I can do it.

David Cake: The consent agenda, we're going to reconfirm your, as GAC liaison, and recommend the - and send a recommendations report on - from the Red Cross names to...

Martin Silva: Well, wait, I can...

David Cake: ...that's on the consent agenda. Take it down to pass the - let's see the agenda. Yes, there we go.

Martin Silva: I think, just to explain around how that works.

David Cake: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: Sorry, just a quick one. Can you just say your name for the record before you?

Martin Silva: Yes, this is Martin Silva for the record. In each meeting, first of all, the - what's the council itself? The council has the mission the PDP process. They have to draft the rules on how policies develop. They have to create or kick off the specific working groups.

And they are the ones that receive the result of the consensus and give a final word, if you may, saying, okay, the consensus has been reached through the rules that we created. Everything was done in a due process manner. And they give like the final stamp so the consensus can go to the board and the board can have their recommendation of how the policy should be.

This means that, I don't know if the work looks pretty administrative. It's not like - I - when I first joined the council, I thought it was like a legislative thing,

where we will debate each topic, each point. And that's not the case because all of that is being done in the working groups.

And that is - it has not always been like that. That is how the current policy process was established or developed. Before that, the council did discuss everything because the work was done by councilors, the policies that we see around that are all over. I think this was changed in 2012, maybe - the actual PDP, 2.0 PDP.

David Cake: Yes, we revised...

Martin Silva: Sorry?

David Cake: We revised the PDP process and we added a couple of variants to the PDP process like an EPDP and things like that and talked a bit about how we revised the process.

Martin Silva: So mainly when we're - in the council, we are not being defined...

David Cake: Particularly, the - that working group is formed about - specifically about issues to do with the policy and - the difference between policy and the implementation phase. So now we have implementation teams that have people from the policy process on it to make sure that the implementation of a policy sort of can help guide it when we're not - when we're on...

Martin Silva: Official... I understand they're working with - before they weren't so open. They are in the present PDP.

David Cake: That's probably true. We've changed a little bit the way we do working groups as well, particularly to make it easier to join after the start in many cases and things like that and - or to be an observer. Generally, there is a move to try and make working groups more open and sort of inclusive. Some of that was

due to a change to the PDP but some of it just we've acted extra programs and things.

Martin Silva: Okay. What I want to transmit to you is while you're going to read the agenda, it's not the point to point debate on each PDP of what's going on. In general, there are - the councilors are constantly being updated on what happens to the PDPs.

But during the council session where we vote things, things are already sort of cooked. They come like a sort of closed thing saying, okay, this is what the PDP is telling us. They have this consensus or it demands the council to take a drastic action. The first part is very administrative in the sense of it's all the rules of okay did we have a consensus for this agenda, does anyone have any update, all the general stuff but even more formal than the constituencies have it.

And afterwards, if you can read the items, each item is one thing that has to be presented. And the ones that say council vote are the ones that the council actually has to vote in order for the motion to process an action. And here the votes start in the item form. Before that, all the other items are not voting matters. They're more administrative stuff or just information being shared.

Let's go with the first one, number four, confirmation of standing committee on ICANN budget and operation charter. This is a committee that was started to - ICANN has a budget each year and the budget is consulted with the committee.

And the - all the constituencies always put up some work, NCC does, NCGS and the policy committee always drafts some sort of comment saying we agree or we don't agree with this budget, for this or for that reason. The council does the same. But it was a lot of work. It was always late. And no

one was really paying that attention because it always came like a last minute thing.

So they created the committee. It's a standing committee because it's permanent; it's always there. It's a permanent committee inside the council where councilors and other give the council some sort of advice on what to say about the budget. Right now, Ayden is -- everyone knows Ayden -- Ayden is the current Chair of the Budget and Operations Funding Committee. And he's done an amazing work.

I think - this was very interesting to see from - see here how the committee was formed, how it is working. This vote is for the council to approve the final charter because so far, we were working as a sort of probation time to see how it was. Ayden will really produce what he had to produce and showed it was something that the council needed. So we're going to vote on that.

I don't think that anyone in the council or the NCSG is going to oppose this. I know if anyone has any comments on it but it basically does.

David Cake: Yes, and this is interesting. This is a new sort of - the council manages the - the primary job is to manage the policy development process but it does a bunch of other things. And it manages - represents the whole GNSO within ICANN. And I think this is sort of in that role really, the ICANN...

Martin Silva: And it has to because in the last year we had all this talk about budget because ICANN thought that was going to have more money. And ICANN also expanded a lot of things in the last years and now we find like, oh, maybe we are spending too much. So when ICANN had to cut back on some things, that really was okay but if you cut on this, we cannot do our policy work.

And that's when the councilors really felt like, oh, then if we have to manage the policy process, we have to also see the resources. And that's where the budget debate became a little bit more relevant than maybe it was before.

David Cake: Is there anything you want to discuss about this motion or should we just sort of move on to the next one? It's really good to know that it's happening and that the - and that... Is this something where the constituencies are sort of directly involved or do we get that?

Martin Silva: Technically, the constituencies remain or we think most of the legitimate opinion. So this committee or the council itself goes into very specific GNSO stuff, right? It doesn't get into the opinion for instance on the budget of the fellowship.

David Cake: Yes.

Martin Silva: But we consider that something that constituencies will say on their own.

David Cake: Okay.

Martin Silva: It's a very limited scope that the committee has. And just that Ayden has been doing an amazing job on this.

David Cake: Yes.

Martin Silva: I want to have that on the record. He deserves it.

David Cake: Okay. Should we move on to the next one?

Martin Silva: Yes. This is one of my favorites. Item five, council vote, the GSO policy development process 3.0. This - we talk about the PDP always as an acronym. The acronym means policy development process. They are the

rules in which we develop a new rule for the VNS system, at least in the generic domain names part.

And here we call it PDP 3.0 because we are reviewing the process and we are thinking to launch the next version like a software, 3.0, a next version of the process. This was launched, at least the idea, I saw it for the first time last - this year, this year in January in the council retreat just before the intercessional session where we were presented with this idea of saying, okay, after IANA with the digitally wrong already in the past and looking for it for the new one, maybe we need to review how to make the process more efficient and more legitimate.

So all of these things were - are being scoped now. Like for instance, we interview all the working group chairs and we ask them, do you think your working group is working. If it's not working, why it's not working.

So a lot of things came up, things like, well the main problem is the dynamic. The dynamic of the group doesn't go towards consensus and the amount of waste of resources creates an incentive to not be part of a working group or not to get invested because maybe you have invested a thousand of hours and nothing happens.

So we try to scope what problems of the current PDP rules could be problematic and how can we change them. Maybe we want to go back. We don't want such an open model for working groups. Maybe we want something more closed or we want a mix. We want to be very open and transparent so everyone can join in at any time and everything is recorded and everything can be read back.

Constituencies have to choose X amount of leaders that we eventually vote to get consensus for a working group, which right now doesn't happen. And that way you create - you put the responsibility to achieve consensus into one group of people.

And maybe that creates a dynamic a little bit more efficient towards okay we have to get this done, we have - we cannot play or delay things just because we don't like them. There's an actuality someone is delaying things.

So the PP (unintelligible) for that is to debate how can we improve the process to make it more efficient, more legitimate. And in here we're just informing the council will be sort of to inform that we believe that the process has to be reviewed basically.

It's not a major issue but it's like sort of the official launching of saying, okay, we are going to review this. This is no longer just an idea we're debating informally among the councilors. We are officially launching the idea that we're going to review it somehow.

David Cake: Right. So this is the - this is launching the process.

Martin Silva: Yes. It's not a working group or anything like that yet. It's like an official thing, okay, we're going...

David Cake: But that's something where it really probably would be useful for bodies like this policy committee to try and be actively involved with the process as it goes along and work out ways...

Martin Silva: Your councilors, at least.

David Cake: Okay, well that's good to know. But it's the start of a process.

Martin Silva: Yes, it's the start of the process because so far it was only informal talks on whether we should do it or not.

David Cake: Yes. But we're definitely doing it.

Martin Silva: We are doing it now.

David Cake: And I think it would be really valuable for groups like this policy committee and others to take a look and see what - how we think that process could be improved and look at our members' experiences.

Martin Silva: Yes. And technically, there are no limits. I mean, we could redo the PDP as where we as a community with the stakeholders with concerns like to.

David Cake: All right. Before I move on, does anyone want to comment on that? Item six, the termination of the next generation GTLD registration directory services.

Martin Silva: That's right. You can...

David Cake: Yes, I can talk to that. I happen to be part of the leadership team of that group. And so that had a leadership team that had representatives from each of the four stakeholder groups. Most of its time - pretty much all of its active time was chaired by Chuck Gomes of Verisign.

Pretty much Chuck is someone who's been at ICANN since the very start and this is more or less his last project. So it's particularly galling that I think effectively we ended up failing to achieve what we wanted to achieve in this working group.

We shut - we decided to terminate it because we suspended it, the working group because - well, basically because we hadn't made enough progress in time. The progress was - I think we did make a lot of - you know, the - we did a lot of work but it didn't get to the point where we essentially had a replacement for WHOIS that would work with the GDP.

And the board decided that this was actually something that needed to be dealt with as an emergency. So they created temporary specification on registration directory services to sort of replace WHOIS with a system that

was sort of the minimum possible system that was consistent with the European General Protection regulation without exposing ICANN to, you know, illegal - you know, to condoning data sharing that had become illegal and potentially exposing it and its contracted parties to massive fines.

So we - when the RDS had - we decided that the discussion around the temp spec, which is going on right now in another room, the expedited policy development process around the temporary specifications, was so close in its goals and involved so many of the same people in core roles that we suspended the registration directory services.

We sort of - we just - we couldn't effectively try and create - inherently try and create the short term - look at the short term solution and try and create a medium solution and try and create a long term solution...

Martin Silva: At the same time.

David Cake: ...all at the same time. So - and then eventually, the leadership - after a few months of that, the leadership of the older one, the next generation GTLD registration directory services, came to the conclusion that the direction of discussion around the temporary specification and such was likely that if the - if we did start work again on a new GTLD RDS, we would likely do that, you know, in a way that was a sufficiently different starting point and sufficiently different context, that there would be no point restarting the old group.

Instead, we would start yet another one, potential third or fourth sort of generation in this particular part of the ongoing saga of WHOIS. WHOIS at ICANN is essentially the great ongoing ever policy debate.

We've essentially been having policy debates at privacy and WHOIS since the - since before the creation of ICANN and are still doing so quite furiously. Upstairs, I think they've probably got to the point where they're hiding behind the desks and throwing things at each other. It seems to be going quite well.

So just to say that this is shut down. This was a decision of the leadership of that group. I was part of that decision. I think it's a good idea. There's really no point continuing to this point and... We were quite careful that the work that had been done by that group was going to be preserved and made available to future groups on this process.

And this one does need a supermajority vote so it does need everyone to pretty much agree. But I think that is likely to happen.

Martin Silva: Yes.

David Cake: I can't see any recalcitrant stakeholder group demanding to keep this going so.

Martin Silva: No. That's the other thing. Usually, the votes are - in most of the cases, we already know how it's going to go because it's discussed previously, if someone has a problem or what are the different opinions around. It's rarely the case where we have to grab to the chair to know whether we make the votes or not.

David Cake: It certainly does happen but not frequently that council... And in the sense it's sort of - I mean, there are natural conflicts that will always happen. But in the sense it's the council should be managing the process so that it never really has a divided vote.

All right. INGO access.

Martin Silva: This one is also about - if RPMs are unliked, this is beyond that. Even lawyers don't care or understand for this one. And I tried many, many things to be part of that working group. And it's being run by people that are very dedicated to it, so it's very hard to grasp sometimes the discussions that they have because it's very high level discussion and they never escalate it down.

David Cake: I was briefly in this working group as well and I left when it became clear that I think Thomas mentioned maybe the working group because it had - you know, it had become too much of a thing for lawyers. This one was a working group where the expert lawyers and ICANN veterans decided that it was too complex and they had to seek outside legal specialists' help.

Martin Silva: Imagine.

David Cake: This one was really quite dense and got a lot into sort of some fairly obscure international law. I think it also ran into some complicated internal sort of disagreements and problems.

Martin Silva: The thing with this is, first of all, this vote was delayed. It was supposed to be voted in the last session but the NCSG particularly asked for more time to understand what we were voting on because most of us are not absolutely - we understand what the working group is about. We understand the conclusions. But we weren't sure of all the implications it meant to have a higher vote on it.

And really what does this mean is that just as the RPMs try to protect trademarks, the international - IGO means international government organizations like organizations that are created with treaties like the U.N., things like that. And the main thing is how do you give them protections on the DNS, for one, and second, how can you also they have a special jurisdiction status for being international organizations that are created through treaties.

So some of the debate is how can you force things on them. And the second is how can they protect their names when they don't have trademarks. And they don't need to have trademarks in the normal regular life.

So a lot of the debate was - were between GAC and GNSO trying to fight one another, saying, okay, I think this, I'm the government body, I created these organizations, I know how they work, they are observers in my advisory committee. And the GNSO saying, no, this is a trade names problem, therefore it's a GNSO process.

So they created a PDP basically where GAC and other specialists could come and participate inside of the GNSO scope. What is the solution they have created? They mainly created a very long list of names that are supposed to be protected from registration and other sorts of domain name appropriation, if you may.

I think it's going to be approved. I don't - I haven't heard anyone bluntly opposed to it. But if someone would, it would be us, mainly because we still don't know how - the process has been followed, yes. But we don't know if it really has a strong legitimate mood stakeholder understanding of what is going on. Some of us think that it was a working group that was pretty much closed when it came to the dynamics it had.

And at least for me, that's not a comfortable thing to have around when we are supposed to all have mood stakeholder consensus policies. But I think it's going to be approved because what they come up is not so crazy and or so dangerous, as long as... This is one of the main things we criticize is that their solutions are not back door open - there are not back doors that allow them to appropriate any sort of names.

So okay, we're giving this process where you have priority or we have - you have names that have a special status and you give us a closed list. Okay, if this is the list or these are the names you're going to protect is this and not others so that the process can be used, abused towards other things. Those are the main concerns that... Okay, what you created is reasonable but we want to make sure that it cannot be abused in the future by sort of back door.

David Cake: Yes. I know one of the issues very early on that was - and that helped create - give the reason for this to be created was that at one stage, the IGOs were very specific that they wanted to protect their acronyms.

And we - no - well, everyone was sort of like, well, we're actually kind of - we're fine with you wanting to protect the acronym UNICEF for example, but we're not really fine with wanting to protect the acronym for like World Health Organization because WHOIS is an obviously English word and several multiple major trademarks and, you know, just because - sorry, well, you can't just reserve it only for the use of - use of discussing health, just as an example.

And a few other things, you know, the ISO is a common standards organization but just because it's a standard organization, why shouldn't international sugar organization get priority access because they were a - because they happened to be an IGO and things like that.

So there were some real concerns but I think it quickly became very legal, and that output of names that deserved special treatment is probably a useful outcome for a lot of - that will settle a lot of the disagreement.

But I do understand it is complex in that not every recommendation got full consensus and there was some dispute within the working group. And I think it was good to have this one...

Ioana Stupariu: (Unintelligible) for us or some members to close at least that is (unintelligible) what's happening. In addition to what David had said, one concern, essentially these NGOs (unintelligible) engaged illegally, it is even possible for them to do that in front of recommendation is to fund them. So I think we should look over this some point which can be (unintelligible) yes.

David Cake: Okay. But none of these things are sort of - there'll all expected to pass uncontroversially, so I think there's any sort of... It's good to know what is

happening, particularly about - I think the... And it's useful for - I think to review what is going on in the policy process.

But I - and particularly I think the new PDP, the PDP 3.0 process, I think that's one that's going to be really important for everyone involved in policy at ICANN and very much one where the voice of newcomers and their experience is really invaluable because if - you know, if you are just - even if you're involvement is minimal, the reasons why your involvement is minimal is really valuable to know so.

And the last thing on the council agenda is the temporary specification for registration data expedited policy development process.

Martin Silva: And we don't have that up there.

David Cake: Just - no, it's the next one down. It's number eight on the council list. Let's go over it a little. Now, I've already mentioned that in discussion with the - the discussion about the...

Martin Silva: RDS.

David Cake: ...RDS working group. I know there were some requests for me to sort of - now, I'm not on that - I'm not a full member of the expedited policy development process. I'm a reserve member or alternate member, which means that when - if one of the full members can't attend, then I can attend in their place.

One of the things that they set - the reasons why the RDS was perceived to take a very long time was because it had very large membership and it was perceived that because it had a - you know, a large membership that that was slowing things down. So they thought they'd tightly restrict the size of the membership of the EPDP. And then when they did that, they decided that

they - that it needed to be very carefully balanced so no group was overrepresented and things like that.

And as a result, they've been very strict on the limited membership. Anyone who kind of came in by some other means, particularly Rafik is the Vice Chair of that group, were restricted in their role and what role they played in the group. Like for example, Rafik doesn't participate in votes and things like that except on procedural issues and so on. So it's very tightly controlled.

And I can't even tell you all that much because I'm not there, even as an alternative. I'm trying very hard to follow that discussion but I'm not involved in the discussion. And it has changed so it will have - literally that, you know, the state of affairs will have changed while we're sitting here because it's going on - their face to face meeting is going on.

Martin Silva: With cold coffee...

David Cake: Yes.

Martin Silva: We stole coffee from that room.

David Cake: Yes, we've cold coffee right now. Yes, so I think as I've said, they're pretty much probably at the state where they're just throwing things at each other by now.

So movement - I've got to say the movement or trying to describe what's going on and give it a bit of a report, it's really sort of meaningful about what is going on. It's very difficult. The consensus process will be going very slowly.

(Unintelligible) has more or less sort of settled into to two opposing camps, neither of which are very keen to give a lot to the other. Internally, we've been

sort of talking about the surveillance caucus and the privacy caucus. They'd probably characterize themselves in a - you know, a different way.

They - and there's non-commercial representatives on that group, generally most of the time working fairly closely with the contracted parties and generally mostly putting the view that we think that the GDPR represents a real change in attitudes to privacy law, that the historic role of WHOIS and open access to data really does need to be changed in the face of - you know, by general prevailing ideas about privacy law but also the very specific real threat of the GDPR fining ICANN.org contracted parties.

And there does seem to be a lot of people who instead are trying to essentially find a legal means by which to recreate the current situation by - or a large proportion of the current access to data especially by particular third parties that have got very used to using it, which includes some cybersecurity companies.

And it includes a lot of intellectual property lawyers who use it for - as an enforcement mechanism or will - you know, use WHOIS regularly to find out who is behind a Web site that they want to take down and so on.

So that is very - that has been quite slow. There's been a lot of discussion today about a few specifically defining what ICANN considers its - the purpose of WHOIS or purpose of collecting registration data to be or the purposes. And each purpose, the implication within privacy law that you can only use - you should only be using for the most part data for the purpose for which it was collected - a purpose for which it was collected.

So if ICANN wants to be able to use data, for example registration data, it wants people to be able to look at it to solve a technical problem, it needs to state at the point of collection that that is one of the reasons why they're collecting it. And it's been a very involved debate.

There's also a less - not yet a PDP but a sort of ongoing process about a united access model or way to get access - a way ICANN will grant access to data. That's ongoing sort of in a parallel process but this does complicate the EPDP because everyone's sort of going, well, what's actually going to happen here in the end when we put this - this possibly this unified access model.

And that brings us around to what has been going on in policy committee. I don't think we have anything directly before policy committee at this point but I want to - and that's the NCSG Policy Committee. I don't think we have anything before the policy committee that I want to directly draw people's attention to that we have - that is before the NCSG Policy Committee at the moment.

I do want to draw attention to a couple of things that we have just done in policy committee. One of them is you have written a letter to ICANN board about this development of the unified access model, pointing out that it's not a - it's not been a community requested process.

It's not come from council. It's - it appears to be sort of an - more an ICANN initiative to try and find a way through. But it comes - you know, we know it comes from certain groups within the GNSO that are sort of pushing the idea and suggested it.

And we wrote a letter as NCSG, saying we kind of strongly object to this process in its current form, the unified access model. We said we don't think it should be unified. It's far from clear whether we want ICANN to be the access model. And we really need to start it as a proper community process rather than as a sort of ICANN initiated side project. So that's to let you know where that debate goes.

Does anyone have any questions on the EPDP or the UAM or any of those sort of things? This is kind of...

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: What?

Martin Silva: ...issue.

David Cake: Yes. Yes, it's - the whole thing is a bit of a mess. And - but it is the - it's also - this is the focus of everybody's policy - well, so many people's policy attention at ICANN. It's why, you know, most of our councilors are sort of - or a lot of our councilors are locked into this process and have been there all day on top of their council work, a lot of our best policy contributors.

And policy things that normally should be huge, like the RPM and so on, have tended to be sort of - drift along a little understaffed because everybody is in the grand WHOIS privacy... I'm really keen on it. If you do have any questions, I'll do my best to answer them. Otherwise, I think we'll...

Martin Silva: We are not (unintelligible). This is just an update.

David Cake: Yes, this is just an update. The council was just being updated. There's nothing to...

Martin Silva: Another one?

David Cake: There was supposed to be some major outputs I think from the EPDP by now but they haven't quite happened. Instead, we have incredibly complicated sort of workbooks about to work through whether the WHOIS...

Okay. I really had hoped to be a lot further along at this point in the agenda. But what I would like to talk about now is to have an open discussion about how this committee is going to function, what do people want out of it.

In particular, I think unless we - I think to be really useful, we need to sort of define what the areas of focus for NPOC should be, that we are going to... This is not to stop anyone from contributing but we're all members of NCSG's... NCSG has a very active policy committee - if - and we're capable of contributing to specific issues that interest us via that method.

So to join together as a policy committee and work, I think there are definite ways in which supporting the involvement of new people and generally helping guide people through the ICANN process is a valuable part of the policy committee.

And I - I mean, this is the first - running people through the current motions and things is I think part of that to help people who are here for the first time work out what is going on at ICANN and what happens and how the process goes.

But we also need to develop some processes do that more practically. Should we be focusing on policy development within the committee? I posted to the list and suggested sort of a set of guidelines for how we would do that, which is essentially to navigate through when do we need to produce a separate comment to NCSG, when do we - or when do we want to lead that process from within NPOC rather than - and get NCUC to sign onto it, other NCSG members.

But that's only a suggestion depending on... I mean, it may turn out that we're not - not many people want us to focus on, you know, driving policy in that way but in other ways, but in facilitating and encouraging it so. That's my - I'd like to say what do people want out of this committee so.

Maryam Bakoshi: Go ahead.

Martin Silva: I think it would be very helpful at least for organization that - to understand the scope of this. For instance, in the council, we always go through the - a

GNSO active process, right, active policies because then you go through each open policy development process, each PDP. And you get a grasp of the full things that are being discussed.

This is very useful I think that all of these or even as a group we go through that. We go through like month to month for instance, say okay, do we have an update on this working group, is anyone following. And then we can - this is one way of organizing is, okay, let's try to assign people roles on them based on what they want.

If you like specifically security, well, this is the actual list of PDPs that are open toward security or this is maybe not about security but could use a security eye.

So okay, maybe we do have blind spots because we have no one there, but this is just a reason for us to outreach for someone with that skill. We can go to NCSG and say, okay, is any NGO here or organization working on this issue that we don't have anyone else working. I think that would quickly build up a team, role, responsibilities.

And as long as administrative leaders go through the motion of going through the action list, assigning the roles and keeping the timing of it if someone hasn't given any feedback yet or the same as NCSG does with public comments. You know, every - once a month, it's, hey, we have these public comments coming -- we don't need to do them all -- but the question is, if any of you have something to say about this public comments.

But I think this list at least gives a strategy I'm proposing has the good part that if it doesn't work, you know why it doesn't work. You know it doesn't work because we don't have enough people or because we are not interested in most of the topics. And it would - it's also easier to learn what's out there.

At least for me, that was the hard part in ICANN, is that - to understand what was proposed to me of the organization like finding out there was an actual list of PDPs and that I could go into one of them, read the charters or read the abstracts. I could start getting to know the leaders like (unintelligible) and going to them, hey, I saw - I know you're in RDS, what's this about and getting their... All of that process for me took me three years to fully grasp what I was looking at.

David Cake: It shouldn't. It should not take that.

Martin Silva: It should not take that long. And for me, it was bumping along walls all the time, bump, bump, bump, until I arrived to the RPM site and said, oh, this is the place I was supposed to go from the first time. I think it would be very useful for the creation of a team, also for the creation of this policy committee, to go through that process so people that maybe - most of you feel - are looking around for your place, can get there more efficiently than I did.

Ioana Stupariu: It sounds like a good idea.

Martin Silva: Yes.

Ioana Stupariu: ICANN so people, myself included, who have a lot to learn so some kind of capacity building we try to (unintelligible). So maybe we could make, as Martin mentioned, so what you have proposed is one and looking at NGOs and communications back and forth both technical NGOs and (unintelligible) give us some input and possibly we can actually offer them, that would be quite good.

Martin Silva: I think it's clear - one thing to clarify. I think it's clear, our model can't force people to work on issues we feel are important. The people on (unintelligible) has to work on what they feel it's fulfilling, that they feel it's worthwhile in that sense. That's why inputting at the end of this analysis what is the NGO's take

because we can only get to a better (unintelligible) once someone is already in the role of looking over that.

And to do that, we have to teach that someone what are the offers and to engage them and at the end of the day, okay, you want to work on security? Okay, this is - or we think this is a good working group for security issues. Now that you're the responsible, let's look what is the perspective for NGOs, the operational perspective of an NGO but in the words of NPOC, I want to speak to.

Ioana Stupariu: It could be good to limit our scope because okay, NCSG is very active. They have excellent policymakers there. And of course we can comment individually but limited scope is something which is actually have us NPOC and for the committees and this interscope besides what is more interesting I think. That seems possibly (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: So Joan Kerr for the record. Hey. I mean, I like the approach of having - it's almost a connection with the GNSO because, you know, it's what they're working on, NCSG is going to be working on and obviously NPOC. I think the points that (unintelligible) has made, which is what I was going to make is, organizations are not necessarily individuals. I mean, they are represented by individuals.

David Cake: Absolutely.

Joan Kerr: But they're actually supposed to take the information from NPOC, go to their organization and the organization that may not agree with them to come back with a - you know, a statement on whether or not they support it, right?

David Cake: Yes.

Joan Kerr: That's sort of how it works, which - so now we have issues of time, involvement, things like that. So who is going to administer that, right? That's the first thing. If you want to get engagement, that is.

Now, the other way, which is probably easier... So that's what we want because we want to engage our mentors, right, from NPOC?

David Cake: But I think that's a really good point...

Joan Kerr: It is.

David Cake: ...that we need to engage them. But our members are not individuals. We need to engage organizations.

Joan Kerr: Right. And the - yes, because a lay individual can't say, oh yes, or organization represents this because... They're just the representative.

David Cake: Yes.

Joan Kerr: And so as we go forward, we - you know, we're trying to make a difference and we have to follow the rules, right? So that's number one.

Number two is if we work together and have a hybrid, I think it could work though, where the membership engagement and the EC as a whole... And we've done some of this work already.

We've identified the regional organizations but more than that, what their missions are. And then get them to be part of this monthly call maybe. And then you'll have the names of your experts. And then they could then be part of...

David Cake: Perhaps we could do something like identify, you know, issues that are coming up and then try and get a number of people from organizations that have a specific...

Joan Kerr: Right.

David Cake: ...interest in that. So we're saying...

Joan Kerr: And so we were going to do the - this engagement.

David Cake: So this monthly call, we will be discussing...

Joan Kerr: Right.

David Cake: ...privacy issues.

Joan Kerr: Right.

David Cake: If your organization has a strong - or, you know, privacy issues specific to, you know, this and this. But if your organization has a strong interest in privacy, you should either communicate or come.

Joan Kerr: Right.

David Cake: Yes. No, that's good.

Raoul Plommer: Raoul for the record. Yes, I think that's a really good idea. But I think we could also... We were talking about a presentation that we were going to give tomorrow for the newcomers.

And Joan said that she has an example of her own life of how the NGO domain was like stolen for seven years. I think that's like really something we'd want to hear from these organizations. But to ask that from them I think

we really need the practical examples first so that they know what we're talking about.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: But they might just have like some really good examples. And it'd be great to engage them as sort of a victim back them and to have sort of talk about that experience so.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Ioana Stupariu: I think such talks that have been proposed would be excellent at some point. It's also a very high threshold.

So you engage, you understand what this is about and then you have a dedicated (unintelligible) for the call. I think having (unintelligible) be policy would have members who kind of hold the view account for their interest. But those need to look into that a lot more. But most of us probably have things that interest us aside from (unintelligible). The Internet is not what it has been 20 years back. I can go further than that.

David Cake: Yes.

Ioana Stupariu: And I think, we are at a unique point where like all are interests are interconnected so we are aware of the Internet (unintelligible) of the different NGOs and suddenly they are becoming more aware of their own interests in the Internet infrastructure even.

So this has a very good angle now to approach it. And if we approach safety to good communication forward so communication from us of the higher policy entity, the way down to them, then eventually we can get more engagement. But it could - I think it could be a really - an explosive moment for a lot of human rights organizations and others to engage.

On the other hand, this is also - I have to come to the point but we have discussed the several policymakers what is an NGO and find some people still have maybe a (unintelligible) this is something being non-commercial, fighting for human rights for instance.

But we can have non-commercial organizations. We say, all right, this is code for girls in (unintelligible) organizations have the right to be represented by us.

But then again, when they look at the funding, they will be sponsored by Google or Facebook apart from what else they are doing. (Unintelligible) is a good initiative. Each gets funding from there. And I think this is one of the challenges we will see further down the road.

And also, like our job to see how we can incorporate it in our membership policies, policy views instead of, you know, thinking like is this the right NGO for us because this is (unintelligible).

Oreoluwa Lesi: Yes, all right. Oreoluwa Lesi for the record. Okay, so I wasn't aware that we actually had any criteria on the type of org apart from it being non-governmental, which I guess in itself is quite vague. Do we have any other criteria for what kind of non-governmental organization or like a focused area? I'm just following up from.

Ioana Stupariu: Yes. It's a - there's a set of rules for that. If you have been applied for membership, they (unintelligible) organizations have to be approved.

David Cake: To be a valid member of NPOC, the organization also has to be a valid member of NCSG. And the NCSG executive committee has to approve them, which is pretty much the only thing the NCSG - well, the main thing the NCSG does...

Oreoluwa Lesi: Yes.

David Cake: ...is just to approve organizations and have a few other roles here and there. And - but the only real - so there's certainly no particular - definitely not any rule about we don't vet organizations to check if their goals are similar to ours or anything like that.

But the one thing is it can't be - it's has to not only be a non-commercial organization but it has to be a non-commercial organization that has a non-commercial purpose. So you can't have - you can't be a nonprofit whose members are all commercial organizations that works for their...

You know, you can't be like a Better Business Bureau or something, which has - is well, maybe Better Business Bureau, the Chamber of Commerce, whose members are literally just commercial organizations, even if it's a nonprofit. So that's the - basically the only restrictions.

Ioana Stupariu: At least are interested in some sort of...

David Cake: Yes.

Ioana Stupariu: Organizations like (unintelligible). But also a side point to David's that is a very clear example, but the field is diversifying.

David Cake: Yes, it does get quite tricky. And you do get the situation where an organization like a Google or Alphabet, which is enormous, in theory it could probably be - probably make a case for being in all four of the stakeholder groups. So it becomes quite complicated on that.

And Joan, we would only let you vote in one but, you know, it's... If you don't vote but still have a lot of money you could still be very influential. So it is a real thing we need to concern ourselves with about how...

Ioana Stupariu: That's (unintelligible) if - I was thinking that if we cooperate with our members in all their base as suggested and then be - see if we can engage more members.

Also the possibility of funding for (unintelligible) and for policy committee (unintelligible) and by funding I mostly mean I just soliciting technical advice and capacity building upon - with the expert group or making excellent publications to put forward reach or acquire funding so which funding to be accessed, for instance. That is a good question.

And to make a small point, I was considering the policy committee making access for funding to ICANN for that capacity building for clearly outlined things which I would like us to hear more about from a very technical perspective. I think and so some of the NGOs that deal with us and some technical NGOs would be interesting for us. It's my (unintelligible) for them, yes.

And one other thing which we could do, not this year or perhaps not the next one, but to organize an event for our members, so one or two day events where we look at policy, real examples and explain what we do. And not so much open engagement but show them are work and show what we can do for them so in my mind the confidence building comes around this time as we start working on things. And then we see what we can offer. Then we - I think we have an excellent opportunity to (unintelligible) we need to feel better about it.

David Cake: Yes, yes. No, I think it's...

Ioana Stupariu: Yes, we are in a very good spot if we are actively engaging.

David Cake: And I think - but I think we've identified a few really useful points, one of which is that the way we want to do engagement and outreach is going to be - it should be different to the broader NCSG focus, which includes very much

outreach to individuals and tends to be about how do we get individuals engaged with the process.

And perhaps we need to think about that point of how do we get organizations engaged. And even if that - even if that engagement is just to clearly express their position and, you know, they might not - it might not be that, you know, that might - it might end up taking a different form, if we could get - encourage them to submit to - you know, comment on reports or something. And that would still be really valuable.

And I think another point is this idea of getting - drilling down and, you know, having - focusing on some areas, having the really deep discussion that gets - where we invite experts from organizations that we're able to connect to and that we will have an interest to discussion. I think that's a really good one to...

Instead of having a sort of routine, every policy committee meeting is the same, which is the model that sort of NCSG uses and I think most other bodies within ICANN, where we're kind of, okay, what's coming down, what do we got to deal with and being quite reactive, perhaps we should do that model of having focused events on particular issues and trying to drag the experts even to help us deal with them.

Ioana Stupariu: I think I'm mostly talking about well we have to make issues policy and then we have operational things we need to set up. At this point, I personally think we shouldn't be actively reaching to our (unintelligible) but - or engaging these membership policies some months because no policy work has been done for quite some time and we need to actually do all this work which we can then showcase.

But if we make a realistic schedule and then we know where we are moving forward with that, and if we avoid being vague just naming an issue but not having anyone who is actually interested in working with it, I think that's how we can move forward.

David Cake: No, I think that's a lot of quite valuable - a few valuable ideas to get us - really, to get us started on where we go from here. So let's take up with these ideas of having some - concentrating on sort of - well, essentially in-reach to our existing member organizations and looking at meetings that are focused on specific policy issues.

And we can - and it may be - to some extent it'll be a little bit around what's going on but I don't - I think it might be - like it might be better rather than having a meeting about - focused on the EPDP, which already everyone involved with already has - is attending a thousand meetings, we have a meeting focused on like the broader issues of privacy as they currently stand.

And then you get organizations that are - have, you know, privacy interests but are not actively engaged to comment. To see what we can get from that, that would be valuable.

And also perhaps - but also when we do want to try and get something, a public comment together, make a meeting, and we invite organizations that we think would be interested in that area, even if they're not directly engaged, yes. I'm just trying to capture some of these ideas and then we'll...

Joan Kerr: I mean, ideas are always great. So I'm going to put on my NPOC Chair hat on as well as the policy. I think that policy is responsible for policy but it's not responsible for what the EC is doing...

David Cake: Yes.

Joan Kerr: ...which is getting new members or doing that sort of thing.

David Cake: Job, yes.

Joan Kerr: So I think what we have to do is work together and have a two-pronged approach, yes. So I just want to be clear about that because we - NPOC is about operations.

David Cake: Yes.

Joan Kerr: That's with the vote. It's - they're not separate. So what I think we need to do is -- and we've had this discussion, so we need to actually do something about it -- is the membership chair is responsible for the outreach.

And once they become a member and we kind of have the initial information and the toolkit and then identify the priority areas, what their responsible for, and then they go to the policy committee then. So it takes us in and we have an approach. And this should all be written down so everybody knows how it works.

David Cake: Yes.

Joan Kerr: And - instead of saying, oh, this is how we... But there's a document that we can send to them, once you have some introductions, you know, to what NPOC is and ICANN is because (unintelligible) is a huge deal.

David Cake: Yes.

Joan Kerr: It prohibits a lot of engagement. And I think that's the role that we have to take as an EC. And then once they're up - you know, understand some of the - then it goes off to you guys and then that approach happens.

Ioana Stupariu: In the Universal Acceptance Group, which is sitting (unintelligible) are very different. What we are doing here, the introduce, you know, associates and ambassadors, each sometimes go to a certain technical (unintelligible) issues that we have on the plate, that could also in the future, possibly in the future be a good idea for the policy committee to engage with because they are

much closer to the actual organizations than - the NCEC for instance, we have to engage with them.

But for - we have a lot of excellent ideas which we voiced. And there can be a good time (unintelligible) for this, which anyone can volunteer to outline. But we also need to be realistic about how much engagement and work is implied so how much - how many meetings do we have, how many hours per week or per month can each member realistically contribute to this and set a (unintelligible) all this.

David Cake: Okay. That's a good (unintelligible).

Ioana Stupariu: Yes. So what is the expectations of the policy committee and what is the expectation of leadership engagement, it's very important.

Joan Kerr: I volunteer to start because I'd like to see this started. And I'll start with the global (unintelligible) and everybody - and then we can curate the invitation. But I'll start it because this is something I really want to have help us.

David Cake: Yes.

Joan Kerr: A clear boundaries of what happens because I think that has been one of the stumbling blocks.

David Cake: Yes, that's really valuable.

Joan Kerr: Is that fair?

David Cake: And...

Joan Kerr: Including the expectations of EC (unintelligible), the policy committee.

David Cake: Yes. And one of the reasons that started that sort of procedural document is to have an - like clarify what the EC's explanations of (unintelligible) the policy are.

We really do need to wrap up. So I just wanted to - I've got two things here. One is I want to mention focus points during the Barcelona meeting. So we've already talked about most of them -- EPDP, UPIM. Want to mention one other. There's one other active PDP that we haven't mentioned at all, which is the Auction Proceeds PDP.

There is a comment we need to prepare. We should prepare it - a comment is due. I mean, I'm not saying we need to prepare it. It may well end up being an NCSG comment or we may have a separate NPOC comment or we might have separate comments from members. But Sam Lanfranco has been involved in that with a few others. So that's one other thing to bear in mind.

And also that one thing I want to do before we finish up now is to get (Thomas) to talk about the other meeting at the end of the week.

Ioana Stupariu: All of these or just Wednesday?

David Cake: Do we have a...

Maryam Bakoshi: On Wednesday...

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: ...group, okay?

Maryam Bakoshi: No.

David Cake: It may not be the end, towards the end.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, so it's on Wednesday. Do you want to read it or?

Ioana Stupariu: No, you go ahead.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, cool. So it's on Wednesday from 1 to 2 p.m. in Room 124.

David Cake: Right. So at that meeting we'll follow up on things we've discussed here. And hopefully we'll have a - like to start to nail them down. We also - we have a charter to work on and plenty to do.

Maryam Bakoshi: There's a meeting in half an hour in 124 as well.

David Cake: Oh, okay so.

Woman 3: Which one?

David Cake: So we will...

Maryam Bakoshi: And then...

Martin Silva: On Monday.

Maryam Bakoshi: In 124, there's a charter meeting after this.

David Cake: So I'm...

Ioana Stupariu: It's just for the EPS.

Maryam Bakoshi: No. Let me - URS wanted to be part of (unintelligible), right?

Ioana Stupariu: Yes, (unintelligible).

Martin Silva: The charter meeting is for everyone, everyone that gets it.

Maryam Bakoshi: The 24th?

David Cake: So we will continue, have a chance to continue this. Let's try and nail some of these ideas down by e-mail. But we really do have to wrap this one up.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

David Cake: So thank you all for your attendance. I think it's been off to a good - I think it's been really valuable and off to a good start. And we will see you again on Wednesday, hopefully.

Joan Kerr: We need to talk.

END