
BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the NCSG policy call on 18 January 2022 at 11:30 UTC.

Today's call is recorded. Kindly have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. Apologies are received from Manju and Olévié. With that, I'll turn the call over to Tomslin. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Brenda, and happy new year everyone, and thanks for coming to our first call of the year. We will get straight into it, even though we don't have too many items today to discuss, but there are some very interesting ones that we hopefully will seek to address today.

So I think we will go straight to our agenda item two, if you could bring up the Council agenda, please, Brenda. Thank you. So as it's our custom, we'll walk through the Council agenda in preparation for the Council meeting later this week, [inaudible] my time. And just like ours, the Council agenda is pretty light this month. I think the Council was spending most of the time discussing the ODPs this month.

So there is no consent agenda like you can see up there. The item number four is for the SubPro ODP. And if you attended our December call, I mentioned that the Council was discussing how the Council should address, the process to address or procedure to address comments going back to the Board through the ODP liaisons when they send questions to the Council. So some changes and proposals were made in

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.

December. I think this will be closing that discussion and then we'll get an update from the liaison to the SubPro ODP which is Jeff Neuman. I think that's all on that item. I don't know if anyone has any clarification or questions on that.

All right, I see no hands. We'll move then to item number five. Another ODP which is one we will be spending some time today to kind of discuss in NCSG what our positions are on this. But for the Council, for those who have not been following the SSAD ODP assessment, operational design assessment report was expected to be published in February. But there was an informal meeting from staff, from ICANN Org and the Board with the Council and EPDP phase two members about some findings. And it turned out that the system will be expensive to implement and operate. And so the Council was discussing what next steps could possibly be taken.

And the Council met again, on attempting to identify next steps. That was last week, I believe, with the EPDP members and SG and C leaders. And I think the conclusion that came out of that was that the Council should wait for the ODA to be published, and additional details which might be present need to be considered before we come up with next steps. So the outcome of that meeting last week is what I think we'll be discussing in this agenda item, and other things like how the Council should assess or review the ODA report that will be published in February. Whether a small team or the EPDP should be in charge of that, I think will also be discussed in this item as well.

Yeah, I think that is all on that item. Like I mentioned, we will be having an additional discussion as NCSG on this item because we didn't come

to any sort of common ground on the mailing list when Milton started the conversation on this, how we should proceed as a group. And so we have an agenda. I think that's the next agenda item, I believe, and we'll have additional conversation on this after we finish with the Council agenda. But I'll pause to see if anyone has any questions or clarification regarding this Council item.

Seeing no hands, we'll proceed to the next Council item, number six, which is next steps for the Council strategic planning sessions. For those who do not follow the Council, this is a planning session that the Council undertakes at the beginning of the Council period and there were some action items that came out of that and I think a report was—the SPS also involves, I think I should mention that it involves stakeholder group and constituency leaders as well. So a report has been sent out to the community leaders and these action items will be discussed in Council on what the next steps are for those. I'll see if anyone has any question on this item.

Seeing no hands, I think that's the last discussion item on the Council agenda. We go to item number seven, any other business and I think there'll be an update on the ICANN 73 planning and an update from the standing committee on budget and operations. I think they're working on a comment for FY 23 budget. And then there will be acknowledgement of—I haven't seen any additional budget request from the Council. I think, as it says, if applicable, but I don't think there is any I've seen submitted to the Council. So I don't think there's any to acknowledge there.

And the last one is acknowledgement of the GNSO contact to the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. They had requested for a point of contact the last time they came to present to the Council. Bruna, I see your hand up. And I see Farzaneh's hand up as well. So Bruna first.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Hello, everyone. Just with regards to the ICANN 73 planning, just to let you know, we're going to have—so far the plenaries according to community consultation and so on, there's going to be two plenaries. One is about evolving the DNS abuse conversation, maliciously registered versus compromised domains. And the second one that was approved is called moving forward with the global public interest framework.

So these are two plenaries that we can join, the planning committees, as part of NCSG, NCUC or NPOC, or even as Council. So just giving you guys like the heads up about the two of them, because the planning calls started yesterday on the 17th. So yeah, the idea is for us to—if there is interest from NCSG, for us to join the planning.

For the past two or three meetings, I honestly was not able to join any of the planning committees because it all seemed too decided when we joined, it all seemed as if there wasn't any space for us or any space for civil society or anything like that. So if you guys think it's of relevance for us to join one or two of the planning committees, I can definitely put some effort in that. So just to remind you, the first one is about DNS abuse conversation and malicious registration, and the second one is

about the global public interest framework. So that's just it for me.
Thank you for the space.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. Yes. I think the Council leadership was interested in the DNS abuse ones, only from the perspective that there might be some better clarity on what the community believes or defines DNS abuse as and a problem statement on what the Council should be working on. Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Hi, everybody. Happy new year. I've been trying to raise this on the mailing list about the NCSG representative on PIR Advisory Council. And I just wanted to add this as an agenda item if we get some time to discuss it at the end of the meeting, because it was the policy committee task and I just want to get clarity on what happened and why we don't have a representative on the Advisory Council. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Farzaneh. I think we should be able to add that agenda item. Yeah, I'm sure we'll have time to discuss it. Hopefully, Brenda, you've taken it down so that when we bring up the agenda, it will be present in the AOB. Thanks.

I think that's also the last of the items on the Council agenda anyway. Like I said, the agenda is pretty light this month. So I think we can get back to our agenda if there are no other questions.

Thank you. So our next agenda item is a discussion on, like I mentioned, the standardized system for access and disclosure ODP and the next steps. And like I mentioned, the EPDP team, stakeholder groups and constituencies and the Council have met informally with ICANN Org and the Board. And we were updated about what will expect to see in the report that will be published in February. And we had a follow up meeting as well, last week, just the Council, the SG and C leaders and EPDP members, where we tried to see if there's any sort of common ground or common next steps that we could possibly take.

There were procedural questions. And that is one of the things that Milton sent on the list, which was whether the Council should wait for the Board to make a decision on the ODA report or rather on the recommendations before the Council makes a move whether to provide supplementary recommendations, or the Council should be proactive and not wait for the Board and make modifications to the recommendations before the Board makes a decision.

And like I mentioned, that conversation, we didn't come to any common ground on the mailing list, so I thought we could take this opportunity today to have a conversation to discuss it. So that was the procedural aspect of the paper, but there is also the substance which is what exactly do we do if we are making any sort of modifications to the recommendations.

So with that, I'll stop talking and hopefully, we can hear from anyone on their views on this as well. Especially those who've read the paper and have followed the conversation. So I'll stop and see if there's anyone

that would like to have their views heard on this. All right, thanks Farzaneh, please go ahead.

FARZANEH BADI:

So, Tomslin, I think that what Milton has raised on the mailing list, there's this one issue other than the procedural issue that we need to discuss, is whether we want ICANN first of all to do SSAD at all. And the other thing is that accreditation and whether accreditation makes sense in this instance, and also for ICANN to do accreditation, or if they can just do some kind of triage of the requests.

So I think that these are the two things that if we can decide on these, then we may be able to also talk about the procedural issue. But I think we have decided that the Council, so we are going to wait for the Board to come up with a decision at the moment, which I think does make sense as long as we get a solid rationale from the Board about their decision, and then start from there.

But what I think that we should focus on perhaps, and you can disagree with me, it's just a suggestion that we focus on substance and discuss whether there should be an SSAD that ICANN's doing, what our approach is, do we want accreditation or not? And on that, my opinion, I have not made up my mind yet. I haven't read the documents thoroughly. But I just thought I'd put it out there. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Farzaneh. You make a good point that we should perhaps focus on the substance now, because I think I mentioned that there are

too many unknowns for us to actually jump on making any move before the Board. But I agree, let's focus on the substance and come to the procedural aspect later. Yeah.

I wonder if there's anyone else who like to make a comment on that, especially on the accreditation, because my understanding was that that was tightly related to the triaging of the requests, as far as the recommendations were concerned. So I wonder how it impacts the recommendation as a whole if accreditation is removed, and whether it's easy, because I've heard other groups suggest that we could use off the shelf solutions and just provide the basic, which is taking in the request and providing responses using off the shelf solutions. But I've asked if that approach was taken, then how easy is it to just add additional features and capabilities on such an off the shelf system? So hoping I can hear other people's views today. Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADI: Yeah, I'm sorry.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Don't be.

FARZANEH BADI: Maybe if I provide—because to be honest, other than the NCSG rep on EPDP, not many of us have ideas about what this SSAD was really for. So I just wanted to put out my understanding of the implications. One of the problems that we face if ICANN becomes the accreditor or if they

don't become the accreditor but if they even coordinate this, then they are going to get involved with accreditation of the governments as well.

And that is worrisome for me, as we have seen that—I know that the recommendation is not very clear on how this kind of accreditation of governments and law enforcement agencies work. But I think it's quite a bad idea for ICANN to become involved in that process. So that's one thing that concerns me, and I'd think twice before suggesting that ICANN actually get involved with accreditation.

One thing that would have been really nice was for these stakeholder groups to come up with their own accreditation mechanism and take some responsibility. But we don't see that from the governments especially. And imagine that when they talk about accreditation of the governments, they talk about accreditation of the governments of course globally, and whoever is a GAC member can accredit their law enforcement agencies. And that is quite problematic, because we know that some of those nation states are human rights violators. And not to say that—even the nations that are like democratic and nice, most of their law enforcement doesn't have like a great reputation.

So I think when we think about accreditation, we need to put the governments aside and think very hard about whether we want ICANN to get involved with that. And I don't think that is a good idea. So that's why I'm a bit hesitant and lean more towards Milton's suggestion not to have accurate dictation as a part of SSAD. That's my that's my opinion. I'm sorry I blabbered on a bit.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No, thank you, Farzaneh. And I know that there are EPDP members on this call. I don't know if they could help us clarify this. But I understand that government accreditation was not going to be managed by ICANN. Yeah, that's my understanding. And I also know that the GAC has said that they don't want to. But I thought that ICANN was not going to manage the government accreditation at all.

FARZANEH BADII: Yes. So if you read the communication of the chair of GAC, then yes, we see there's quite a struggle here about how this accreditation is going to happen. And ICANN is saying no and GAC is quite a reluctant as well. But I think that a clarification from the EPDP members would be great. So that's one thing.

I don't see anybody's hand is up, and I don't want to prolong this. But another issue that we might want to consider is that as well as accreditation, it's the cost that ODP has come up with. And as I said on the mailing list, it's quite vague, the basis of which—they don't have enough data to come up with a cost estimates of this SSAD.

And I think that also is a huge issue. And there are these two issues that I think that are on the table at the moment. And if we can get NCSG to come up with a solution about either, that would be great.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Farzaneh. And yes, I agree we need to come with a position at least on this. I don't see any hands. Yeah, I'm still hoping that the EPDP members could contribute to the conversation and clarify a few things

for us. In the absence of any hands coming up, I guess we'll have to take it back to the mailing list. And the document. Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS:

I was typing on the chat. But would it be worth Farzaneh, Stephanie and everyone on the EPDP, for us to come up with a new letter about this? And if so, just to the Board, or to who else should we be dealing with now? Because I think this is something we can start drafting today with the input that was provided here in the call and on the mailing list.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Bruna. I think there is benefit in drafting something. And I was hoping that we'll have a bit longer discussion today because I noticed that on the mailing list, the conversation has sort of come to—it's been quiet for a while. So I was hoping we'll come to find more common ground today. And I see Stephanie's hand up now. So I'll first let her speak.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thank you. This thing is hardly a new idea. It's been a long time coming. Members who've been following the EPDP will recall that Ram Mohan from the Board struck with Göran's help a separate committee of technical folks, members of the SSAC mostly, who were checking the feasibility of such a system way back in the old days when the RDAP implementation was relatively new.

And certainly Steve Crocker has been nursing this idea in SSAC and promoting the idea of this centralized processing. Now, I said my piece

on the list and there's been very little that I've seen since. I think there is benefit in some kind of central accreditation of the actual requests. I've always believed that that would be useful, basically, for human rights reasons.

We deal only with the big companies at ICANN when it comes to registrars and registries, but there are others around the world who might not be paying attention to the privacy rights of their members and who may easily be coerced by their local governments or any other government for that matter into coughing up the data of their registrants when served with any manner of a question. And therefore that that rule of having a central authority that basically follows the rule of law would be useful.

I am well aware of how many governments try to get around their respective constitutional protections, or who bully because they don't have any constitutional protections for people. And most countries don't care about other people, they only care about their own. So you have this constant problem of cross border bullying.

So I think that is a reason to support the idea of a central process. The problem, and what has driven up the costs, which the ODP has recognized, but they should have known, is that governments don't want to do this for various diplomatic reasons. And when we were on the EWG, we being me back in 2013-2014, they tried, ICANN sought out potential candidates to do the job of accreditation, and nobody wanted it. For similar reasons.

So this, I think, was not unanticipated. And now we're seeing some sort of a look at what the costs might be. The costs, of course, one of the problems with any of these systems is the revocation of privileges. The IPC and business community have an idea that the regular users of the old WHOIS would just be accredited. The notion back in the EWG days—and it hasn't changed—is that any lawyer who is working on something would be accredited, and that that would then be delegated t down to all illegal aides that file requests.

And, quite frankly, that's not good enough. So I think we're hitting what I would consider to be an inevitable roadblock here. As to the matter of sending a letter, I'm not sure that a letter would be particularly useful, but I'm certainly open to it. I think that's about all you need to hear from me. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Stephanie. I don't know if you could explain a bit more why you think the letter might not be useful.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, I don't really think the letter is going to say anything that we haven't been saying in the EPDP. We have been saying all along that this would cost a fortune. And there's—that it doesn't. I mean, we had a big debate about this when we were discussing automation in the actual meetings. I think there's a fear that it'll be a slippery slope, that the moment you have this system in place, that then ICANN will start approving the disclosure of information.

In my view, this puts them in a very dominant controller position, which they have been ducking throughout all of the EPDP discussions, because they would then be setting the policy for disclosure and making the decision. They appear to be wanting the contracted parties to be the controllers, and ICANN simply to be in some ways a processor.

They can't do this if they start making the determination on disclosure. So I think that's a bit of a roadblock there. But I certainly understand the concerns that Milton raised. However, the real thing behind the scenes that we're not able to see right now, that we are not privy to, is the discussions between ICANN and the data processors and data controllers as to the agreements that they would have to set up to be compliant with GDPR, to make these arrangements.

So for instance, if they have a contractor that would like to perform the accreditation role, we don't know about it. Several candidates that could be lined up trying to get that nice big juicy contract. But they would be definitely processors and ICANN as the administrator of that contract, they become more and more likely to be considered the dominant controller of this data.

I think that's a more important issue, is, what is going on behind the scenes. My understanding is that the contracted parties are trying to discuss this issue with ICANN. It's a picket fence issue, because of course, they do not want the community negotiating their contracts and the contracts are intricately related to the question of controllership, co-controllership and being a processor.

So to me, that's the thing that we're in the dark about. And that would be a useful letter to write, because we might actually push them to be more transparent about what's going on.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. I think Bruna made a point in the chat, which I see her hand up now and I'll let her maybe voice in support for the letter. Please.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thanks, Tomslin. Just to point out what is on the chat already, that I think the letter at this point, it's not just something that would help communicate with the Org or whoever's discussing and deciding SSAD or the accreditation process, but with our members. In my opinion, this has been a rather niched discussion. So I just think that this is an exercise that would help us communicate better our concerns and even like the positive points about this process, if there's any, to our membership, because to me, that's some part I keep on forgetting about, we all keep on forgetting about, and that will be something we should be working on for the next year.

So again, I just emailed the list, and I would insist on us—I can do the draft and it's no problem. But I would insist on us doing this letter just so we can improve our communications with regards to this topic, and especially because in light of the plenary session that's going to happen in ICANN 73, I think if we manage to reach some level of consensus, this is a position our representative or any noncommercial representative

can take to the plenary on accreditation in ICANN 73. So that will be my suggestion about this one.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna, and I agree on the aspect of bringing the issue to the members, since not many have been following the issue and that might help bring some more better understanding to members about the SSAD. So absolutely agree there. I also think that there is also benefit in what Stephanie raised about the transparency issue between ICANN and the regulators. So that could be another aspect to include in the letter perhaps. So I'll take your offer to start the draft, Bruna.

I don't see any other hands raised on this issue. So, I think the takeaway here is that we'll be able to put our thoughts which we've discussed today on a letter, and Bruna is going to help draft that and we can all contribute to it. So I think with that, we can move to—thanks, Stephanie. I think that will be helpful, to inform members to listen to today's webinar.

And there is an SSAD update webinar today as well, I think that's the point Stephanie's raising on chat. I can't remember what time it is. I've seen Andrea just put the link. So it's 15:00 UTC. So members can get a bit more information about what we've been discussing today. And that will help in the conversation moving forward as well.

So unless there is any other hand raised on this issue, we'll move to the next. Any other business. I think we'll start with the NCSG representative on advisory council. Farzaneh, I think you mentioned

that this was a PC issue. I was thinking it was an easy appointment, but I'll let you speak a bit more on this.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you very much, Tomslin. Just a point of clarification, I'm not really questioning because we've missed the deadline, we don't have a representative. I just want to give you a little bit of background that might be useful next year, for the nomination.

So basically, the Public Interest Registry, historically, the NCUC had a representative which was the chair of NCUC on the advisory council, and this is why we—and also this was traditionally the case because we received also funding from them for quite a number of years. And that is NCUC.

And then when I was the chair of NCSG in 2018, I think it was 2018, then it was decided that to be more inclusive, they wanted a representative from NCSG. And also, they changed their bylaws and charter about the advisory council in a way that while we were not entitled to have a representative on the advisory council of the Public Interest registry, we were supposed to go through a nomination process and put forward three names that they could choose. The nominating committee could select for the advisory council of PIR.

And we went through that process, we even have a procedure for Policy Committee, and I understand that it can be confusing, that it might have been like executive committee, it might have been perceived as such, but at the time, we decided—I will send you the procedure as well.

At the time, we decided that the Policy Committee should send these three names. And one of the names would have been the chair of the NCSG, and this is how Stephanie Perrin who at the time was the chair of NCSG and her name was put forward, and she was on the advisory council until December this year. And we need to also like do something about that, what will happen when they are not chairs anymore? Will they stay on that advisory council or not?

But now I see that we do not have a representative on the advisory council of NCSG, anybody who is an NCSG member, because that's very valuable and great, but we don't have a representative that can like keep in touch with us and tell us what is going on at the advisory council of PIR. And we had this traditional relationship with PIR, which was very important.

So I urge you to, maybe with Bruna, you can contact PIR and tell them—well, this at the moment may be not a good suggestion, but maybe in six months, when we are closer to the next round of nomination, that we start the process of nominating an NCSG representative. And the PIR might tell you that, the NCSG shouldn't have a representative and they have changed their approach. PIR doesn't say exactly that NCSG shouldn't have a representative. It's just that they say the process changed. And this is why we came up with that procedure.

And what is going on in chat now, that they are mentioning that we have NCSG members who are on the advisory council. And as I mentioned, that is not enough. I was hoping that we can have a representative on the advisory council that could be in touch with the members, that could discuss things that is going on with the PIR, with

the members. They do a variety of things, they have come up with a variety of policies that unfortunately, we are not really discussing among ourselves.

Sorry, I went on and on. I just wanted to get some clarity on what happened. And it seems like from what I see, the Policy Committee didn't start the process to put the three representative nominations forward. And that is the story. So I just thought I'd provide you with a bit of a background so that we can fix this issue for the next round. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Farzaneh. That was helpful. Like you said, the Policy Committee didn't start the process. And I'll definitely be reaching out to you to get that procedure that you mentioned. so that we could have a look and plan for the next round. And to reach out to PIR like you suggested. I see Bruna's hand is up. So I'll pass it to you, Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you, Tomslin. So about reaching out to PIR, I have been doing that. I think we can coordinate on the whole thing and more than just one person reaching out to PIR all at the same time. But just to walk you through, what happened last year is that I have been in touch with Paul Diaz about the slots [and us] having a little change of representation on the PIR advisory board.

And as Farzaneh said, it's not necessarily that the PIR is against NCSG having a slot at the Council. But the point is that they have

reemphasized to me over and over again that the process had changed as she was explaining that the process was different and we would all now have to run for the slots or even like run and do the whole application process. That was last September. And this was the first point.

When I reached out to Paul the first time—not just to Paul but to PIR—it was explained to me that Stephanie was already the representative. And then I had to go through with them on a conversation, just saying that we just had a leadership change. So it will be interesting for us to also have a change in our representative and the representative that takes the NCSG name, and not just the members of NCSG, but they are on this council.

So that was where our conversation was heading forwards. And in September, the process was up. I personally apologize because I dropped the ball, I did not send the proper call, the call that was opened by PIR when it was up, but I do remember Stephanie sent it. And I think there was some level of—rather like problem of continuation between the conversations I was having with PIR and my updates to you guys, and how were we sending the application or like who were we suggesting to this council.

But that's just to explain to everyone that it's not something that's been completely out of the radar. We do have conversations with Paul, where we have been emailing him ever since last year, ever since the beginning of last year, about this position.

At first it was suggested to me that we waited for the call. And then when the call was up, we did not have an internal discussion about who would be our representative there. So that is one thing.

On the email to PIR, what am I going to do right now—not right now, but this week, is send an email to Paul in the same lines that were just suggested right now saying that despite the fact that we did miss the call last year, it is at our best interest to be part of the advisory council. So if he has any updates of the upcoming processes, that he let us know, because we do want to apply again, we do want to go through the process and we do want to have a representative there.

So if you all agreed that that makes sense, I will be more than happy to send this email to Paul this week just apologizing for not applying and explaining that we do have interest in that.

And last but not least, yes, let's just settle this question. We do not have representatives at the PIR advisory council right now. We do have people who happen to be members of both NCSG and At-Large who are at the Council but they are not using the NCSG hat. So it will be even confusing to reach out to these people and like require them to bring some updates or anything to the NCSG if they're not using our hats there. We can still talk to them, we can still ask them whether or not they would like to talk to the NCSG about the PIR advisory body, but it's not their task to update our stakeholder group if they are not there using our hat.

So I just wanted to put this on the record and to clarify everything because it's been a rather confusing and exhausting process last year

with the different—the whole pandemic and problems we were having with regards to representation and changes and everything else. And also to put my apologies here for dropping the ball on this. But hopefully we're going to get this question, this problem settled and write to Paul as soon as possible if everyone agrees. So thank you, Tomslin, and apologies for taking too much time.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: You're welcome, Bruna, and thanks for explaining what transpired there. I just had one question. You mentioned the issue of transition of our leadership in the event that the chair was the member of the Council. Did you get any response on that issue at all, or will we just still have the same issue in that case if we have a chair change?

BRUNA SANTOS: The correct thing will be for us to wait until our elections and see who is going to be the next chair, and then open an internal process for the NCSG ahead of the PIR call. To me at least, it will be the more logical thing for us to do, because as you pointed out, there is going to be a change in the leadership in next October. But we are going to know who our next chair is in July. So it will be good for us to do some—we can work on a timeline for that. We can definitely work on a timeline.

So as soon as the NCSG elections are over, we can open the internal process to decide who will be the NCSG candidate to the PIR advisory body and when the call comes in in September, then we can apply with this person name or whoever else wants to apply. So we can definitely work on a timeline in order to avoid such questions.

Because when I reached out to PIR last year, I was informed like over and over again that we already had a representative and it was Stephanie and that her mandate was automatically renewed. So I had to explain to Paul a few times that the leadership change would have required us to do some changes as well. But that's when I explained I dropped the ball because I couldn't handle too many things at the same time. And despite of my move and everything else.

So yeah, I think we can definitely work on a proper timeline and see how can we put everything together just so next September, when the call comes up, we do have one or two candidates to present to the PIR advisory body call. So that's it.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. And I see Stephanie's hand up. Stephanie, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: My apologies for not pushing harder. I did mention it at Council meetings, which of course, the call went out in the summer, in probably August because I know I didn't send it to the list immediately. And I believe we had low Policy Committee attendance back in August. But I could be misremembering, I just remember sending it to the list.

Now, if people have been discussing all of this with Paul Diaz, and I'm not pointing accusatory fingers, but it would have been good to tell me and keep me in the loop on all of your concerns, because Paul told me quite emphatically that they had changed the way they appoint the members, that they were doing an open call, and that PIR would choose

the members themselves. And they encouraged us to advertise to our lists, but I was told that we did not have a rep.

Now, bear in mind that when I started my term, it was the fall of 2019. Unfortunately, I happened to be in the hospital at the time of their big meeting in Washington. Joan went, and as I keep reminding people, she was indeed the head of NPOC at the time, so possibly might have updated the list on what happened in Washington.

But then, of course, the crisis over the sale of PIR and that whole thing broke out. And so it was extremely awkward, because of course, NCSG members various were leading the charge against the sale. So I do feel that my term hasn't been particularly useful. I would also like to tell people, I don't know who has actually served as a PIR member, but there's a very firm nondisclosure agreement that I had to sign in order to be on the advisory board stopping you from saying anything about the PIR advisory council meetings outside of that meeting.

So quite frankly, it is one of the least useful advisory councils that I've had the pleasure to serve on, where there's very little of substance that is actually being consulted on in my opinion, and where I said something on the list about the sale and got reprimanded by the head of PIR for doing so.

So just in case anybody thinks that there's a really lively input here, I beg to differ. Possibly, it's changed over the years with new leadership, with new operations. As I say, the impending sale was a polarizing moment. And that may have tainted this. But those are just my comments on the whole advisory board position. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. So I see hands in the queue growing, and I see the chat as well. But if I understand your point, Stephanie, is that the representative will still not be able to update members of what's going on in the advisory committee. Is that correct? I think Stephen is gone. Bruna, you are next in the queue. Please go ahead.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you. Just to come back on this. I guess the point here is, it's not to put the fault or to blame anyone about this process, because as I said, I dropped the ball, I have some level of responsibility with regards to the lack of follow up on this. But as everyone here has explained over and over again, the process has changed. The process is no longer automatic kind of like renewal to the mandates or they're just like the PIR just accepting an NCSG representative in their advisory council, just because the [inaudible] the process is a new one and a different one.

So let's just use this as a good learning experience for us to develop an internal process on the PIR board and for us to discuss things ahead of time. It was very unfortunate that when this call was up, I was already in the process of changing countries and everything else. So my mind was in something else and I didn't also have the time to bring forth the call to everyone or anything like that.

So let's put this back and let's focus on actually coming up with a process in July when we have our elections figured out, when we know who our next chair is going to be, and just so we can make sure that our communication with PIR is pretty clear, every single of our member

understands that we don't have an automatic chair there, that just sort of make sure like we all are on the same page about this process.

So I just to wrap up, I agree with some of the things Stephanie said. In the past years, the advisory council of PIR changed a lot, might have even become slightly more political, past the situation of the sale and everything else. So I don't doubt that it was a rather confusing and maybe problematic space for us to be in. But let's just focus on how the process is going to be this year and make sure we get a representative there, whoever this person is.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. We'll work together then to come up with a process, of course with whatever has been used before or by the PC, which Farzaneh has promised to send. Farzaneh, you're next in the queue.

FARZANEH BADI: Thank you. Not to drag this on. And I'm not pointing fingers at anybody. Just to be forward looking. Yes, the advisory council is given NDAs, but in the past, what we did was that we talked to the legal counsel after the meetings that the advisory council had and sent the messages that we wanted to send to the NCSG mailing list to the legal counsel, and the legal counsel would say, okay, so this is good, and this doesn't have confidential information, or at least like some of the stuff that are public and not brought to the attention of the NCSG, we can discuss them.

And we can discuss them even now. The advisory council, was a window dressing and is window dressing. But I always saw it as a strategic

position for us to know more what is going on. Also that we received funding from them for a while. I don't know what is the situation with that now, but that's for some other day. But thank you, I just wanted to acknowledge that there has been shortcomings, it's not just one person or like pointing fingers. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Farzaneh. So I think summarizing this item, I think there's agreement, first of all, that we should communicate back to PIR. Bruna will be doing that and I'll work with her to develop some sort of process which we'll share with the Policy Committee to approve on how we can, moving forward, nominate members to the advisory council. So thanks.

I think the other item under AOB I had was a vacancy for our representative for the task force which is meant to work on modifying Statements of Interest. I believe we're supposed to appoint no more than two members, two representatives. And we're hoping that we'll get one from NCUC and one from NPOC. And I note that the call has already gone out in the NCUC mailing list. I'll be working with Raul to try to get a call go out on the NPOC list as well. And Bruna, you've just mentioned on the chat that you have an AOB. Please go ahead.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you, Tomslin. It's just about ABRs. I will send an email to the list today still about the additional budget requests. We have an open call until the 24th of January. Andrea just confirmed the deadline for me. So if anyone would have suggestions or ideas of actions and activities we

could suggest as ABR for the next financial year, I will be very much appreciative of reading and going through those suggestions.

But bearing in mind that we have a short timeline, the 24th. If you could just reply to my mail as soon as it arrives on the mailing list about suggestions and ideas, that will be good. Yes, Raymond, the ABRs are still open until the 24th as I just mentioned.

And just as an example of what we applied for in past years, we have two good examples. The one was the policy writing course. And the other one was also a policy kind of formation as well. But that was far more oriented on how NCSG could be better positioned in working groups, policy discussions throughout ICANN and everything else. So if you have any ideas, please make sure to reply to my mail. And we have until the 24th to apply for the ABR. So thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Bruna, noted. Hopefully some ideas come through. And unless there are other things that members would like to bring up. I think that is all I had today from my end. I'll pause for a second to see if there is any hand up.

If not, then I'd like to thank you all for coming or attending today's meeting. I look forward to seeing many during the Council meeting, and maybe even at the SSAD meeting today. Happy new year again to everyone. Thanks for attending. See you soon. Bye.

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you all for your participation today. Happy new year.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]