
BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. I'd like to welcome you to the NCSG Policy Call taking place on the 14th of December at 12:00 UTC. Attendance will be gathered from the Zoom room. Kindly state your name before speaking for the record and keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. This call is recorded and I'd like to turn the call over to Tomslin. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, afternoon, and evening today. And like Brenda said, welcome to our monthly policy committee meeting where we prepare for the monthly GNSO Council meeting. And for this month, it will be on the 17th of December. So, that is this week.

So, we have the agenda up which we will go through today. I think we should look at our—I shouldn't say first item because that was introduction—second item on our agenda today, which will be updates from the GNSO Council Action Decision Radar. So basically, this is something we add into the agenda for the first time and as some may know, the Council has a couple of new set of program tools to manage its work. And I must admit I'm also learning these tools. They're not as simple, but very important and very useful ones.

One of these tools is the Action Decision Radar, or ADR, which basically lists actions and decisions within the next 0-9 months and the level of effort on the Council. So, I intend to be bringing to the attention of the PC just a few highlights from that tool in our monthly meetings. So, some of those actions, decisions that I'd like to mention just to bring to

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

the awareness of the PC this month just because it's good if the policy committee and NCSG in general is aware of some of these things happening at the Council so that we can better prepare and plan and for our policy work. And we have an agenda item about that today, too, about a discussion on how we can better plan for policy work.

But going back to the ADR, some things I'd like to highlight today, one of them is the fact that the Council responded. It will just be a few because I know that we're going to look into detail in preparation of the Council meeting and some of this will be discussed as well and some others that I won't highlight. So, I'm just bringing a few highlights here.

So, like I mentioned, the Council responded to the ICANN operational design phase and in summary, it recommended a generic framework rather than a procedure and it also included some clarifying questions, especially around the design feedback group.

The other action decision that I'd like to highlight is that the Council expected to consider the RPMs Phase 1 final report consensus recommendations and the other is that the Council will be briefing, too, on the SubPro's final report. It does happen that these two are our only active policy PDPs as well, which we would have otherwise had updates during that session in our agenda. So, I don't think Kathy is on the line, but if she is not, this is probably the most update we'll get for this because they have submitted, those two PDPs have submitted their final reports to the Council for consideration.

And the other action I'd like to bring attention to is the Council will consider the transfer policy issue report as well and a possible launch of

PDP. You remember that that comment period, public comment for that issue report closed on November 30th.

And then finally, the SCBO, that's the Standing Committee on Budget and Operations, I believe, to review the ICANN Org FY '22 draft operating plan and budget as well. So, those are the only ones I meant to bring to your attention today. I'll open the floor if there are any questions.

All right. Seeing no hands... Tania.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Hi, Tomslin. Hi, everyone. I just wanted to make a short comment that I posted the link to the Action Decision Radar on the chat, so if anybody wants to take a look what kind of project load the GNSO Council and as a consequence, we, as NCSG and NCSG Policy Committee, are going to have in the next month, you can just go and check it. But, be sure that Tomslin is going to update you every month on this. Thank you, Tomslin, for the update.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Tania, and you actually, while you are here, I would like to invite you to please take us through the GNSO Council prep. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Sorry, Tomslin. It's my agenda item right now, right?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, that's correct.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, one moment. One moment.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: That's fine.

TATIANA TROPINA: Hello again, everyone. And I started sharing my screen, so I do hope that you all can see the page with the final proposed GNSO Council agenda for the meeting on this Thursday.

This is the last GNSO meeting we are having this year and the agenda is not quite full. However, we have quite a few items in this regard which are quite interesting and debatable. And the GNSO Council meeting is going to start, as usual, with the item number one on administrative matters like roll call, updates to Statements of Interest, and review of the agenda.

The item two is going to review exactly what Tomslin was talking about earlier, a review of the action items list and project list and Action Decision Radar, so the GNSO can stay informed about what's on its plate and plan its work better.

Then, we have a consent agenda. And then again, there are quite a few items for approval. As you know, the consent agenda is where the GNSO Council votes as having a consensus and consent. And if any items has

any concerns from the GNSO, it is going to be moved up to the normal agenda for discussion. So, the consent agenda this time is quite full because we have quite a few things to approve.

And the first approval item is the approval of Standing Selection Committee leadership. For those of you who don't know, the Standing Selection Committee is the committee who selects the people based on their applications and Expressions of Interest for various positions within the GNSO. So, we are going to approve the leadership of the Standing Selection Committee for this year which is going to be Carlton Samuels as Chair and Sophie Hey as Vice-Chair.

The second item for approval is the approval of Heather Forest. You probably know her. For those of you who don't know her, she is the former Chair of the GNSO Council from two years ago and right now, she is the President of the Intellectual Property Constituency. And she kindly agreed to serve, yet again, an additional term on the Fellowship Selection Committee as a GSNO nominated member for the selection of fellows. All of you probably know that right now, without the physical travel, the fellowship and the NextGen program is a bit different, but still, the selection is going on.

Then we have two items for approval when we have to approve the Chairs. The first is the EPDP Phase 2A Policy Development Process Chair and we had an application from Keith Drazek from Contracted Party House. So, we are going to bring to the attention an approval of the GNSO Council his candidacy to serve as the Chair of this Expedited Policy Development Process to wrap up finally, hopefully, the process which brings ICANN in compliance with the GDPR and data protection. As you

know, and here is a bit of a step back, the EPDP Phase 2 finished its work. However, there were some outstanding items we should put to the so-called A Phase where the community still has to convene this working group and solve these items like legal versus natural and so on.

Then we have the approval of Chris Disspain to serve as the Chair for yet another PDP on IGO Curative Rights Work Track. And we have a bunch of liaisons, council liaisons, to confirm for various policy development processes like all rights protection mechanisms, new gTLD SubPro, EPDP Phase 2. Unfortunately, we still have no liaison for the EPDP Phase 2A, so perhaps, this is something we can determine either before or after the GNSO Council meeting. And we have quite a few committees like Standing Committee on Budget and Operations and Standing Selection Committee where the Council leadership should serve ex officio. So here, Philippe Fouquart and I decided to distribute the work a bit so he is going to be the ex officio on the SCBO, Standing Committee on Budget and Operations, and I am going to hopefully be confirmed by this consent agenda as an ex officio of the Standing Selection Committee, so a bit more work for me.

And we also have the liaisons to IRTs like EPDP Phase 1, privacy and proxy services accreditation, IRT on translation and transliteration of contact information which is paused now. And we have the confirmation of liaisons to various other parts of the community, for example, the ccNSO and the GAC.

So, this is probably not going to cause any traction. I believe that we are all going to vote for this consent agenda and if any of our GNSO Council members from the NCSG have any concerns about this, I will post here

and let you bring up anything you have. Also, any of you, if you have any questions, please feel free to ask them now about this agenda item. Just raise your hand. Yes, Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks, Tatiana. I just typed it in chat, actually. I'm wondering why we don't have a liaison for the EPDP Phase 2A. Not that I'm more or less inviting Olga to leap in and volunteer for that one as well, but it seems odd. And normally, I wouldn't volunteer to be a liaison because I don't like having to be neutral. But I also think that it's a key role. I recall how important the fact that Rafik was our liaison on the end of Phase 2. I think that he did a great job in steering us away through the rocks there. So, it is an important role and if nobody's coming forward, maybe we ought to grab it somehow. Thank you.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you, Stephanie. I believe that the answer to your question is, of course, that nobody volunteered to be a liaison for the EPDP Phase 2A. If you ask me about my personal opinion, I do think that it is important for us to have the members of our team on the EPDP to be neutral. And of course, once you are liaison, you will not be able to. So, I would just suggest that we will see how the discussion goes, and I also think that perhaps Olga, as a volunteer for the EPDP Phase 2 liaison, can also jump on the Phase 2A. But I would say that either let's wait and see, or perhaps, some of our councilors can step in, perhaps something to coordinate between us.

I cannot do this just because being on the GNSO leadership got me into a big workload and yet another item will damage what I'm doing already. So, I ought to have also normal work. So, any thoughts on this?
Yes, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I might be mistaken but I thought I saw Olga ask for a bit more detail from staff regarding EPDP 2A just to know what the workload will look like so she can make a decision whether she can take it as well.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah. I think she's now in the process of considering it, but also, let's see that perhaps somebody else could volunteer, I mean, either from Non-Contracted Party House or Contracted Party House, I believe there would be some options to consider. So, I really just suggest we leave and see on Thursday what is going on with this and whether Olga will be willing to step up or anybody else because I don't want to put any pressure on any of us because it is, indeed, a big policy development process and quite a contentious one. Stephanie, yes, I see your hand up again.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks. Well, I'm not sure all the councilors are on the call but it would be very useful if a councilor that's not actually on the EPDP 2A could step forward because there's quite a crew of us now, I believe, on it. But it has to be a councilor to be the council liaison.

Now, Olga has not participated in the EPDP at all. She's a former GAC member and this is an extremely contentious couple of issues that we're dealing with. The legal versus natural, believe me, I'm still licking my scars from the PPSAI fight we had on this and I thought we had it more or less shelved, but apparently not. So, it's quite important, and for those of us who need to fight, we can't be the liaison. So, just an appeal to anyone who feels like having a role.

The workload on the liaison is not that heavy. You get a whole lot of support from staff. The question is can you pull together a neutral report to Council that expresses the issues. And staff is usually pretty helpful with that. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Stephanie. And indeed, because we don't have the full slate of councilors here, perhaps this is something that you could bring on the PC list to alert the councilors and so we can perhaps discuss with the inclusion of everyone around. What do you think about this? Will you be able to share your thoughts on the list about this?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes. I'll nag them.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much. So, are there any more questions here?

Seeing none, I also hope that I shared my screen right so you're not getting distracted by the participant list or the chat and see only the

agenda items. If it's not the case, please let me know. I will just reshare in the right way.

Moving to the fourth agenda item, which is the Council vote, and it's probably one of the most contentious votes, well, maybe not this year, but certainly one of the most contentious votes in the last few months. So yes, [inaudible]. Thank you.

So, Council vote to affirm intent of the EPDP Phase 1 Recommendation 7. Those of you who attended the Council meetings or the previous PC meetings probably know that this item was dragged along for quite some time on the GNSO agenda. So, short update on what was going on.

As you know, the EPDP Phase 1 finished quite some time ago and one of the recommendations it's produced, Recommendation 7, clearly conflicts with the thick WHOIS transition policy. And the problem of this is not that the EPDP Phase 1 could not repeal the policy or could not issue something that contradicts this policy. The problem is that the ICANN Board and the IRT, Implementation Review Team for the EPDP Phase 1 did not see enough clarity in whether the new policy repealed the old one. And the ICANN Board asked the GNSO to confirm what the intent of the Recommendation 7 was because the Implementation Review Team with different conflicting interests between NCSG Contracted Party House and some parts of the Non-Contracted Party House like Intellectual Property Constituency or Business Constituency went to complete impasse on what the intent of the recommendation was. And some of them even called it a shadow repeal of the policy.

So, after months of negotiations and trying to figure out the way out of this situation, first with the GNSO small team, which basically rehashed the same arguments and conflicts that were happening in the Implementation Review Team, after a few meetings with the Board and leadership and a few discussions with the GNSO Council, we thought that we perhaps found some way out and the way out is to vote for a motion which will clearly say that the Recommendation 7, indeed, had its intent to repeal the thick WHOIS and that the EPDP Team had all the ability and mandate to do so.

I believe that there is still some contentious issue remaining here because the draft motion was submitted after yet another discussion in the small team and there was still some conflicts remaining. So, we are yet to see how this voting is going to go.

The intent of Council leadership, because this issue has been dragging along for such a long time, the intent of the Council leadership is not to accept any deferrals only unless there would be some exceptional circumstances. However, another point here is that I believe that we still cannot determine what would be the voting threshold for the Council vote on this.

On the one hand, some argue that this motion can be adopted by a simple majority. On the other hand, others, and I must admit that while I prefer a simple majority, I belong to the camp that argues for supermajority because we are confirming the intent of recommendation which was adopted by the supermajority of the GNSO Council. So, you might see here on the agenda item that the Council voting threshold is to be determined, and I believe that we will know briefly, or at least on

the GNSO call, how the Council should vote on this motion, whether it should be the supermajority, so two-thirds of each house, or it is going to be a simple majority.

And I will pause here and ask if you have any questions or comments about the agenda item number four.

So, I'm seeing no hands. No, Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes, hi. And I am sorry to keep going on, but this is a bit of a worry that we are in such a—I won't use the word I'm thinking of—state of disarray on this particular motion. Now, for those who haven't participated on PDPs, let me say just as a sort of "my opinion" statement, this is partly a result of not having decisive enough language in the final report because we were trying to get the darn thing through. And when you weasel word things, then you wind up with problems later at Council. And there's a long history of us losing on privacy issues because we appear to have won something and then when it gets into the back room, everybody picks apart the language and says, "Oh well, that doesn't work. We'll have to do this instead." And "this" is usually something non-privacy enforcing. So, that's the end of the rant.

What do you think of the chances this is not going to get resolved at this meeting? I haven't counted the votes, but I presume even on a supermajority basis, the votes will fall in favor of clearing this matter up and canceling the thick policy. And then what's the moving forward? Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you, Stephanie. Well, indeed, I, again, belong to the camp which believes that EPDP policy, EPDP final report was actually clear on this if Recommendation 7 reads not alone, but in conjunction with other parts of the report which clearly states that it affects the thick WHOIS. But of course, if you take literal interpretation of the words of recommendations, any recommendation, we can probably go to impasse almost on any issue.

As to the way forward, I do believe that, of course, there are chances, just chances, that this will not get enough votes because in case of supermajority, we will perhaps, if the IPC and BC are going to vote against this, we will have to rely on those who do not belong to any house voting for this motion.

I believe that even the Commercial Stakeholder Group is actually tired of this impasse and that they are willing to compromise and, for example, [John McElwaine], he was very much involved in the effort to find this compromise. So, I'm optimistic here. But of course, due to the lack of crystal balls on my table, I cannot really predict with 100% possibility how this is going to go. It is still contentious and there could be some last-minute turns. So, let's just hope there will be none of those. I hope that this is satisfactory answer. So yes, Tomslin, please go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Tania. I was just going to say I do also think that taking a feel of the Council, it feels to me that we will get the votes, the supermajority

votes, for this one. I don't think I've seen enough dissenting voices on this.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, thank you, Tomslin. And yeah, I agree that [Bird & Bird's] opinion on this matter was probably not clear enough.

Well anyway, are there any other comments? And if not, I will say, let's leave and see. I can certainly say that from our side, we did our best to get this motion through and get it in a way that might, perhaps, gather enough consensus and enough votes for it. So, as I said, I'm staying positive and hoping for the best. And if there is no other questions, I'm going to move to the agenda item number five, which is a briefing on the final report from the review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms, RPMs. Stephanie, is it an old hand or a new hand?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: That's an old hand, but if I may, I just want to nag councilors. This is not the time to miss a Council meeting or be late. I know it's a busy season, but when it's a supermajority, we need you there. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, thank you. Or at least, we need the proxies, or perhaps, something to remind the councilors about, I think Bruna and Tomslin can do this, just closer to the meeting to say that you either attend or please submit your proxy because we can go with proxies just well for this vote.

Yes, Tomslin, thank you for agreeing on the chat. And I still see the hand of Stephanie but I get it as the old hand.

And moving to the RPMs final report, perhaps this is quite a happy agenda item because the RPMs was going on and on for the last few years and the deadline for the report submission was extended from the councilors quite a number of times, and at some point, we were even afraid that the group was completely in shambles. But in November, they finally had their call for consensus and so the report was delivered to the Council on the 24th of November, 2020.

And with this agenda item, we are going to have yet another briefing to better understand what is in the report and the scope of the substantive recommendations because we are going to vote on this in a future meeting. I guess it's going to be a January meeting. So, we are going to have the introduction to these topics and a briefing from the GNSO Council Liaison and we are going to have a discussion on this. I don't think that for now it is any contentious item, it is rather information on the substance of district board and identification of potential problem that Council might having voting on this. Anybody wants to intervene here?

So, I'm seeing no hands and no questions. And that was quite a quick move through the agenda items. And I'm moving through to the agenda item number six, which is yet another substantive discussion and this is the update from the Council small team on which steps the GNSO Council has to take to implement Work Stream 2 recommendations. And as you know, the recommendations for Work Stream 2 were adopted already more than a year ago. And finally, the GNSO Council

was able to get their hands on this. And that was the small team which was led by me. So, what we did was to go through the entire implementation assessment report, to go through all the recommendations and mark them in a way that will allow us to see what is exactly within the remit of the GNSO Council, what affects the GNSO Council because many of the recommendations have to be implemented either by the GNSO community or by the stakeholder groups and constituencies of the GSNO. God, what is happening to me? I just cannot say the word “constituency” today.

And so, what we did, we came up with a table which clearly shows what is in the remit of the GNSO Council and what GNSO Council has to care about in the long term, short term and medium term. So, we also identified the priorities. What can I say here? Of course, some of the recommendations are very dear to my heart but I still understand they’re not in the remit of the Council, like for example, accountability of stakeholder groups and constituencies, they have to be addressed on the supporting organizations and advisory committees. This is not something to address by the GNSO Council.

If my memory doesn’t fail me, the most important questions we identified to be addressed by the GNSO Council is human rights, a framework of interpretation, implementation on the GNSO level, because it would affect the policy development process and it would also affect how GNSO Council is managing and administering the policy. So, we are going to present this as an assessment to the Council.

And another one, perhaps less interesting for this group and more nitty-gritty, is the guidelines for good faith for petitions for removal of the

ICANN Board Directors. This is something the GNSO partially addressed when it was writing various documents following the adoption of the new ICANN bylaws, but there is still work to be done detailing the guidance for good faith.

What else? So, just as a general overview, this is the task, the exercise, which are going to be done by the entire community. So, for example, when our small team marked some of the issues as being mandate of the ICANN Org for implementation or constituencies and stakeholder groups or advisory committees and supporting organizations, apparently other ACs and SOs are going to do the same and then we will have a consolidated table with various views and see who thinks what was the mandate of whom and identify and resolve any contentious issues and see what the priorities really are.

So, I'm trying to speed up out this work. I'm trying to do my best to speed up this work, but of course, now we have it on the table of the Council. But we will have to look, have a bird's eye view for the entire community and see how it goes. I'm just happy that it goes, that we are proceeding with this, and that we have this quite high on our agendas. And I will pause here and ask if there are any questions or comments about this agenda item.

So for now, I am seeing no hands. Right. Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I just wonder if anybody was tracking—and I apologize for being tied up with EPDP and other matters and not having the time to follow this work stream stuff—but what ever happened with the recommendations

regarding the Ombudsman and any potential reform and accountability measures for his office? Anybody following that?

TATIANA TROPINA:

Stephanie, if I may, yeah, I sort of follow the Work Stream 2 implementation recommendations, and as with any recommendations here, there is identification of who is doing what right now. And I believe that we marked the reform of ICANN Ombudsman office as something that ICANN Org is responsible for implementation with the help of the community, of course. But for now, it's outside of the GNSO Council remit as a policy administrator. So, this is not something that the Council is going to deal with, but of course, I do believe that the community should nag and put it high on the agenda, reforming this office. Perhaps, this is something for us to keep in mind when the NCSG will be doing the same exercise about marking their priorities.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks. Yeah, I do think we shouldn't just let it drop because it's not functioning as it should and, in my opinion, of course. And I know some of the members have decided views on that, so it would be a good thing to keep an eye on. Everybody else is going to be too busy and just shrug, I think.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much for flagging this, Stephanie. Yes, I believe that, unfortunately with the COVID pandemic and all this virtual stuff and all the challenges that not only the ICANN community but humanity, is

facing currently, many of the things fell through the cracks, basically, and we have to get them on track somehow. So, good to remember that there are recommendations which we, as the non-commercial user constituency are flagging quite high on our agenda and we can try and push for them. Thank you.

Avri is commenting on the chat that all of the Org items have been followed up on as far as she knows. Thank you very much for this comment, Avri, and I believe that, yes, the ICANN Org items are probably even more ahead compared to what the community is doing. So perhaps, I can even ask ICANN Org on the updates if they have any about the Ombudsman and everything else. Once we can have the prioritization table done for the community, we can just start seeing what has been done already and what is being done.

Any other comments? Any other hands or questions, remarks? I see none.

Well, I am a bit afraid to call on Avri on this, but Avri, if you have any further comments, we would really, really welcome any remarks from you. So, if you want, you can unmute yourself and speak. I will pause here, but otherwise, if you think that there is nothing to say and that you should do what you said on the chat, I will just continue.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. Hi.

TATIANA TROPINA: Hi, Avri.

AVRI DORIA:

First time I've used my voice today. Apologies. Yeah. No, and in fact, it's really all being followed up. I'm part of the Board's caucus on following up on WS2 and in the process of trying to get sort of a coherent update of where all the items are, and what their status is that can be discussed further. So, it really is all being followed up in. It's all being tried to fit into the prioritization of work. But WS2 does have a large degree of priority on a lot of things. So, it is being worked on. It's become an important issue to see that it is not allowed to be shrugged off. So, I'll follow up and at future meetings that I'm attending, I can check on things specifically and come back with, perhaps, other answers. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you so much, Avri, and especially thanks for joining this call at quite an ungodly time for you, quite an early morning, and for keeping us updated so we are not the silos here. Thank you. Massive thanks. Very much appreciated by me and I believe by everyone here on the call.

Any further comments, questions about the agenda item number six? So, I'm seeing none and I am going to move to the last agenda item of the GNSO Council meeting, which is our favorite agenda item, which is AOB.

So, any other business. What's on the plate here? First of all, it's notification of stakeholder groups and constituencies. I finally said this word in the right way. And Council discussion and agreement on the process of appointing the GNSO members for the community

representatives group to select our IRP standing panel. This has been a very contentious discussion on the Council before because there was some of our councilors—and I fully support this point of view—that just simply delegating it to Standing Selection Committee by the decision of the GNSO Council would violate the ICANN bylaws because we believe that it was up to stakeholder groups and constituencies to select their members. And if stakeholder groups and constituencies want to delegate to the Standing Selection Committee, well then, okay, this is the right process.

So, the GNSO Council finally got this on track and consulted stakeholder groups and constituencies on this issue. And perhaps not surprisingly, it was still decided that Standing Selection Committee is going to be tasked with this. And we had a small group meeting to help Standing Selection Committee to guide this process, the selection process, because this is something that they have not dealt with before and the IRP Standing Panel is the panel which defines ICANN accountability or sets the example for it for the years to come. So, we have to be careful here. So, we will have the update from the GNSO Chair, Philippe Fouquart, on how this process is going and we'll discuss it.

I will pause here and ask if there are any questions. Yes, Tomslin, please go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks. I just wanted to check. Not to put you on the spot, Bruna, but I just wanted to check if the EC has any comment about this issue of using their Standing Selection Committee.

BRUNA SANTOS: Hi, everyone. No, the EC doesn't have any comments yet because we have just formed the EC. We had a little delay on the constituency's appointment of delegates to the Executive Committee and hopefully we're having our first meeting this week. So, Tania and Tomslin, I am probably going to nudge the two of you to maybe join our first meeting that's yet to be scheduled. But that's the situation and that's where things are. We had a considerable delay in the appointment of the constituency's delegates.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you, Bruna, and thank you, Tomslin. Tomslin, go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No, I'm just going to thank Bruna for the comment.

TATIANA TROPINA: So, a comment from me here. I do believe that in a way, the process was followed once this was given to stakeholder groups and constituencies and even if we are against Standing Selection Committee, here the resistance is probably useless because everybody was quite welcoming this idea provided that the Standing Selection Committee will have clear guidance and clear understanding how much important this selection is.

However, perhaps for what it's worth, Bruna, maybe it would be worth to contact James Gannon because he was advocating for not using

Standing Selection Committee. But I believe that his concerns were resolved by taking this issue out of the GNSO Council as council and given this decision to stakeholder groups and constituencies. And once they decided that this is something that should or can be done by the Standing Selection Committee, there is very little we can do because procedurally, this might be the right way to go because it is the decision of the parts of the GNSO then.

Yeah. I see Bruna in the chat is saying that this alternative was accepted given the condition of setting up the criteria and so forth. Yeah, so I guess there is very little we can do here except do our best to actually try and detail this process as much as we can and ensure that the Standing Selection Committee understands its task and then the Standing Selection Committee will really pick the best candidates. And perhaps, that to ensure that we have good candidates playing for the IRP. But this is something to be considered a bit late.

So, Stephanie on the chat is saying that there is a lot of work no matter how you slice it. I agree with you that this is, indeed, a lot of work. But it has always been like this, and of course, we need the help of our members and participation of any helping hands here. Any other questions or comments about the agenda item number seven?

And if there is nothing yet, I am going to go to the very last agenda items. The next on the Any Other Business is the update from the SO and AC leadership roundtable. I guess this is going to be about the strategy for the ICANN meeting or any other roundtable, maybe something I'm not aware of, so we'll be waiting for Philippe Fouquart to talk about this.

And the very last agenda item was submitted at the very last moment, is an update on our own new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process final report delivery because on action items and on the Action Decision Radar and agenda, so let's say in GNSO planning tools, the date for delivery of this report was the 23rd of December. Apparently, the group is not going to deliver the report on the 23rd of December, so we just want to discuss whether this is close to completion and how much time, how much more time this policy work group needs to deliver this report and how do they ensure that they are focused on delivering this report and not going into the weeds of some of the issues that are not related to the SubPro mandate. And I'll pause here and give the floor to Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks very much. This is, perhaps, out of line but on the issue of future meeting strategy, our group has always had an issue with so many of our members coming from countries that have difficulty getting Visa at the best of times. I can see that various organizations that I'm associated with are starting to tentatively plan face-to-face meetings for the end of 2021 in anticipation of getting the vaccine. I just think that it'd behooves us, as the NCSG, to start thinking about what our position is on this because if ICANN starts to meet at a time when many of our members will be living in countries without the vaccine or with a very limited distribution of the vaccine and the airlines aren't necessarily running as normal, and, and, and, and, we need to figure out what our position would be in discussions with the rest of the membership because I do fear that we'll start having face-to-face meetings but it'll be the elites who will be coming and that wouldn't be good. Thank you.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you, Stephanie, for this comment, and indeed, I think that this is something that we can address to Bruna. But I also think that from what I gathered, this concern is quite high on the agenda for ICANN concerning any future meetings so that the meetings will not become elite meetings and that we really, really do not exclude regions where a vaccine is not available or would be a scarce resource. Bruna, I will give it over to you.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you, Tania. Just to echo your point as well, I don't think we are yet at the moment in which we will be forced to decide whether or not ICANN will move back to an onsite meeting and we should be worrying about that. I do think that maybe by the end of 2021, maybe the first meeting of '22, but I honestly don't think it's a concern right now. There is a considerable amount of voices highlighting the same concerns whether or not it is for this meeting to continue to be elitist or to be slightly more elitist because we have to agree it was already. But this concern is very much on the table, Stephanie, whether it's with regards to health insurances or our own responsibility of attending those meetings or anything like that. But I guess this is something we'll know better by the beginning of '21 when the planning meetings committee comes back into force. But just to say that we are also watching the same movement.

TATIAN TROPINA:

Thank you, Bruna, and I fully agree with this. I also don't think that ICANN Org has taken into account that community is so diverse and things might not be available in many countries, we'll go back to any kind of face-to-face meetings until we can really get community traveling, not only from developed countries, but also from other parts of the world. And frankly, I do not think that it's only NCSG who is going to be against it. I can't ever imagine At-Large allowing this and not screaming out loud.

So yeah, I think that here, we can certainly have At-Large as our atlas because they have a very diverse community as well as we do, not only elitist. Any other comments on this matter?

Bruna, is it an old hand or a new hand? And in the absence of voice reply, I would assume this is an old hand. And with this, I would say that we are through the GNSO Council meeting agenda, and if there are any questions or comments, please feel free to ask now. I will stop sharing my screen, however, and we will leave it to Tomslin to continue this meeting with our own agenda items. Thank you very much for all your questions and comments, and again, lovely to see you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you so much, Tatiana. Brenda, if you could please put up the agenda again. Thank you.

So, we'll move to our agenda number four, which is policy updates, and it so happens that we've pretty much discussed the two PDPs that are active right now in the last two agenda items, what we saw in the SubPro discussion that's meant to happen in the Council regarding their

final report submission, or rather, delivery. And the RPM final report has been delivered. So, Kathy who is our member [inaudible] is not here today, so unless someone else has something they want to add to that working group updates, I'll just check if anyone has their hands up to make a comment. I see no hands and my chat window is very tiny. I'm hardly able to read the chat.

I'll move on to the public comments. And I just wanted to make a comment here that we did struggle quite a bit between the last ICANN meeting and now with the comments that were put out. We struggled to get volunteers for them, but also I think planning for them was a key thing, which we will probably, Farell will help us lead that discussion in our agenda item number five. But we did struggle a bit even though we did submit the majority of the comments, thankfully. But it was quite a struggle to get volunteers for this, so hopefully, we can plan better for this and I think, I hope we could bring some ideas when we're discussing PC improvements in the next agenda item about how we can probably do this and make it more efficient and organized. And with that, I'll move to the next agenda item unless someone has a comment to make on agenda item number four in general.

Seeing no hands, I'll move to agenda item number five. So, this item came in, was suggested by Farell and it's got to do with improvements like I mentioned earlier on how the PC does its work. And he listed some points on the mailing list that we could discuss. Some of those points were the PC archive, its usefulness, and ability to attract members to actually visit the page, and some PC materials on our PC website as well, and how we could better plan for public comments to avoid the sort of issues we've had in the past, especially regarding volunteering. One

thing Farell called out was the potential issue where we could have very many volunteers volunteering for one comment and then we suddenly find that there is another comment that has been put out and we don't have any volunteer for that because the others are working on an existing comment. So, I will request for Farell to lead this agenda item, if he is here. Farell, over to you, please.

FARELL FOLLY:

Thank you very much, Tomslin. Okay. So basically, here the idea is that to, let's say, brainstorm about how we can help people engage more for policy-related tasks. As you have just pointed out, there have been many calls for volunteers but nobody, or mostly no volunteers show up and perhaps it has something to do with how we foresee public comments or simply it has something to do with people's time and involvement and whatever. So, I think that's one way to do this, for instance. We'll need to foresee most of the public comments ahead and then have a plan. It could be a three-month or even one-year plan about, okay, what kind of, how many public comments are we probably getting this year? Because when PDP are going on or when working groups are working on something, we are mostly aware that sooner or later, there will be some public comments on that issue.

So, instead of just waiting that the public comment is released and then ask for members to volunteer, it could be like last minute. Most of the time, we got one month, or if it's too much, it could be like 19 days to reply for a public comment. So, even though this seems like a huge amount of time, sometimes there are many concurrent public comments that people, or most of the people who used to volunteer

are working on, and then they do not have anymore time to volunteer on something else and newcomers may be interested to work on some new public comments, but actually, they have no idea and no one is actually ready to help them working on that.

So, a simple thing would be to foresee all the public comments that will come for three or six or 12 months, and then have a plan, and make people volunteer ahead. So of course, we might not know in advance who can do this, who would be available or whatever, but at least you can have a plan in advance. So once the public comment is [read,] it will be much easier to have at least two or three people who volunteer ahead to participate in the public comment and then having an additional volunteer would be much more easier to have.

So, for this overall improvement, I was thinking about, let's say, we have many subject matter experts here in our group and those people who have not [inaudible] public comments or have not put in overload on them, that they could be like people who advise, who keep memory of public comments, and most of the time, be ready to give a quick briefing to people or penholders that would like to draft public comments. For instance, I know, for instance, that Stephanie is really good in privacy [inaudible], has been following rights protection mechanisms for many things, and Milton is very good in everything that has to do with governance and so on and so forth. So, they could be some kind of those people identified ahead that will mostly be there to advise, to give direction, to warn, so that not only we don't be surprised with public comments, but we keep a constant sense of coherence throughout many updated versions of public comments.

So for instance, Avri Doria represents us at the Board. She can identify something that will be of interest for us or that we should be thinking about and then she writes an e-mail, and then one month later, all of us forgot, the e-mail gets lost, and once a public comment related to that is out, nobody remembers afterward. But if we have, let's say, a team of SMEs, then the people who volunteer to a public comment or whatever, know at least some reference person to refer to and act as, okay, what is the story behind this, what is the memory of the NCSG regarding this? What can we do to keep aligned with our previous comment on the issue and to stay focused on the comment also?

So, this is generally the idea I want us to have and it will avoid us to be, most of the time, surprised about the newly released public comment, and also not have enough volunteers or when a volunteer volunteers, there is no more time to write a proper public comment and submit it the way we would like to be. This is the overall idea. After this meeting, I will send an e-mail with an empty document because it will be [inaudible]. So I will add maybe some sections. Anybody will be welcome to add some sections on this and propose many different things, but this is the overall idea.

And in alignment to that, I think that this kind of information, this kind of progress fast tracking group, SMEs and all those things could be put on our webpage, I mean, the Confluence webpage, so people do not see only our archive or past comments because so far, I'm not sure that 10% of our members visit that page. And most of the time, when people have to write a new public comment, if one or two did not participate in the previous public comment that is related to that, no one goes to the

website and reads it. But actually, we need some kind of memory to keep track or to make sure that we ensure continuity.

So, this webpage could be used also as a dashboard to help people know what's going on, etc. For instance, I think this is one of the issues that the GNSO Council has been having and they decided to implement some new tool which are like Action Decision Radar, Project Management Tool, Project [inaudible], etc. Although those tools are very important, I think it could be very difficult for people at NCSG level to understand and to go through. There is too much information and even myself, as a councilor, it took me a month or actually more to understand how all those two are related together and then jumping from one to another and so on. So, it could be too complicated tool for NCSG member to understand, especially newcomers.

So, I think using our Confluence page properly, we can narrow all these tools to a smaller tool at our level to help people quickly understand what's going on, where to find what, and how or why this was decided. I'm not saying that the briefing that Tatiana just did is not useful. It will always be useful. But at least, after the meeting, people don't have to go and browse all the GNSO Council website to find what they need or to understand how information are linked. But instead, they can just go to our webpage and have the NCSG level of interesting information for us. So, that's actually what I'm thinking about. So, it will help people find information quicker and also avoid the unnecessary burden for newcomers or for members to have to scroll or to browse all the GNSO Council level to check the information they need, and also help us to foresee the overload that we'll be having facing the public comments.

So ahead, we can plan and with some people, like I said, some subject matter experts. This is just a proposal. It's not finalized or it's not a decision. But this is something I'm thinking because I think there are many people like Rafik, Stephanie also who might not have time to be writing all public comments but who can guide and who keep memory of our history or whatever and be a person of contact for specific PDPs that are going on or are in progress. So, I will stop here to ask if anybody has some questions or suggestions or anything else that we can add to this matter so that we can go to the next agenda item, if there are any. So, Tomslin, I'm done here. I won't be longer unless some people have some questions or some suggestions or improvements related to that. Thank you very much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Farell. And yeah, I think it will be really helpful to plan like you've suggested and also organize the Confluence page in a way that really attracts people to visit it with more useful information than only past information. And I wonder, too, whether given that memory you mentioned there should be put in a nice way on the Confluence page or should stay in the subject matter expert's head only.

But I would first give Rafik the floor. I saw his hand come up first to give his comment.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Tomslin, and thanks, Farell. So, just firstly trying to understand the goal and what is this proposal aimed to resolve or to respond. But I think you should make an assessment of what exists

already before starting any new initiatives that will take time and volunteers to keep it sustainable. And we need be always careful about that, if we can call that the cost of maintaining it.

So, first I am hearing many objectives and when there are too many moving targets, there is a risk that you don't achieve any at the end. We have the pages about our public comments, like what we respond and the status and the link to previous comments. Probably the format is not the best. It can be always improved, maybe also to be more publicized more, but I thought that was the case when the call for volunteers to remind people that they can find archives there. But anyway, I think that all can be improved if someone thinks there is a better format and thinks how we can make that conference page better, clear, easy to access.

I think the whole NCSG Wiki space can be revamped a lot to make it more simpler, maybe to update some pages. There are some pages which are not updated for too long that can be removed or merged, etc. There is a lot of work that can be done and I think it can be started any time.

I shared a link in the chat which gives us some idea of what's coming. But I can tell you the dates there are not going to be met. Even they said that maybe December there will be this public comment and so on. It might be not the case. So, I understand, Farell, that you want to kind of foresee for one year, but I have a lot of doubt that we can do that. I can just mention that maybe the two important kind of topics that we needed input, I don't think anyone could plan them in the beginning of the year, like about the operation and design phase. It didn't even go

through a normal public comment, but it's a paper that we should respond because of the importance. The same about the survey on meeting planning. It's not something that was planned. Maybe it's you need to follow all the blog posts or all the communications from ICANN Org, ICANN Board, etc. to try to have an idea. But there will be many times that ICANN Org, the Board, they are asking for input and that's not planned.

For PDP, we have more or less a good idea what's coming because usually, they have the initial report. But not really for the final report. The SubPro is just an outlier, for example, because they did more than one public comment. But that's around four years of PDP and there are different reasons why they did that.

Maybe for review teams, we can have some idea what's coming. But if you check the list of public comments, many times, like about agreement renewal, maybe we can plan that, but what I'm just saying is just maybe we're trying to plan to some extent, but we need to be ready that a lot of public comments or requests for input, they cannot be seen even one month before because there are so many projects going on.

There are things that are recurrent, like now we have, for example, the ICANN budget. You know that's coming and there is already some communication about the ICANN budget because it starts early. It's not just public comment. It starts early with webinars and so on, and so on.

So yeah, maybe you can have some focal point, SME, etc. to follow closely. But just, I wanted to put the caveat that there are already some

effort or an existing page in the ICANN website, etc. but I just want to be cautious about that idea that you can plan the work ahead for one year. It's different for GNSO Council because GNSO Council initiates, to some extent, several activities but also has to handle incoming requests and that's why we do a prioritization on GNSO Council, etc. and still have a lot of issues because, for example, one thing, I believe maybe it was discussed in the planning session with [inaudible] identifying the community resources and capacity and I don't think anyone has the solution to that. We can just do some guessing and some assumption.

Anyway, at the end, what they can say, yeah, we can start with formatting the page and familiarize our members with that. But the issue of having volunteers is totally different. It's not because you know that we have this public comment. It's we need to identify from the beginning who can, or is interested to respond. I think that what was approached before was really to, in many times, to see as an opportunity to get some members to, I would say, to be involved or to participate because maybe it's simpler to try to draft with other people than asking to join a working group. So yeah, I think it's possible to try to some extent, but my point is just we need to be careful that there are a lot of unexpected and this is the problem, I think, in ICANN and even for GNSO Council, we are trying to resolve is how you can be sure about the work and I don't see things that will improve quickly. But anyway, just I will see what can be done.

And I just remembered that there was before attempt in terms of project management and the policy committees to use Trello as a tool, but it didn't go so far because I think one of the problems is how you get people to use any tool or even Confluence page. So yeah, I just wish you

good luck sincerely because it's always the big challenge. It's not really the ideas. It's really how to execute, how to keep that in a sustainable way, and that's always my concern.

So, we need to build a solution that can be sustainable. Building a page that will try to replicate what you can find in GNSO Council material, etc. or GNSO website or ICANN website or what they are doing, maybe it's not the best use. So, I guess it's just we need to brainstorm how we can leverage that and to start small, probably small and see how things go and get some feedback. And I will be happy to help as much as I can, but I won't commit or promise that I will be heavily involved. But anyway, I think it's a good start to think about improvement. So, sorry for taking too long, but yeah, I was trying to elaborate to be more clear. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Rafik, for those ideas and the suggestion to start small. I will pass it on shortly to Bruna, but did you want to respond to that, Farell?

FARELL FOLLY: I would just add a quick comment. But I don't know. Bruna has the [inaudible] to speak, right? Maybe we can just let her go forward first before I speak.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay. Okay. Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you, Tom. So, Rafik made the majority of my comments. I just wanted to stress the point of the predictability in the blog posts because these are often things that, as Rafik already mentioned, they come either as an initiative from the ICANN Org or as something that wasn't necessarily mapped. And this doesn't necessarily also constitute kind of a public comment or a public consultation process. So, in this project or like improving public comments process that you guys are aiming for, mapping these sort of what I'm calling informal consultations might be really worth because these are often the things that get a little outside of our records and following up processes and so on.

Another thing I wanted to point out was the working group. I see it's something that is aimed at helping and allowing people to find the correct resources and so on. But we also had before focal points in topics and maybe the better and the smaller approach would be to try to come back with these focal points or people who would be helpful in allowing the newcomer or anyone that's not as knowledgeable about the public comments that are writing or they have volunteered for, to go and consult with these people because I honestly don't think a working group might work at this time and especially because we have been seeing a lot of our volunteers focused in kind of the same efforts.

So, again, the start small advice from Rafik might be really helpful in this because I just think that either we're consulting with people whether or not they would like to be the focal point or incentivizing other people to go ahead and ask around because this is something we have been commenting on, the policy writing course, when NCC hosted that. You can go after people who have been writing these comments for a while now and I don't know whether people don't feel confident enough or

whether people are too shy to ask, but I also haven't seen this process going on. So, I just think that somehow we should avoid overburdening our volunteers and also finding a way to have people actually asking the right colleagues and going after the information. It's a little confusing, but it's just to the point of not overburdening our volunteers because this is very relevant.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. I take it you finished.

BRUNA SANTOS: Yes, I did.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: A quick comment so that we get some time for the next agenda item.

FARELL FOLLY: Okay. Yes, you are right. I think the two people who had some comments, I think that they have made some very interesting points and I think we are on the same page. Like Rafik said, sustainability, for me, rhymes with memory. If we want to make something sustainable, we have to keep memory of what we have been doing and ensure continuity. So, I think everything will depend on how we're implementing or how we get people engaged. He is right that we should start small. I don't think that we will do everything at the same time. That's why I will be sharing an empty Google document and add some people who want to comment or brainstorm or have ideas to give. For

instance, Bruna just talked about focal point [instead of] subject matter experts. We will have to brainstorm. It's not an urgent thing, but I think we have to foresee because if we do not plan, we will be, at every turn, surprised and we won't be efficient. That's what I think.

It's like not having a plan is worse than having one. If you have one, at least we know the risk that we could be facing and even if something changed because it was unpredictable or something urgently came, that we know how to adjust the plan. But when we have none, it's very difficult to adjust and we have no prioritization mechanisms. Sometimes we will have too many people on a public comment and then we have a new, which we think is very important and no one will volunteer. So, should we just continue doing this way? We can, but in my opinion, we can try another way, like at least having an overview of what is coming and then we can adjust. So, that's the overall idea because if I have only 100 active members and I know that possibly in the three coming months or six coming months we'll be having 20 public comments, at least I know that I always have a [program.] So, how could we mitigate that risk? Should we prioritize? If I were to decide or to suggest, for me, I would prioritize. I'd say, "Okay, if someone can do this, this, this, and this public comment, maybe he does only this one for the moment because it's more prioritized than the other ones." So, this is the idea to avoid burden and to make quick and smart decisions instead of not doing anything and just waiting for public comments to come and request for volunteers. And it's been showing that it's not working efficiently. At least, we have all been complaining about that so far because there are many calls for public comment that have no

volunteers. So, we have any way to do something about that. So, that's my comment, Tomslin and all.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Farell. Stephanie, I see your hand up for a quick.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah, just a quick comment. I find myself agreeing with Farell here that we need to do something. I also agree with Rafik and Bruna that one has to be careful not to create more work for us that's going to detract us from the actual writing of the public comments. But I think we need a new strategy because we seem to be getting into more and more difficulties in terms of responding. And I'd certainly be happy to participate in anything. I find that I'm very busy right now. We have three pieces of privacy legislation going through in our jurisdiction and I'm busy trying to work with other scholars on comments. And so, I'm distracted. I'm not following the comments, and if one pops up and I find out about it from an e-mail, it's really too late to focus and do the assessment of what needs to be done. So, some kind of a forecasting device, somebody reaching out. I'd be happy to help somebody if they ever called, but I'm not going to take the initiative of doing it myself and jumping in on something before others are engaged.

So, I think there are plenty of older members who possibly have some expertise to share, or in my case, I always used to do the English edits for those who are working in other languages and I'm not even doing that anymore. So, if somebody gives me a nudge, I'd be happy to participate. But it seems, at least from my perspective, I'm kind of

disengaged on this. Anyway, I'd like to support Farell's initiative here, whatever it is. I see there is discussion going on as to whether it's a working group or not. I think it's a forecasting tool, but I'd be happy to talk about it offline. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. Unfortunately, we have gone above time so I might just have to draw the line on that discussion. Sorry. Bruna, I know you have your hand up. Yes, Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS: I promise it's quick. I promise it's a quick question. It really is. But I was thinking about the amount of volunteers that you guys often have for one topic and then we don't have anyone for another one. And then my question is should we set something as a volunteer cap for a certain public comment, like say we will only take three volunteers per comment as the penholders, and anyone else who subscribes to that should be going through the review or anything else, or directed to other topics. But maybe because we also know that when we have five volunteers, it's always one or two who write that in any case. So, thinking about maybe setting a penholder cap to the comments might be an idea.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. We'll take that into consideration. And I think I'll have to move to agenda number six, unfortunately. And especially because I know you have some admin matters you need to bring to our attention.

So, I will quickly give you the floor and I just want to give my apologies to staff for going above our time slot today.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Amazing. Thank you, Tomlin. And hi, everyone. I am also going to be quick here. Two points. The first of them was that it's only now in December that we are finalizing the Executive Committee, as I mentioned before, so we did face a little delay on the appointments. And now this committee is fully formed and we should be starting to work, so any delays on membership approval or anything like that was in light of that.

And last but not least, we have the ABRs topic to discuss. We had, last year, an ABR approved for an NCSG policy writing and advocacy training. This was supposed to be an onsite training, but given the situation, we're following with an online training for the NCSG community. And we need to... This is basically I would pretty much be welcoming any suggestions of topics or discussions you would like us to add to this training. We had some things before kind of mapped out This is an ABR that Stephanie was the one in charge of submitting. But we had questions related to PDP participation. We had questions regarding our community itself, where it stays within the GNSO, what do we stand for and other things related to the workloads and critical analysis and positioning of the community. I have sent everybody an e-mail about this ABR and so, if anyone wants to go through this Google Doc, either by adding new topics or comments to this, I would pretty much appreciate that.

And my second point about ABRs is that we have a deadline until the 31st of January for the FY22 ABRs. So again, if anyone else has ideas or suggestions of projects that we could apply for extra funding, I would be happy to work with the ideas you give me. And this is just an e-mail that I have sent to NCSG list, so if anyone feels like replying to that thread or directly to me, feel free to do so and thank you very much for this space, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Bruna, and again, apologies for going beyond our time today. I won't keep you guys any longer. Unless anyone has anything to quickly add, just I think this is our last meeting for this year so I would like to wish everyone a Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays, and I'll see you next year.

Thank you and bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]