ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO: NCSG Policy Committee
Tuesday, September 20, 2022 – 16:30 to 17:30 KUL

ANDREA GLANDON: Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper format, as I will note in the chat shortly. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment verbally, please raise your hand. when called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. mute your microphone when you're done speaking. This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation and ICANN's multi stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I will hand the floor over to Tomslin, you may begin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Andrea, and thank you everyone, online and in the room who is attending our NCSG policy meeting today. We usually use this time to prepare for the monthly Council meeting and the monthly one for this month will be tomorrow here at ICANN 75.

We have a couple of items on the agenda. The first of which will be that preparation I just talked about, the Council agenda, we'll walk through it so that we give our stakeholder group members and the Councilors in particular the opportunity to be ready for the meeting tomorrow. And then thereafter, we'll look at some other items that are of interest.

I note that some of those who have had opportunities to discuss them already in either the NCUC meeting or the NCSG meeting. So if we might find ourselves replacing if necessary, with some other items. But let's start with the Council agenda, then see how we go.

So on board, it's a bit small for people in the room, but that is the Council agenda. Because it's the general meeting, there'll be two parts to the Council agenda, to the Council meeting rather. The first part will be the substantial part where the Council will actually look at issues that it will discuss. Then the second part will be very administrative, which is the rollover of leadership in Council.

So for the first part, we do not have any administrative item, I believe. No, we do. All right. So that's the usual stuff, which is just the roll call and updates to statements and stuff like that. We have no item on the Consent Agenda, and there's nothing to vote either except for the voting for the chair during the administrative part of the meeting. Part two of the meeting. There is no item on the agenda to vote for.

Item number four will be an update from PTI, the public technical identifier, and IANA. They will be sharing with the council an update about that part of ICANN. They'll be presenting that to the Council. And I don't think there is anything—unless someone has a question regarding this, we can move to the next item.

Item number five, I'm sure there'll be questions on this one. This will be a discussion on the registration data accuracy scoping team. For a bit of a background, the scoping team was put together by the Council to look at what needs to happen to registration data accuracy and the impact of GDPR on accuracy, compliance, contractual compliance in the registry and registrar contracts.

So, this team was late to submit their report, but they have submitted their report and make some recommendations to the Council on how to go forward with registration data accuracy.

The tasks of this team, which were four, but the team was asked to work in the first two, which related to how accuracy can be measured and whether maybe there is need to probably spin up a study on how to measure accuracy in light of GDPR and things like that.

We have some—had, because the team is now winding down unless the Council chooses to bring them back up—a member from NCSG on this team. I think Stephanie was our member on this team. And they've submitted three recommendations to the Council.

The recommendations are related to—one, they've asked the Council to with ICANN Org to do a survey on registrars to understand how they use the accuracy reporting system and possibly also do an audit on registrars. And this is not the intention, this will not be to access any registration data but just to gather information on how registrars comply with current accuracy requirements. Those are the first two recommendations, are related to that.

And then the third recommendation just simply highlights the dependency on this work on another work that ICANN is undertaking by seeking for direction or guidance from the European Data Protection Board, the EDPB, whether or not ICANN Org has a legitimate purpose that is proportionate

[inaudible] to request contracted parties to provide access to data to ICANN.

Now, those are the three recommendations which are in the report as presented to Council and Council is meant to deliberate on what to do with this report. And I think the Council has a couple of options to take here. One obviously is to not support the recommendations in the report. That will mean that the Council have to give new instructions to the scoping team.

The second option will be possibly accept the recommendations and actually ask ICANN Org to start working on that survey on registrars, and also the audit perhaps. Or just put this on hold until ICANN is—there is clarity back from the European Data Protection Board on whether ICANN should actually have access to registration data or not.

So I think there are options, but the Council will deliberate on these and decide on how to proceed. So I'll pause there, see if there are any questions. And I see Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thank you for all the background, that you're providing, Tomslin, on really important issues. I was wondering what our Councilors think about this issue, and particularly Stephanie Perrin, who is an expert on data protection and related issues.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. And actually, I think that's the reason for this meeting, to listen to what Councilors think about it. And also to kind of get a way forward between us and the Councilors on how to address the issue tomorrow. I know that I'm not exactly clear on Stephanie's position on these recommendations, so to speak. I don't think we've had the chance to discuss these recommendations before because she on—

KATHY KLEIMAN: Is she on this call?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I was hoping so. I'm not sure she is.

BART BOSWINKEL: It is 5:00 AM on the east coast.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: But yeah, maybe Councilors in the room could comment. Manju, please.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. I'm also on the scoping team. And how do we say this? We're not in love with the recommendation of having the survey

because we don't think it's going to provide useful data, but I guess we can just live with it. Because it's not like we ... How am I gonna phrase this? We're not in love with this survey, but we're not gonna use our lives to stop it. So I think that's how we're thinking about it now, because we couldn't even reach agreement on how to define accuracy, like we've been advocating in the scoping team that we have to have at least workable definition for accuracy, but it was just not happening in the whole scoping team period. And we ended up with something like current practice of accuracy, which is we list out how in the contract it is written like what the registrars are supposed to do. And then that's practically it, and then we are trying to collect data, but then all of this data, it's just so much risk of having personal information in it. So that's why we're coming up with this option of survey which registrars they will be carefully themselves not submitting any data that was containing personal information. And actually, last Saturday in KL, we are supposed to be reviewing the questions for the survey. But then the discussion just again got kind of distracted to some other proxy privacy kind of discussions, we didn't even really have time to review the survey questions. So I guess we really have to—what the next step for us, scoping team, is really to review the questions, because I think a lot of us weren't very happy about the questions. And on the side of Council, I would suggest us to just ask, where do you plan to finalize the survey questions,

because it's not finalized yet. And then we can really think of, I guess, next steps. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think from what Manju said, I just had a question. Because the recommendations say that Council should consider developing the survey, which means Council needs to first accept to go the route of the survey, then the survey questions are developed. That's my reading of the recommendation. So I'm not sure whether asking for the actual survey questions is necessary, then, in that case, to accept or deny the recommendation. So I'm not sure.

MANJU CHEN: Yeah, that's probably my mistake. If that's the case, we're just doing preparation work probably in the scoping team. And then like I said, we're not extremely against the survey, but then we're not in love with it. I will say that if people in the Council are supporting this, we won't be like strongly against it. But if there are people who are strongly against this, we can definitely talk to them and decide whether we want to go that way, just because we don't see the value of the survey anyways. Yeah, that's probably my suggestion. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Manju. Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: If that's the only recommendation coming here from—is a survey, you're right, the questions will be important. Couldn't be too dangerous to do a survey, I think. You were on the small group, you said, with Stephanie on it. She's been involved with this in the committee that Michael Palage is resigning from his chair, Stephanie was involved in. So I would also check with her, see what she thinks. Data accuracy is a big issue. And actually it's a red herring. There, just so you know, data accuracy could threaten a lot of things. So you're right to be cautious about this. Data accuracy is not the most important part of WHOIS. Protecting people's identity is, particularly political speakers who could be killed or their families could be killed. And there's not— WHOIS, we found in the first—going all the way back to when there were no controls, there wasn't that much data inaccuracy issues. Guys, people used it as a privacy mechanism until they got proxy and privacy.

And now under proxy and privacy, we found that the accuracy is much higher, because people know they're not putting their home addresses, their name, their home addresses, location of their children out on the public network in a 24/7 directory. So accuracy is not a huge—I've never thought—and I'm on the record

as saying it's not a huge issue. But you're right, we shouldn't go too far but a survey might not be the most dangerous thing. But I'd love to know what Stephanie thinks and if we can see the questions. Thanks for your caution on this. It's always good. And what I worry about is ICANN spending an awful lot of money and time on data accuracy and I think it goes overboard. But thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. If there are no other questions, we can move to the next item then. [inaudible], proposed updates to the GNSO operating procedures, working group self-assessment, and GNSO statement of interest procedure. I think Stephanie was initially in this group as well, where the CCOICI developed a proposal for working groups to do self-assessments on themselves. And this statement of interest procedure, the change on the statement of interest. And I think there was a public comment on this. And we'll just get the Council discussing, we'll get a presentation from the chair, and then the Council will discuss this. I don't know if there are any questions or comments on this item.

See none, we'll move to the next. Item seven is the PDP improvement tracker. I think I've given an update. No, I think I just wrote that down. So update on the PDP improvement tracker. A survey was developed and sent to Councilors and SG and C leadership to kind of review the categorization which I have

shared earlier in the past. We've looked at it in a couple of our meetings already, whether they are okay, so it was now a formal, is it okay, or do you have comments about it?

And some preliminary responses have been received. And so the Council will continue reading reviewing these responses that have been received under this item. Yes, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Has anybody reviewed this closely? Can I ask some questions about it? Any Councilors?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Please do.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. So with PDP improvements, do you know anything about the timing of PDPs and what happens when a PDP falls behind, what the GNSO Council has planned? Is that anywhere in this list?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No, it's not.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. The reason I'm asking is what's happening now is ridiculous. GNSO Council plans things, COVID hits. And then we

have to spend a month trying to justify why we're running behind. You guys, as a co-chair, that was a waste of time. We've got to start planning for real people, volunteers, real world, pandemics, crazy things and just make it easier to understand that it's real people doing this work, and that we're not going to be able to stick to timeframes when the world is doing something else. So anyway, if that's ever a part of it, please make it easier to extend a PDP timeline, because otherwise, all your leaders are going to quit, because it's just too hard. But that's a different issue. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: To answer your question, Kathy, there actually is a tool available in the GNSO Council to address that already. Like in the case of the registration data they were supposed to have put in—the leadership that is, was supposed to put in a change request to update their project timeline that they had submitted at the start of their project. So there is a tool that allows for working groups to submit a change request to the time. And then it's a formal change request where it captures the reasons behind it. And the Council is meant to take it, discuss it and then approve or deny. There exists a tool for that already, which is why it's not in the tracker. But it expects that the leadership of the group will submit one. I guess the members of the group then should be asking their

leadership to submit a change request if they believe they need to change their timelines.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay, we'll talk offline. It's very time consuming when you've already got other things happening. But okay, if that already exists. So what in essence are the improvements that are being changed in this tracker? What's the substance of what's happening here?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Before I answer that, I see Rafik's hand up, I'll let him speak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Tomslin. So I wanted really to intervene regarding how the timeline is managed for a PDP and that the GNSO Council and with PDP 3.0, we come up with that process, the project change request to make also kind of the PDP working group more accountable in terms of managing their timeline and to not go forever. I guess we can understand there are some external factor or internal factors too. We have to have in mind or issue like maybe the coping and so on. And in fact, with PDP 3.0, we discussed how we can improve that like in terms of scoping and so on to avoid more long PDP.

But at the end, the PCR, the funny acronym, with the context, was made so that the working group, in particular, the chairs, leadership of the working group, to explain clearly to the Council why there are delays, and what they are proposing as mitigation.

I think that it's not heavy process, is quite simple form to fill. And I think it's a way really to—in terms of governance to explain why there are issues or delays, just the proper project management. Cannot have PDP going forever. And in fact, in most of the PDP, when there was PCR, they were approved by the GNSO Council. Maybe for some it was issue because they already took a long time, more than three years.

So I just wanted to intervene here and to just share that some cautions. It's not complicated process, just need to be followed and GNSO Council for the last years, five years, we're trying to add that project management approach so we can manage those PDP more effectively and to deliver on time. So that's always there when there is that continuous improvement process for that matter.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Rafik. So to answer your question, Kathy, the proposed improvements, there are three categories of them. The first category is—they've been categorized as either easy to implement, some work, and then difficult.

But putting that aside, there were a couple of places where these improvements are currently on the improvement tracker. So just to note that this tracker will be growing, it is not fixed. So it will continuously be adding stuff on it.

During the last Council's strategic session, some items came up. And in that session, the big thing that the community was talking about was how already approved recommendations or recommendations that have been sent to the Board are taking too long to be approved or taking too long to be implemented.

So some ideas that came out of that discussion were things like perhaps we need to bring in this type of implementation evaluation of the recommendations into the PDP, into the working group so that it's done earlier, or bring in a Board liaison into the working group so that some items that could potentially affect—that could be raised early are raised during the working group process or get a GDS liaison into the working group as well so that they can also highlight issues that are of concern, which will be of concern at the time of implementation to the actual working group to kind of make sure that they take that into consideration as they make their recommendations. And another one was—and I think this one came from ICANN Org—was the proposal of the working groups to consider the impact of already existing policy recommendations on how their recommendations will impact already existing policies and include that in the report

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

as well. Those are the sort of improvements currently on the tracker.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Can I ask another question? This is a big picture question. Has the material that you're sharing now been circulated to NCSG already? It's possible I didn't see it. And we're very busy. It's all been circulated. Okay, because I missed it. Because we should be able to read this ahead of time and think about this. I've got concerned with bringing implementation into the policy development process. You're adding more stuff in. If the Board doesn't adopt some interesting. This is a hard question. I'm not sure there are easy answers on this. But let's be careful about overloading the policy development process working groups. We design them not to be implementation, to kind of leave that for later. But this is hard. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. It was shared quite a while ago, actually, and that's why I mentioned that we've talked about it in a couple of meetings. And the survey was then generated based on what had been shared already, just so that leadership and the community can now respond and we can assess how we move forward with the tracker, basically.

Let me see if there's any other hand up. If none, then we can continue. All right, we'll move to the next item then, which is what was formerly called the SSAD Lite, and now called the WHOIS disclosure system. There was a small team after the SSAD or ODA was published, the Council had put together a small team to review that document and some requests from the small team was made to ICANN Org. I see Stephanie's saying not a very small team. Welcome, Stephanie. We had some questions for you earlier, but welcome. Thanks for joining.

So the Org now has released a system design which the small team is currently reviewing, and I think they are yet to bring their response to the Council. So I think on this item, because the small team hasn't yet really submitted its official response back to the Council on the system design, I believe they're still working on it, the purpose of this will simply be to consider conversations that have happened since we got here in KL around this issue with the rest of the community. Stephanie is now online so I don't know if she has something to add to this. Stephanie, are you able to speak?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. I must say I'm a little discouraged with this WHOIS disclosure system. First of all, I don't think we should be calling it WHOIS, because I think that sets us in a path towards more and more

disclosure. I know, that's a subtle point. But the reluctance to actually accept that we're not going to be releasing everything is still there.

And I'm not sure that we are actually getting anything out of this system. I raised that point the other day. Because we're spending a fair bit of money, they're accessing the $20 million extra fund, emergency fund, whatever it's called. And hopefully, they won't be spending all that. But I think that the actual costs of building this are bigger than anticipated. And it's not clear that there will be universal adoption of this thing. It's voluntary, so the big players are going to be doing it. But the systems are not meshed up with their own systems. So we may be just doing a data gathering exercise that will not be permanent, just as some kind of proof of concept. But, definitely everybody wanted the proof of concept. So I guess we're rushing ahead with this. It is a request system. Yes, that's correct. I see that in the chat. But it's called the disclosure system. I think Becky summed it up quite well in our meeting with the Board. There are a lot of sort of, "Why are we doing this?" questions that one might ask. So that's probably enough out of me on it. We are continuing to meet in the small team and discuss this. So if anybody has any questions, please ask, guide me. I can talk further. But I don't want to just keep rambling.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. Quick question before I come to you, Kathy. Do you know how long it might take before the small team returns with something back to Council?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, I know there's pressure on us. And Sebastien is begging for some more response. So no, I can't give you like, weeks, months. I imagine there's impatience to get this thing going. Staff may have a date that they mentioned the other day, but I can't remember what it is.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay. Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I have some comments on WHOIS disclosure, but also, we had had a question for Stephanie on an earlier item. Do we want to ask that? Can we go back to the earlier item? Stephanie, it's Kathy. Hi. Going back to an earlier item, Stephanie, that had to do with the survey, I believe on data accuracy. Can we go back to that item? Thank you. Stephanie, I was wondering what you thought about item number five for Council discussion, the registration data accuracy scoping team, and it appears to be coming to the GNSO Council for authorization for a survey. And I'm not sure if it

goes beyond a survey. Unclear what that survey is. And I was wondering what you thought of this.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: So it's related to the report that came out of the accuracy data team, the three recommendations that came from the report. One being the survey of registrars and the second being the audit.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Right. What do I think of it? Well, I'm afraid you've caught me flat footed. I can't recall what the upshot of the last meeting was, and what the discussion was. So let me go back into it and get back to you. I'll have to do this online.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I can just give you a quick overview. And then you might be able to give your thoughts to it. You think that might help?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: That might help. Yeah.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right. So basically, the report recommend that the Council consider working with ICANN staff to create a survey of registrars to determine how registrars comply with the current accuracy

requirements. And the intention of that is to use that additional data to work on assignment number three, which is the effectiveness of the current accuracy data compliance in the registrar contracts. So that was, in summary, that's what the recommendation was about.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Right. Well, basically, this is the discussion that continues on. Review of accuracy per the last RAA. Right. The question is whether or not we're going to get meaningful data from the registrars, in terms of whether they are testing and to the extent to which they're testing whether for instance, the contact email works, as opposed to verifying whether it is accurate, whether that's actually who is registering. If you're following me here. It's not an identity verification, it is a functionality verification. And so they want fresh data on this.

And you may recall that there was a lot of focus on this in the WHOIS review team that completed its work a couple of years ago, there was a lot of focus on accuracy. So it's really a fresh look at that kind of data, is to see whether registrars are in fact doing this.

Now, what the point of this is, I'm not sure. I gather that the registrars have agreed to it, and we will be pushing forward on this pending appointment of a new Chair. Members might want

to have a look at the work, the material that Tucows been putting out on some of the accuracy checks that they do. But of course, the problem is we're only dealing with the big GoDaddy, Tucows, the major players in the ecosystem. The question is, to what extent are those guys responsible for the problems that the accuracy endeavor seeks to control? Not a question we've debated or discussed, of course. I'm not sure whether that answers your question or not.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Does it, Kathy?

KATHY KLEIMAN: I think it does. And it doesn't sound like you have huge objections, Stephanie, if I'm reading it—that you may not think it's the best idea but you don't seem to have huge objections.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, quite frankly, this debate rages on and we in the noncommercial group, we don't actually have a stake in the outcome of this. If the registrars are prepared to go through the work of doing this survey and producing results, just to sort of keep this process going, I don't feel that it's something I want to take a stand and say, "No, No, you mustn't do that." I'm not sure

that it's going to give useful information. But it's not a hill I want to die on.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I note that we have only about 20 minutes left. Manju.

MANJU CHEN: Oh, thank you. I was actually talking about WHOIS this closure system, which we were on the item. It's nothing big. We had this CCOICI meeting with [Ephraim] on Monday, I guess. And we decided to share the HRIA of SSAD and ODA to the Council because apparently it was sent to the Board directly, wasn't really shared to the Council list. And we thought it will be like Seb who's leading the small team on Council might appreciate that report. So I just shared to the list. And if we want to bring that up, and the Council can just [raise awareness to this document,] we can. Yeah, that's basically about it. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:	Thanks, Manju. Kathy.
KATHY KLEIMAN:	Yeah, I have some comments on this WHOIS disclosure system. So did post this publicly for comments. So I was able to get it downloaded, read it on the plane. This is silly. Sorry. Things that you might be useful to ask ICANN, or if you're discussing it, can a registrant get access to request for data about themselves?

So let's say someone's stalking me. Can I request from this system who's coming after me? So I keep changing my domain name. I keep changing my information, because someone's stalking me. And I'm not making that up. It's happened on the WHOIS from the WHOIS data. Can I find out who's coming after me? Sometimes you know your stalker, sometimes you don't.

One thing we really want, and it's not in this paper, is access to the data by academics who research this kind of data. We may anonymize it, but we need to know—we need people—there are people who are going to want to study this and help ICANN understand it and help everybody understand it. There's no access to this data.

The big question—as Stephanie pointed out—so I don't know if anyone's making lists of these things to take into the conversation. The GNSO Council can ask questions in a way that no one else can. So again, access to the data by academics to

study it, access to the data by registrants. Why is it costing so much? This is a very simple system. All ICANN will be doing is passing on—unless I'm misreading the system, passing on queries to the registrars, who then do all the work. I'm not sure that's inappropriate. I think maybe the registrars should do a lot of the work. But I don't know why it costs so much. It's a pretty simple system.

And as Stephanie pointed out, I don't think the name is correct, because it's not really a disclosure system. Stephanie, I think you had a better name for it. So we should think about that. But what I'm concerned about is harassment and some of the checks and balances on the system that should be written in, and whether this is a test system or not, how long the system is supposed to last. Is this a system in perpetuity or is this some kind of test system? So thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. I just want to check. So my understanding is this is a proof-of-concept kind of thing. They stopped calling it a proof of concept. But if you will notice, it might not answer some of the concerns of the actual SSAD recommendation itself, which is what Stephanie mentioned, that it doesn't—whether we actually need it. It's only meant for data collection. So for use by the Council to determine or answer the questions that the ODA poses.

So my question to you, as you ask that, is, will you be wanting those two items you raised for academics accessing the system and registrants accessing the system to be included in a test system that is simply to collect data to make a determination on the SSAD itself.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yes, because if you don't build it into the test system, you'll never have it in the final system, the final system will roll over. So yeah, I would build it in now. And that way, there's a balance there. And the registrant access would be narrower, obviously, just to the requests about them. And the academic access would be much broader to all the data. But perhaps anonymized, because requesters as is noted in the paper will have privacy issues as well, privacy concerns, which also have to be balanced. It's really interesting. We should find out more about the rights under the GDPR of requestors for data. Because I'm not sure those rights are the same as the requested person's data.

But I would build everything into—at least versions of it into the test system, in part because academics may help us review the test system. And so if they don't have access—we should just build the right balances in from the very beginning, I think. Thank you for asking the question. Good question.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you. One of the problems with this whole discussion is that we're not doing any verification of the requester. So it is still up to the contracted parties to verify whether the requester has the right to ask the question. And in order to do that, you have to figure out who they are. And that does require—if they're looking for personal information, then that does require verification of the identity.

Obviously, if someone claims their law enforcement and sends you a request, you have to verify that it is indeed law enforcement and not some stalker pretending to be a cop. So that's one of the weaknesses of the system. In my humble opinion, one of the most useful things that we could build into a system is that front end verification system, or at least something that assists the contracted parties in doing that. Fine for the big guys like GoDaddy, but what about all the smaller ones? So that's an issue.

Now in terms of Kathy's example about the stalker, if you keep changing your domain name and you keep getting stalked, then the issue would be whether your contracted party is providing information about you. So that is definitely not something this system is equipped to answer, in my opinion. Because you're not able to access it. The academic issue that Kathy is discussing,

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

you're still not necessarily—it's going to be anonymized data. This is volume data, and request type data. You're not going to be able, in my view, to access the identity of who's actually using this system. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Stephanie. Kathy, maybe we continue this because we only have two minutes. And I just wanted to bring two points up before we go. Because the next item on the agenda is an update from the universal access working group, but I think we'll just get an update on it.

I just wanted to bring two items that are in the AOB which is of interest to us. One being the confirmation of the approach of the term limit of the GNSO liaison to the GAC. It's been—the Council's discussed this and is going with Manju's suggestion or approach, which is that the GAC role should be advertised every two years. And we should limit of a maximum of four years for an individual I n the role. So the Council will be given the confirmation to this approach.

And the second is—I don't know how many people know about the SCBO. We usually appoint some people to the standard committee for ICANN budget and operations. The Council is considering changing how that committee will operate going forward based on an evaluation that it hasn't really been efficient,

and participants usually do not—it's meant to be Council responding to public comments, using that to respond to public comments, but it hardly does. And even when it does, the most active members are non-Councilors, usually.

So the Council is considering changing the operation of this group to a platform or forum where the community in general interacts with ICANN Finance and Budget. So it will be discussed. But I just wanted to bring that to your attention. And of course, will be giving farewell to outgoing Councilors in the Council, one of which is from our own Juan Manuel will be leaving the Council. So thank you for the work you did for us. Thank you. And that's it from me. We've run out of time. Thank you for the heated conversation, because that is important for Councilors going into these meetings to know how the stakeholder group feels and the positions so that we can better have conversations that represent the stakeholder group. So thank you. Thank you everyone online. See you tomorrow.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]