ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Council
Thursday, 18 April 2019 at 21:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-18apr19-en.mp3

Adobe Connect Recording URL: https://participate.icann.org/p44ivf39ab2/

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page: https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar [gnso.icann.org]

List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): **–** Non-Voting – Erika Mann (joined first 30 minutes)

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Pam Little, Michele Neylon, Darcy Southwell

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Maxim Alzoba, Keith Drazek, Rubens Kühl

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Carlos Raul Gutierrez

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo, Scott McCormick, Philippe Fouquart, Osvaldo Novoa, Paul McGrady, Flip Petillion

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Martin Silva Valent, Elsa Saade (absent, apology sent - proxy to Ayden Férdeline), Tatiana Tropina, Rafik Dammak, Ayden Férdeline, Arsène Tungali (absent, apology sent – proxy to Martin Silva Valent)

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Syed Ismail Shah

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison

Julf (Johan) Helsingius– GNSO liaison to the GAC

Maarten Simon – ccNSO observer (first meeting as ccNSO liaison)

ICANN Staff

David Olive -Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional

Marika Konings – Vice President, Policy Development Support – GNSO (apology sent)

Mary Wong – Vice President, Strategic Community Operations, Planning and Engagement

Julie Hedlund – Policy Director
Steve Chan – Policy Director
Berry Cobb – Policy Consultant
Emily Barabas – Policy Manager (apologies sent)
Ariel Liang – Policy Support Specialist
Caitlin Tubergen – Policy Senior Manager
Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Operations
Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator
Sara Caplis – Technical Support

Coordinator: Excuse me, recordings are started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much operator. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 18th of April 2019. Would you please acknowledge her name when I call it out? Thank you. Pam Little?

Pam Little: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Maxim Alzoba?

Maxim Alzoba: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rubens Kuhl?

Rubens Kuhl: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Keith Drazek?

Keith Drazek: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Darcy Southwell?

Darcy Southwell: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Michele Neylon?

Michele Neylon: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Carlos Gutierrez?

Carlos Gutierrez: Here. Thank you Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you Carlos. Marie Pattullo?

Marie Pattullo: Here. Thanks Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks Marie. Scott McCormick has warned he will be a couple of minutes late. Paul McGrady?

Paul McGrady: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Philippe Fourquart?

Philippe Fourquart I'm here, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Rafik Dammak?

Rafik Dammak: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Elsa Saade is absent apologies for today's call. Arsene Tungali has also sent in his apologies and we have Martin Silva Valent assigned as his proxy. Flip, over to you.

Flip Pitillion: (Unintelligible).

Nathalie Peregrine: Flip you may be muted I see you in the Adobe Connect room. Osvaldo Novoa?

Osvaldo Novoa: Here thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Tatiana Tropina?

Tatiana Tropina: Present. Thank you Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you Tatiana. Martin Silva Valent?

Martin Silva Valent: Present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Ayden Ferdeline?

Ayden Ferdeline: I'm here thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Syed Ismail Shah?

Syed Ismail Shah: Yes, here thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here. Thanks Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Erika Mann?

Erika Mann: Nathalie yes I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Johan Helsingius?

Johan Helsingius: (Unintelligible) Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Maarten Simon.

Maarten Simon: Hi. I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. And I'd like to welcome Maarten Simon. He's the ccNSO liaison to the GNSO Council and this is his first GNSO Council meeting. So thank you very much Martin. We'll also welcome today guest speakers from ICANN.org. Sarmad Hussain and Russ Weinstein. And from staff we have apologies from Marika Konings. On the line we have Steve Sheng, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Caitlin Tubergen, Berry Cobb, (Arol Yang), Sara Caplis for technical support, Terri Agnew, myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please to please remember to state your name before speaking for recording purposes. Thank you Keith and over to you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you very much Nathalie. Hi everybody. This is Keith Drazek. You are welcome to the GNSO Council meeting of the 18th of April 2019. So as I noted prior to this meeting earlier in the day today I sent an email, essentially a prep email or a summary of some key agenda items. And included in that email was a letter that I received from Manal of the GAC yesterday regarding the proposed motion that's before us today for the IGO INGO curative rights final report recommendations. And so I just wanted to

make sure that everybody had a chance to review the contents of that email as well as the attachment so if you haven't done so please take an opportunity to do this as we're going through some of the administrative matters to begin the meeting.

So with that we will – I will ask if there are any updates to statements of interest? Anybody updates to your statement of interest please raise your hand or speak up. Seeing no hands we'll then move on to a review of the agenda.

So the agenda is in front of us on the screen and I think as most of you have probably seen we've had already one request for moving one of the consent agenda items to the main agenda which is the vote to approve the appointment of Janis Karklins as the chair of the EPDP Phase 2. I received a request from Ayden on behalf of the NCSG to move that to the main agenda which I'm happy to do. So we will have that separated out. But it does mean that we have to allow for time for a vote on the consent agenda as this additional, a separate vote on this particular topic.

So in light of the amount of time that we have and we have quite a full agenda today and I expect there will be some discussion about the IGO INGO CRP motion, I'm going to spend just a little bit of time on the action items when we get to that. We'll go through that fairly quickly and then get to the substance of the call. So a review of the agenda we have a few items on the consent agenda. Just - okay so the first item on the consent agenda is a motion to adopt the GNSO Council response to the GAC communique. This was a circulated list just before the call today.

So what I'd like to do is to ask if there is anybody who feels that they need to have a longer opportunity to consider the substance of the GNSO Council response to the GAC communique. And in those circumstances what we would do is have an email vote following this meeting because I'm just

concerned that people haven't had a chance to either review the contents of the substance of the response and, you know, maybe not socialize it with their stakeholder groups and constituencies.

So if anybody I see a hand up. I think is that Pam? I can't read the entire thing on the Adobe Connect screen. No it's Paul. Paul go right ahead. Paul if you're speaking I can't hear you. Your Adobe…

Paul McGrady: Yes you've got to unmute two things, not one. This is Paul McGrady for the record. Did it change again after we reverted Pam's language this morning or is it that version?

Keith Drazek: I'm going to defer to Julf on this one. Julf if you could speak to this is the coordinator of the effort to develop the GNSO Council respond, if you could speak to where we are with this and, you know, where the latest draft ended up please? Hey Julf can you join?

Johan Helsingius: Sorry thinking again two different mutes. Sorry Keith. So it's Julf for the recording. Thanks Keith. Yes it is my understanding that's of – it is as it was this morning. We undid the last - we reverted the last switch so it is unchanged from this morning.

Keith Drazek: Okay so Paul says thanks. So again I'll ask would anybody like to remove this from the consent agenda or shall we leave it on the consent agenda? Going once, going twice, all right it will remain on the consent agenda. Thank you.

So again just reviewing the agenda at this time we have also a confirmation -- this is on the consent agenda -- a confirmation of the recommendations report to the board regarding the final report from Phase 1 of the EPDP. This is a procedural confirmation. It's of the recommendations report by council. As I

noted the previous third bullet under the consent agenda has now been moved. That's regarding the appointment of Janis Karklins as chair of Phase 2.

And then finally on the consent agenda is the approval of the suggested amendments to the GNSOs fellowship selection criteria. And this is the effort that Heather was helping to - Heather Forrest was helping to coordinate for us. So that will be then three items on the consent agenda. Then moving down to the main agenda we will have the discussion and then council vote on the appointments the approval of the appointment of Janis Karklins as chair for the PDP Phase 2.

On Item Number 5 we will have a council vote, a council discussion and vote on the IGO INGO access to curative rights motion before us and have a council discussion on managing IDN variant TLDs, 15 minutes allocated to that. And that's the session that Sarmad Hussain from ICANN org will lead. And then we'll have a council update on the status of the EPDP Phase 1 implementation and Implementation Review Team. Then we'll have a council discussion on an updated timeline for the PDP on all rights per the mechanisms and then any other business.

So are there any suggested edits or additions to our agenda today? As I noted that's a pretty full agenda with some, you know, some pretty substantive topics? Okay not seeing any hands then let's go back to a quick review of action items list. So if we could please have the action items put on the screen.

And while we're doing that let me just note that - I'll just start going through them. The first item on the action item list is a reference to the election timeline with regard to travel guidelines for ICANN funded travelers. I sent an email to the stakeholder group chairs and constituency chairs about this issue but it's basically to highlight that ICANN travel funding has changed its

guidelines from 90 days to 120 days and that this could potentially have an impact on new officers or new folks elected to positions prior to the annual global meeting so in other words if you haven't - if you are elected and appointed but it's after 120 day prior notice requirement for ICANN travel appointed member would be (unintelligible) ineligible for ICANN travel funding because they would have missed 120 days. And the email I sent was essentially highlighting this for the chairs of stakeholder groups and constituencies to make sure that each group is updating its charter or is at least aware of the situation as we head into election season.

Would anybody like to speak to this before I move on? Okay seeing no hands, on the action item list are reference to the IRTP, you know, policy status report and the Privacy Proxy Service Accreditation Issues. That's the PPSAI. So I think at least on the PPSAI Pam I know that you have been helping to coordinate a draft letter and in response (unintelligible) the letter that we received as council from ICANN org asking for the council's views on the pause and the possible restart of the PPSAI effort. So if I could have you speak to that one and then if there's anything else about the IRTP policy status report that we should touch on briefly right and that either you or Darcy can speak to that. Pam?

Pam Little: Think you Keith, Pam Little for the record. So we have had some discussion on the mailing list so I think I would just touch upon the first part of that draft letter which concerns whether the pause of the PPSAI (unintelligible) implementation work should continue. So as everyone will recall in Kobe we discussed this during our council meeting and there are different views around the councilors. So the goal of this letter really is to reconcile those views and see whether we can find common ground for - and the next step see how this work can proceed. So that was really the purpose of that letter to record and recognize there are different views around the councilors.

And the, I guess the latest suggestion or suggested edits from the IPC I was responding to only yesterday -- and I apologize for only responding so late -- was I feel there's we also have another stream of work that is the vehicle for us to respond to GAC advice. And this topic is also include in the Kobe GAC communique. And we have the small team there drafting. I believe Paul McGrady are colleague from the IPC is also in that small team.

I feel quite strongly that the suggested edits additional language noting the GAC advice on this should be though within the council's review of the GAC communique. So that's part one. The other part was about, you know, our different views whether the IRT implementation should continue - or should kick start again or continue to Paul. I guess Flip or IPC colleagues and the registrar representatives on the council really would – can only - I can only say agree to disagree. We – can you hear me? Yes, so the final report of that policy or policy recommendation was over 3-1/2 years ago and the council approved or adopted the final report on those recommendations over three years ago. And a lot has happened since then as everyone in this call would recognize. So we are reviewing a lot of the ICANN policies that are affected.

So I'm not as confident as my IPC - our PC colleagues who feel there's no need to revisit, review those policies and those policy recommendations are all sound from the final report. So I guess we have different views on that. The other bit on the transfer - the referral, the transfer issue to the IRPT believe the letter is pretty self-explanatory if anyone has any question about that or I'll be happy to answer them. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Pam. This is Keith. And I think Paul McGrady has noted in the chat that Flip is working this particular issue on behalf of the IPC and I know that there has been an exchange just over the last, you know, 12 to 24 hours on

this topic. And thank you for taking the lead on helping to coordinate this. And I'm confident that, you know, over the next couple of days that we'll be able to come to a letter that we can all agree to and that we will send in response to Cyrus.

So obviously this is, you know, it's a challenging issue and there are different - differences of opinion among councilors but I think the goal is you noted is for the letter to capture that and to respond in a meaningful way to Cyrus and we requested that we received. Flip I see your hand, go ahead.

Flip Pitillion: Thank you Keith, Flip for the record. I just wanted to be very brief and refer to the email so I can't repeat myself or what is in the mail. I just want to be very consistent and I've expressly referred to what the EPDP itself has actually said about this issue. I have I think we should take that into account. We should give it full consideration before we move on. Thank you Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Flip and thank you Pam. So in the interest of time we'll move on and just note that there's ongoing and active work on this particular topic which is why wanted to highlight it today for everybody and that, you know, in the near future we will be finalizing that document and responding to Cyrus with as best a position as we can take even recognizing that there are differences of opinion on a couple of different sides of this. Okay so let's move on and then I guess I have just a question for anybody, IRTP policy status reports. And I don't know Darcy if you've been following this one or Pam if there's any update that we need to discuss today on that one?

Pam Little: Hi Keith.

Keith Drazek: Yes Pam, go ahead.

Pam Little: Sorry. I believe we are waiting for ICANN staff to provide the council with the updated status report prepared by staff. So no action at the moment. I think there are quite a few moving parts at the moment. We have the – that report or final report from staff. Also there's EPDP the work stem from the EPDP Phase 1 to review the transfer policy. So I think maybe in the next meeting the council can discuss how to move that forward. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: All right thanks Pam. So we'll put that as an action item for the next meeting. Okay and then I'm just reviewing the action items and I think that we're – I think is pretty straightforward. I don't think there's anything that we need to call out at this point in light of the other things that we need to get to today. I wanted just take this moment though - I heard Erika say that she had to drop. And the CCWG on auction proceeds is one of the items on the action list. So Erika if you're still there if there's any update you'd like to provide on auction proceeds CCWG feel free to do so.

Erika Mann: Oh, I'm still here, just checking if you can hear me.

Keith Drazek: We sure can. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Wonderful Keith. No there is no real update. We lasted – at our last meeting in Kobe I mentioned that I would love to have a longer session in Marrakesh. We would love to make real progress. It's very difficult to have these calls only, you know, on the phone. I see the few exceptions which we have in the past and real meetings. And then we always had very short meetings. We're at the end phase so we are reviewing the public comments we received. It's a very technical work were you – it's helps immensely if one can just sit down and can go through the comments quickly. They have great templates. Staff is working immensely at to prepare everything but you can't imagine one loses a lot of time, you know, just because it takes time to get in the, you know, in the

rhythm of reviewing these comments. And it's just that people needs to be constantly reminded as well where we are what we're talking about. And it's much, much easier and goes faster if we can do this online.

We agreed that we will have the – we will not – we're not planning to finalize it in Marrakesh but we will – we want to have let's say the practically and in diplomatic terms you would call it in zero paper ahead of Marrakesh and then we like to review this zero document.

And then we will give us still one month or maybe two months to finalize it after Marrakesh. That's the goal so it's a very tight calendar. I'm not going into the topics. I don't think it would make sense to discuss this on the call today. Is this okay Keith?

Keith Drazek: Thank you Erika. That's perfect and that's a good brief update for everybody. And I'm sure is there are other developments you'll bring them to our attention. And if anybody has questions…

Erika Mann: Absolutely.

Keith Drazek: …for Erika feel free to reach out to her.

Erika Mann: Keith absolutely. I will stay silent and will not send anything if there is not a major conflict or a major development which is not coherent to what I said today or what I said in Kobe. Otherwise you will hear from me.

Keith Drazek: Very good. Thank you so much Erika.

Erika Mann: Pleasure.

Keith Drazek: And we understand that you'll need to drop shortly for boarding a flight so thank you…

Erika Mann: Yes and it's very disruptive here.

Keith Drazek: Thank you. Okay everybody in the interest of time what I'm going to do is park the rest of the action items and if we have time at the end of the meeting we can come back to them. I think we covered sort of the key topics that are sort of active at the moment. So with that let us move then to the next part of our agenda which is the consent agenda. So as I noted we have three items on the consent agenda for now. First is the motion to adopt a GNSO council response to the GAC communique. A second is the confirmation of the recommendations report to the board on Phase 1 the EPDP Phase 1 final report. And the third is approval the suggested amendments to the GNSOs Fellowship selection criteria. So with that Nathalie if I can hand it over to you please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much Keith. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion please say aye? Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say eye? Hearing none with all those in favor of the motion please say aye?

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: And thank you.(Martin Silva Valent and Ayden Ferdeline who holds
                proxies please say aye?

Man: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. We have no abstention, no objection. The motion
                passes Keith.

Keith Drazek: Nathalie are you there?

Nathalie Peregrine: Hello, can you hear me?

Terri Agnew: Nathalie this is Terri. I can hear you.

Keith Drazek: I don't hear Nathalie in Adobe Connect.

Man: I do hear Nathalie in Adobe on the bridge.

Keith Drazek: Yes I can - I hear you but…

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Can you hear me now? This might be the Adobe Connect audio failing?

Keith Drazek: So Rafik and I cannot hear Nathalie on the AC bridge.

Nathalie Peregrine: Can you hear me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nathalie, Cheryl here. We went through this several times in Adobe Connect on…

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: This is Mary from staff. We're just double checking. Give us a second, sorry.
f
Keith Drazek: Thanks Mary, appreciate it and if I need to dial in…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The phone bridge stays up and the audio into the AC crashed. I think it happened at least three times on a call I was on yesterday. So if it's starting to happen you're really going to have an issue today with such a busy agenda.

Nathalie Peregrine: Just in case the AC audio does come back I'll just carry on speaking. Keith can you hear me? As a reminder for recording purposes we all need to be on the audio bridge. That's where the recordings take place with transcript equally so if we are going to have Adobe Connect audio…

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Osvaldo I see your typing into chat. I think some of us can be heard on AC and others (unintelligible) was trying to (unintelligible) clear on (unintelligible).

Mary Wong: Keith everyone, this is Mary from staff again. And a reminder to everyone that it's best if you join on the audio bridge because AC audio is not the most reliable. And so Keith while everyone does that would you want to hold on the results of this until the next item in the interest of time?

Keith Drazek: Mary this is – thank you. I think what we need to do is to make sure that everybody's on and able to hear. So if that means we need to take two minutes and everybody try to join the phone bridge then maybe we need to do that. Let's just give it another minute here and see if - everybody let's do this. Let's take five minutes and everybody join the phone bridge. If anybody needs to dial out please type it into the Adobe chat room.

Terri Agnew: Hi everyone. This is Terri. I did reconnect the Adobe Connect line. For those only on Adobe Connect can you verify if you're able to hear me? Again only those that did not connect via the telephone.

Mary Wong: Terri, this is Mary I'm still on AC and I can hear you but hopefully the councilors are dialing in themselves as well.

Terri Agnew: Wonderful, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Hello everyone. This is Nathalie on the audio bridge. Please let me know if you need to dial out?

Man: I am hearing perfect. I don't know if anybody is speaking also.

Nathalie Peregrine: I think it would just be for the moment on the audio bridge.

Man: Oh.

Keith Drazek: Hi. This is Keith. I'm back here on the phone bridge now.

Man: Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Wonderful Keith were just dialing out to Julf so if you can just wait a couple of second and we'll…

Keith Drazek: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: …let you know when he's joined.

Keith Drazek: All right thanks Nathalie.

Martin Silva Valent: Hi Martin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Martin no one was speaking. This is Nathalie. Can you hear me? Tatiana's point in the Adobe chat room chat, please remember to mute your phones when you join the phone bridge. Thank you.

Keith this is Nathalie. We're just waiting on Julf to join. Just out of interest for those on the Adobe Connect room when did the audio cut out for you? Was it at the result of the consent agenda vote or when I called out the proxy?

Keith Drazek: Nathalie this is Keith. I don't believe we heard you call the proxies. So I think it was – we had basically gotten through your call for abstentions, no votes, yes votes and then that was it.

Nathalie Peregrine: Okay perfect, we'll pick it up then. Keith this is Nathalie. Julf has joined us on the phone. Is it okay if I just start again at the proxy vote and announce the results?

Keith Drazek: Yes please Nathalie. And thanks everybody for your patience here. I trust everybody is back and can hear and thank you Nathalie. Yes let's go ahead and complete the voting on the consent agenda. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. So to date there were no abstentions, no objections on the consent agenda vote. Martin Silva Valent and Ayden Ferdeline who holds proxies please state your votes.

Ayden Ferdeline: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: I believe we are missing Martin…

Man: (Unintelligible).

Nathalie Peregrine: …unless I misheard. Martin Silva, do you hold a proxy for Arsene Tungali. Please say aye.

Martin Silva Valent: Aye, aye, aye, aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much with no abstention, no objection the motion passes Keith.

Keith Drazek: Great, very good. Thank you very much Nathalie and thanks everybody for your votes and your patience in terms of our technical difficulties. So we will then move on to the next item on the agenda which is the discussion and a - the council vote for the approval of the appointment of Yanis Karklins as chair for the EPDP Phase 2. So I'll just again summarize and remind everybody that the GNSO Council has had a process, has a process. It was the same process that we used for the appointment of Kurt Pritz as the Phase 1

chair where we issued a statement, a call for expression of interest. And the GNSO Council Leadership Team myself, Rafik and Pam as well as the Leadership Team for the Standing Selection Committee went through a process of review of the expressions of interest and had a discussion and agreed unanimously to recommend the appointment of Yanis Karklins one of the two respondents to the expression of interest call.

And so before us today we have a vote for the appointment of Yanis Karklins as chair for Phase 2. But we did receive as I noted earlier a request from Ayden and the NCSG to have this moved to the main agenda so we could have a discussion. So Ayden would you like to pick this one up or someone else? Ayden thank you.

Ayden Federline: Thanks very much Keith. Hi everyone. This is Ayden. And just before I begin just to alleviate some concerns because I know we all want the EPDP to resume as soon as possible.

The NCSG is going to cast other (unintelligible) for this candidate so don't worry about that. It was more a process note and a question that we wanted to raise. And really I have one question, one statement and one suggestion that I wanted to put forward that may possibly alleviate some of the concerns that I had and others in the NCSG has and appropriately are going to be embedded within my question.

So initially when I saw this motion on the agenda I thought that we were being asked to rubberstamp one name to serve as the EPDP chair. And I appreciate that we need a chair urgently and the candidate before us is very qualified. I don't question that and no on in the NCSG questions that. However on a process note I was surprised to see that an email had been sent to one candidate rejecting him and another email was sent to the other

candidate saying he was the preferred pick before we even casted our votes today. And so what's done is done but in the future I would just suggest we send both candidates an update saying this is the motion the council is considering and only sending notices of rejection to candidates once we have the consensus decision on who should be the chair. And this is something that I very much hope we can do in the future.

On the substance of the agenda item before us from what I understand the candidate that we are being asked to appoint as EPDP chair is also the chair of the general assembly of the World Intellectual Property Organization. And this to me raises significant questions about his impartiality. He also has a long history with the GAC. And to the best of my knowledge not significant experience in engaging in GNSO procedures which is not quite the same as those which GAC operates under.

So I would find it very helpful to hear from council leadership as to whether this factor that he is chair of WIPOs general assembly whether that was something that was considered in his appointment, whether it was viewed by any members of council leadership or the standing selection committee leadership team as problematic. I just feel a little in the dark as to how the candidates were actually assessed, what factors went into recommending one over the other, because when I try to be objective here and I looked at those candidates I see in why (unintelligible) the rejected candidate, a trained neutral lawyer and mediator and I would have thought that these were very desirable skills in an EPDP chair. And then I see another candidate who I would think is again very qualified and does have experience in other parts of the ICANN community however is also involved in a different capacity than what I would say is a role that could potentially be supporting the particular stakeholder group.

And I guess that's what leads me to put forward this suggestion and it's something that I raised very briefly on our list today can't we retain Chris as well? Can't he serve as a co-chair or as the very least a vice chair (unintelligible) rejected him because what I see before us are two qualified candidates. We have a shortage of people who are willing to chair these working groups so why not accept both and have them divvy up the work as they see fit? Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Ayden this is Keith and I see Tatiana is in the queue but let me try to respond to the last point that you made about the vice chair or co-chair situation. I think the current situation is obviously that we had - for Phase 1 we had appointed Kurt Pritz as the appointed, the GNSO Council appointed chair. And there was then follow-on discussion about the need for a vice chair to be selected from among the group. And it turned out that individuals representing the various stakeholder groups and constituencies, SOs, ACs, you know, felt they didn't want to assign somebody to a neutral leadership position because it would take away one of their people from participating as an advocate.

And so Rafik as the GNSO Council liaison was also appointed to be vice chair. I believe I recall Rafik mentioning in our meetings in Kobe -- and Rafik I'll certainly welcome your input on this -- is that there was a recognition that, you know, we might need to revisit the role of the vice chair and the, you know, the occupant of the vice chair roll noting that we have, you know, sort of Rafik wearing two hats at the moment. And so I think there is an opportunity for us to review the vice chair situation. And but in order to have a co-chair we would actually have to reopen the charter for the EPDP. And I think that this point I think having, you know, a single chair able to make decisions, you know, and just in the, you know, finding consensus among the group is probably the preferred way to go.

I'll speak frankly here and I think, you know, we're seeing some challenges related to a co-chairing situation in the RPM PDP Working Group and I'm not sure that we want to necessarily go down the path of having co-chairs at this point. At least my feeling is probably not. But I'm certainly open to further discussion on the vice chair issue.

I'll have to go back and check Ayden on your earlier question about the relationship with WIPO. I know that Yanis Karklins is the current Latvian Ambassador to the United Nations in Geneva but I'll have to go back and double-check on the question you (relaised) - that you raised related to the WIPO situation. And I see – so with that we can come back and have further conversation about that but Tatiana over to you.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you very much Keith, Tatiana. First of all I want to echo Ayden's concern about connection of the proposed chair to WIPO. This is open information. One can find it online. And I do wonder if GNSO leadership and Standing Selection Committee Leadership address this issue because I think that it's just, you know, it screams for a possible conflict of interest and I really wanted a clarification on this. Don't get me wrong I don't want to blow up this chair. I don't want to vote against him. I don't want to stop the process. I understand that on EPDP we need to start as soon as possible with someone who can lead. But I do want a bit of clarity whether this was in his application where this issue was addressed, whether GNSO leadership saw any link to possible conflict of interest. So I do think that this is a big issue here because finally it does relate - I'm sure that this chair is - this prospective chair, suggested chair is very capable but how do we ensure neutrality and whether this issue was addressed during the conversation?

And secondly about Chris and co-chairs and vice chairing, there was a big conversation in Kobe I think on the GNSO Council and on the EPDP itself all about resources where we talked about a different kind of a (unintelligible) for example supply of transcripts we're compromised on this.

But if you remember for the EPDP Phase 1 I believe that we used professional mediator. And what strikes me here is that the person who is professional mediator is actually willing to serve as a chair or co-chair free of charge. And why don't we can't find a way - why cannot we find a way to utilize this somehow is a bit beyond me. So I believe that maybe it would be good to review this. And I'm not talking about opening the charter. I would be very much against this but I would like to have another careful look at the charter and see if we're - if it actually opened the room for co-chair.

And I understand that maybe - many would be against this but using Chris maybe in any other capacity where he can serve because he's willing to serve I believe might help us because he's a mediator and we paid for them. So basically this is it. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Tatiana. This is Keith. So yes just a couple of responses there and then I'll circle back to Ayden's question about the WIPO connection. So the - so yes I actually had the same thought is that at some point if it turns out that the group needs additional resources and, you know, mediation supports or something along the lines of, you know, those services and the expertise that Chris has then that's certainly something we can consider down the road as it relates to, you know, we have already identified to ICANN org and the board that we would like to continue having the facilitators, that we continue to need the legal expertise in the Phase 2 work.

But we also made it clear that this was a preliminary list of resources that we were requesting and that it would be, you know, once the new chair was appointed and the, you know, and essentially the group was able to start is work on Phase 2 that we may come back for other requests. So I certainly wouldn't close the door on that possibility at all. I think that's certainly within the purview of the new chair and the group once it gets going in Phase 2 and something that should be considered.

So let me circle back now to Ayden's question about the connection -- and Tatiana reinforced it with WIPO -- and that yes Yanis did include that in his application that he was - was at the chair of the WIPO General Assembly, either acting chair or current chair, one of the two. And so that was in his application.

And during the, you know, the discussions of the Leadership Team it was not identified as a, you know, a strong concern or a conflict. And so I guess I'm curious if you all would like to talk a little bit more about what you think the conflict is or might be. But I think at the end of the day, you know, any chair of any group is likely to, you know, come from a part of our community and to, you know, have a range of interest. And but they're still required to and expected to act in a neutral and evenhanded fashion.

Kurt in Phase 1 was, you know, he's currently associated with a new gTLD registry operator. And he participates in the Registry Stakeholder Group. And so I think for us to think that, you know, chairs of groups while expected to be neutral don't have, you know, connections to other parts of the community is really a challenge. I just that's a tall order. So I see Maxim and then Pam.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the transcript. Do you hear me?

Keith Drazek: Yes Maxim go right ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: I would like to add some items the discussion about the chair for EPDP. In
addition to experience we have to take into account the, I'd say historical
experience of the community. As I'm think - I hope I'm not mistaken Chris
LaHatte held post of ombudsman by the time of the previous Marrakesh
meeting. And there were concerns in the community from the parties who had
interaction about the process and outcome. And without taking into account
opinion of the community we shouldn't say yes the person was trained. But
we shouldn't forget about the historical experience of the results of when the
training was applied to the life field. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Maxim. Pam and then Paul and then we need to move on.

Pam Little: Pam Little speaking. Can you hear me?

Keith Drazek: Yes, loud and clear Pam.

Pam Little: Thanks Keith. I just want to maybe respond to Ayden's question. The
leadership of the GNSO Council and the Standing Selection Committee did
discuss the issue of potential conflict but we as Keith mentioned did not see
this as a material issue in terms of Yanis association with various organization
or his previous role as a GAC chair.

I want to echo the view that as Keith said in the ICANN land that it is a very,
very small world. And we often have our commercial background or interest
we're representing or different organization we are representing. So it gets
very difficult to say we're all personally neutral. So I guess the issue with the
potential conflict of interest really is - it is really for those who feel that there

is such perceived or actual conflict of interest to articulate better what they are.

And then it is also up to the council and the EPDP Team to really make sure the new chair is acting in a neutral manner as required under the charter. As required under the GNSO operating procedure it is very clear. And we now also have the PDP 3.0 to really take a more proactive role in sort of I guess keep an eye on how a team or working group chair is performing or not performing. So I guess that's something up to us to make sure the new chair is fully aware of the importance to act in a neutral manner when he's onboarded and also going forward to make sure that is the case. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Pam. Okay Paul you're next. Maxim, I think that's an old hand if I'm not mistaken. Paul your next and then we'll go to any last words on this and then we'll move to the vote. Thanks.

Paul McGrady: Thanks Keith. This is Paul McGrady for the record. So going back to Ayden's idea about Chris do you think it makes sense to put the question to the EPDP Team, you know, how can Chris best help and let them know the reopening the charter isn't our favorite thing but, you know, maybe finding a way for Chris to, you know, from the earliest days of Phase 2 to be involved in problem solving, to be involved in ideation to get past roadblocks, you know, that kind of thing?

I think we've got a gem in Chris. I think that the folks who chose the other guy made the right choice but I think Chris is great. And I don't want us to get too wrapped up in the, you know, was he with WIPO discussion and miss the opportunity to latch onto what Ayden suggested about getting Chris involved. So I don't know what we do with it next. Is it a council thing? Is it a ask the

EPDP Team thing? Is it a ponder it and talk about it again in the next call thing? I just don't want us to lose it. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Paul and thanks to Ayden and Tatiana and everybody for weighing in on this. I think, you know, at this point I think frankly that we should give the new chair the opportunity to get the team going, get the work started and get things going. And then if it appears that we need some assistance in mediation or something like that then it's completely logical. I think at that point the EPDP Team and chair would basically identify an additional resource request and the council could then follow through on that. So again I'm happy to continue the discussion but I think at this point we should be, you know, we should be focused on, you know, supporting the new chair to the upmost and to basically give the group the opportunity to get started.

And frankly if there are concerns about neutrality or lack of neutrality then those of the kinds of things that should be escalated up from the EPDP Team through the GNSO Council liaison to us and then we can review, you know, how best to handle that and how best to deal with it. I don't think that's going to be a problem. If I thought that would be a problem we wouldn't have recommended Yanis as the person. But I think let's not close any doors at this point, but I think I'd like to, you know, give the new chair the opportunity, you know, to get things going.

So and I just want to also just the emails that I sent - Ayden this is in response to one of your points. The emails that I sent to both Janis and to Chris LaHatte didn't say that the decision had been made by council. It said that the recommendation had been made by the Leadership Team and the SSC Leadership Team and that the council would be, you know, essentially taking it out during our meeting today. So wasn't a complete rejection at that point. It

was essentially, you know, we followed the process and the process is – the recommendation has been made to the full council

So with that any final thoughts before we moved to a vote? Okay thanks everybody for that and let's – - Nathalie I will hand this one over to you for a vote.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks very much Keith. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion please say aye? Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Hearing none would all those in favor of the motion please say aye?

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Martin Silva Valent and Ayden Ferdeline who holds proxies please say aye?

Martin Silva Valent: Aye.

Ayden Federline: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. We have no abstention no objection. The motion passes. Thank you Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much Nathalie -- appreciate that and thanks to all for the good discussion, agree with Paul and Ayden in the chat. It was worthy to have the discussion so thanks for bringing that up and glad to move that one from consent to the main agenda so we can do that. Okay let's then move to the next item on our agenda, Item Number 5 which is the council vote and discussion and vote on the IGO INGO Access Securative Rights Protection Mechanisms.

So I - so this is not new to anyone obviously. We have been discussing this for what seems like an eternity and certainly for the last ten months I believe since the final report was delivered by the PDP Working Group itself. And the motion before us essentially as I summarized and explained in the email I sent to the council list earlier as well as before us in the motion language basically is a recommendation to – for the council to approve the first four recommendations and forward those to the board and for the fifth recommendation to refer it so to reject it and to refer the topic for further work under the RPM PDP Working Group.

And I understand that there are some concerns about, you know, what that might do and how that might impact the work of the RPM PDP, but I would

like for us to consider that as we look to re-charter, potentially re-charter the Phase 2 work or the RPM PDP Working Group generally that we consider this as a possible sub-team or a separate work track of, you know, concentrated folks with expertise who can actually, you know, focus on the issue.

So it doesn't necessarily have to be the RPM PDP Working Group as a whole. We could consider it as a Worktrack 5 like effort associated with Subsequent Procedures Group as an example or it could be, you know, a subgroup could be chartered by the council under some of our PDP 3.0, you know, sort of guidelines. So I just want to – that's essentially what the recommendation is. It's not any or much different than what the council leadership proposed back in December. We've had, you know, endless discussions about this. And I think this is, you know, an opportunity for us to move this thing forward, to acknowledge that some of us think that the right thing to do is to approve everything and forward it to the board and let them deal with it. Others of us feel like we should reject everything and start over and I feel like this is a middle ground or a compromise position that acknowledges that the group reach consensus on the first four recommendations.

Recommendation Number 5 was out of scope and is specifically a recommendation related to the UDRP. And therefore, you know, sort of sending this to them, to the RPM PDP Working Group gives the opportunity for further work on the topic before approving, you know, a policy that in this particular case would have actually made things worse for the IGOs and was certainly out of scope for the work of the IGO INGO CRP work.

So I'm just going to pause there and see if there's any further thoughts or discussion on this with anybody. I also should note that again that we've received a letter from Manal, GAC chair yesterday. I have sent her a courtesy note to let her know that following, you know, the engagement that we had in

Kobe and before that this was the direction that the council was taking at least this was going to be the most important before council for a vote.

And the letter that I received back yesterday was pretty clear in that it was, you know, it expressed some surprise and expressed disappointment that this was the direction we were going. I think the GAC would clearly prefer to have a standalone EPDP on the issue without the council approving any of the first four recommendations but basically start the work over with an EPDP. And so that's out there. I think we need to recognize that, you know, that the path that we're taking is still not consistent with GAC advice and that could, you know, present the situation with the board where the board decides to take a different action than what we're recommending.

And so I think there's still, you know, a fair amount of uncertainty about how this actually plays out in the end but let me pause there. So I see Paul and Martin. Paul, go right ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Paul McGrady here. So I had a really dumb procedural question which is so if this is, you know, we don't reach - assume for a moment we don't reach enough votes to vote yes on this, resolved one the GNSO Council approves, we don't vote yes those are clearly disapproved. Number two, relates to Recommendation Number 5 where we say we do not approve but if we vote no then we do not approve the not approval. Therefore Recommendation 5 is approved or therefore nothing happens with Recommendation Number 5 and it just sits there being neither approved or disapproved? How does that work? Thank you staff?

Keith Drazek: Yes exactly. Thanks Paul. So I will turn to either Nathalie or Mary to help out with this answer. I mean my sense is that it's, you know, we're voting on a single motion and therefore it's, you know, approved or is not approved. What

that means is a good question. So Nathalie or Mary do you have – Mary go right ahead. Thanks.

Mary Wong: Thanks very much Keith. And Paul I hope I understood your question correctly. My other colleagues can jump - and jump in and rescue me if I get anything messed up. But I think there's two points here. One is the more substantive point you raised Paul as in if we vote to approve Recommendations 1 through 4 which is the first resolve clause but you don't vote to affirmatively approve Recommendation 5 what does that mean? Does Recommendation 5 just hang out there?

The staff answer for now is that yes that is indeed the case because the motion is worded in such a way that you are affirmatively approving Recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 4. And so if there is a no vote to approve Recommendation 5 it just isn't approved.

On the second question which Keith touched on about voting as a package, one difference between this motion and the typical PDP motion which basically just says all the recommendations together in that latter case the council is normally discouraged from unpacking the different recommendation. In this particular case you are looking at two different votes if you like. So I would say that if for example, the council in terms of Recommendation 5 would like to vote on a different mechanism for example and assuming that that can be a friendly amendment, then you could certainly alter that resolve clause two and anyone that follows on the mechanism.

In other words there's is nothing to prevent you from first of all approving Recommendations 1 through 4 and deciding how you want to do Recommendation 5. I hope that's clear. Thank you Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Mary. And Paul I don't know if that – if you have any follow-ups you can go right ahead.

Paul McGrady: Yes.

Keith Drazek: Yes.

Paul McGrady: Yes thanks Keith. So yes there's a little - I want to make - I'm not sure that Mary understood my question because my question did not anticipate breaking these things up. We – there was some talk about breaking things - breaking the various chunks of motions up during the Phase 1 EPDP vote. And I thought the takeaway from that was we don't do that. And so I'm a little concerned to start doing it if we, you know, don't always do it right?

So one, I want to make sure that the vote is unitary up or down on the whole thing. And then I'll do better with my question which is Question Number 2 which is if it's a unitary vote and the collective vote is no then one through four die because they're not approved what happens to number five? We don't accidentally approve it by voting node to disapprove it right? Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Mary go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks Keith and thanks Paul and I apologize that I didn't quite get that right. But just to keep matters brief, yes. If you vote this motion as a unitary motion and if the motion fails nothing gets approved. I hope that helps.

Paul McGrady: Thank you Mary.

Keith Drazek: Yes thanks Mary and thanks Paul for the question. Carlos you're next.

Carla Gutierrez: Thank you very much Keith this is Carlos for the record. I just want to praise to come with a single resolution. Nevertheless I understand the disappointment from the GAC side. In a very specific perspective every time we have discussed this we have a track record with a different solution which was the protection for the Red Cross and Red Crescent which was a very simple list to protect 190 countries. It amounts to a few thousand names and everybody was happy.

And here we are lost in a totally different mechanism. And saying we don't need the new right protection mechanism might not - might have not been explained well enough to the GAC community. So I don't feel good about this choice of that we have in front of us. Thank you very much.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Carlos. This is Keith for the transcript. I - you know, - I look this has been a challenging one from the beginning and we have a range of views as I said in my email and as I've said before on council.

And I, you know, we have strongly held views that we should approve everything and kick it to the board and let the board deal with it. We have strongly held views that everything should be rejected and we should start from scratch. And I think this while imperfect and I understand the disappointment and the, you know, sort of the feelings of the GAC members in particular and particularly the IGOs in this but we're in a situation where we have to follow our procedures. There was a consensus set of recommendations that came from that group. and we're in a situation now where I think we've recognized that one of the five recommendations had serious problems, was out of scope and recommended changes to a consensus policy that is currently or about to be under review by the RPM PDP Working Group. And so I think we're trying to do the best we can under these difficult circumstances and it's, you know, there is no perfect solution for this one.

So I understand I hear you and perhaps what we as the GNSO Council can consider if we if and when we do refer to this or if we refer this to the RPM group is to give it some level of priority, give it some level of, you know, sort of very narrowly focused charter to keep it on track to ensure that there are experts available to participate in the group to, you know - and we've talked about referring into Phase 2 but if we're looking at possibly, you know, sort of setting up a chartered sub team of dedicated focus on to the group, under the RPM group maybe it doesn't have to wait until Phase 2. Maybe it can begin sooner.

Like I think there's a range of options that we as council can consider here relying on PDP 3.0 and to, you know, make sure that it doesn't just get kicked down the road for two years. But I think we're at a point now where we have to make a decision and we have to send, you know, we have to make a decision. And at some point the board may decide that it's not going to accept our recommendations and it may kick them back to us and if they do we'll deal with that.

But that's sort of where my head is at right now. So Paul I think that was an old hand if I'm not mistaken. I'm going to go to Tatiana next and if anybody else would like to get in the queue please do.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you, thank you, Keith. Tatiana Tropina speaking briefly. While I do understand Carlo's concerns and anyone else concerns who say that GAC isn't happen, this shouldn't do it because we will have conflicting GAC advice to the board. But I would like to say the first of all we are GNSO and we have our own process for policy development. We cannot - I mean I do understand the willingness and the desire to make everyone happy but at the end I do not believe that in this case it would be possible unless we are made

fully (unintelligible) to that. And this I wouldn't like us to do. As far as I remember from the timeline in Barcelona until the GAC advice break we were going through – we were discussing that we might work for the entire package recommendation. Now we're trying to find a compromise.

And this decision to compromise is already trying to make at least, you know, kind of okay GAC will not be happy but still we're trying to compromise and not approve them all. And I do believe as Keith said that ICANN board and ICANN has a process for the board deal (unintelligible) so policy in GAC advice. But I do believe that we have to get at least something done here.

My I mean I do believe that we expressed several times some of us that let's just work for the entire package. For me not voting for Number 5 is already a compromise. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Tatiana. Philippe?

Philippe Fourquart: Thank you Keith, Philippe Fourquart for the record. Yes I understand that we're caught between a rock and a hard place is probably the least (unintelligible) decision for this and we have to make a decision. I understand GAC (unintelligible) on this. And the only thing is that it's - I'd like to make sure that we keep council in our role of the manager of the PDP and it's not council revising the substance.

So I understand that and it's now a question, the rationale for not approving Recommendation 5 is that it's out of scope. I just I'd like to have that on the record. It - I didn't read that quite specifically in the motion. Maybe it's just my reading of this but I would like this to be a precedent for future decisions so I just want to have that clear. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Philippe. This is Keith again. So yes, I think the sense is and the view is that a Recommendation Number 5 was out of scope and that the group was tasked to just try to decide if a new or separate process should be, you know, should be developed or put in place to accommodate IGOs. And instead Recommendation 5 actually recommends a change to the UDRP that would make things worse for IGOs rather than providing them something that's better or different.

And so I think, you know, the sense is that in addition to it recommending an existing – a change to an existing consensus policy where there is other policy work already chartered to focus on that, that it in effect fact, you know, was out of scope for what the group should have been focusing on. And that's the rationale for essentially not opening up and not changing the substance at the council level because I agree that would be inappropriate in terms of, you know, re-litigating at the council the work that was done in terms of the discussions, in terms of, you know, the work towards consensus.

But in this particular case it simply recognizing that it was out of scope for the group and that it really should be referred to the group that has the responsibility for reviewing existing RPMs in existing consensus policy of the UDRP. So sorry for going on so long but that's my sense. And if anybody else would like to jump in on that feel free to do so. Marie you're next.

Marie Pattullo: Thanks Keith. Can you hear me okay?

Keith Drazek: Sure can.

Marie Pattullo: Great, with all the audio (unintelligible) we had. This is Marie. I would like to thank you for your mail this morning and also for your explanation right now. As you know this is a concern that I raised back in I think it was in Los

Angeles but maybe before. It is a very specific question. It's a very technical question. It's a very complex question thought a narrow – I'm talking about Recommendation 5 sorry – – a narrow group that can look at this.

And so it doesn't fall into the for once the (unintelligible) that is the current RPM with all the work going on there I'm really supporting of that on a personal level so I would like to thank you for understanding. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Marie. And yes I think as we talk about next steps I agree that simply handing this issue to the entire RPM PDP Working Group at this current stage of its work which is already behind schedule -- and we'll talk about that in a little bit -- you know, I think handing it to them would be a mistake. If it was simply saying okay here PDP Working Group, so RPM Working Group take this on and go figure it out right?

I think that what we can do as the council is to apply some of our PDP 3.0 guidelines and sort of the work that's been done there, create a small team within the RPM PDP Working Group. And again part of the reason we want to I think have it within an existing PDP that's focusing on the issue from Recommendation Number 5 is also we've got a broad group of people participating right? And I'm concerned that if we were to go the EPDP route which I don't think we have support for and we'd need a super majority support to do that from council is that, you know, you basically have a broad group and then have a very focused element within that group rather than having to try to find people who care about this issue and are interested in this issue sufficiently to participate in a standalone EPDP.

I'm really concerned that we simply wouldn't be able to find enough people that care to participate in a new stand-alone PDP. So that's sort of again sort of the further thinking and the further rationale for, you know, housing this

effort within the RPM group but having it be, you know, a really focused and targeted subset that can work on its own timelines and, you know, maybe not be, you know, be held back by the broader work of the group. So anyway sorry for going on so long there. Marie I think that's your old hand and then Martin.

Martin Silva Valent: Hi guys. Can you hear me?

Keith Drazek: Yes, sure can.

Martin Silva Valent: Perfect. I just wanted to echo what both of you guys were saying and to remember that unlike (unintelligible) remember the rights protection mechanism it's a review working group. And it's supposed to say okay this process is working or it's not working because these data showed us that and we recommend be adjusted with this way. And this is a very different task than creating a mechanism from scratch which is sort of what the Recommendation 5 is trying to do. So again repeating what you guys said regarding the timeline and everything it really comes to the core of it's not just about throwing to Phase 2 where we can, you know, sort it out there or we do the charter.

I like the idea of having that a small team that sort of is eventually evaluated by the RPM Working Group that has this independent, you know, life where it just doesn't compete, it doesn't stall, it doesn't go into the work of Phase 2. When we refer to Phase 2 we're just referring to a timeline what number of things with actual Phase 2 on it because as it is now the working group is just chartered to take this task and it's not a hard (unintelligible) job of just adjusting two or three words. The work team was not prepared to create mechanisms, was just prepared to have a data driven review that implies small connections, small adjustments not whole redoing of it.

So just to echo it and the councilors that are maybe not so familiarized with it have a deeper understanding that when we say we are doing this through Phase 2 we have to be very conscious that it is not about just inserting into Phase 2. But in the wildest scenario it just means that we will somehow relate to their RPM work in the later stage. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Yes thanks very much Martin. And, you know, I think you make some really good points there. And I also think that, you know, while we need to make sure that the group, you know, any subgroup is very narrowly focused we want to make sure it's not too narrowly focused in that, you know, the group needs to be able to, you know, sort of consider the implications of jurisdictional immunity that the IGOs have, you know, and, you know, is that specific too, you know, trademark issues or is it something else?

I mean, and, you know, I'm getting way out over my skis here in terms of the substance but I think we'll need to be very, very careful and cautious I think Martin to your point about how we go through the chartering and to make sure we get it right because I think at that point we will be, you know, either setting up the subgroup to succeed or to fail.

And so oh, I see Martin yes you're saying not just for, you know, the subgroup but making it clear what the RPM working group is. And I think we certainly have an opportunity to look at re-chartering that group as a whole to make sure that it's as specific as it needs to be so by all means. Carlos, over to you.

Carlos Gutierrez: Sorry this is Carlos. I had a hard time finding the button. Just a follow-up, very straightforward simple as possible could a nearly chartered subgroup of

RPM deal with issues like a protection list similar to the Red Cross case yes or no? Thank you very much.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Carlos. I don't see why it couldn't consider it. I think I would have to – I don't know if it applies directly to this particular issue or not frankly on substance. So, you know, it's a great question. If anybody else has an answer, Mary, if you have an answer as to whether that would be, you know, a possible avenue for consideration. But I don't think we would necessarily tie their hands if there are a range of options to consider. So Mary go ahead and respond. Thank you. And then I'm going to go to Rafik and then Martin again.

Mary Wong: Thanks Keith. And just real quick as a procedural reminder the Curative Rights Working Group scope in terms of a list of IGOs actually started with the list of IGOs from the GAC which at the moment is 192. About a year into its work the Working Group actually requested the council at the time -- I think it was 2015 -- to amend its charter to broaden it to all eligible IGOs. So at the moment what you're dealing with in terms of Recommendation 5 is a broader scope a wider list not even an enumerated list compared to the GAC list of 192.

But as Keith said that doesn't mean that if the new group were to be scoped in a particular way or even if the new group as it goes about its business figures that the most appropriate legal and policy rationale might be for a more limited group based, you know, a law or good policy making that they couldn't do that. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Mary. I hope that answers your question Carlos. So I'll go to Rafik next and then Martin and then we probably need to move on and move to a vote. So Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Keith, was really short intervention. So good to hear all of the comments and input about I mean, possible way to do in the future. So I think we have the flexibility when the council will start and decide how we'll do with Recommendation Number 5 and the motion give us that ability so we are kind of – and the time is – I mean, is where we can take – we are already taking an order for it was proposed of them like the small team and so on and we can elaborate that in due time. So I think it's really good. We should move on and I think we have that flexibility to deal with the issue later on so so…

Keith Drazek: Thank you Rafik. Martin you have the last word.

Martin Silva Valent: Yes just a very quick follow-up that of course you're going to have to touch something of the charter to have Recommendation of 5 to the RPMs. But my personal view is that we shouldn't touch what (unintelligible) already is because of – because basically that's how it was charted to work for URDP review. If you're going to add something you can call it Phase 3, you can call it parallel worktrack whatever, but I wouldn't try to just plug it in Phase 2 because any review of Phase 2 chart part it's going to be very, very, very, very messy and it's going to bring a lot of other delays.

So our work in taking Recommendation 5 inside the working group should not disrupt in any way the already Phase 2 work that is coming up. I don't know if that's clear enough but that worktrack should not be (voluntary). Whatever we do – I mean the workgroup might be a good place to do Recommendation 5 but the Phase 2 should keep going as it is because it's something we are opening a Pandora box. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Martin and I take your points. And I think here what we have is a situation where Recommendation Number 5 is suggesting or recommending changes to the UDRP which is of course the main focus of Phase 2. But I

think as we look to charter a sub team or a separate worktrack however we decide to do that I think it's possible the work of that group will not be on Recommendation Number 5 or, you know, sort of the proposed change to the UDRP. It could actually focus on something else. But eventually it will still be one of the rights protection mechanisms one way or the other. And so I take your point though that it could end up having some implication for Phase 2 but it could also sort of carve his own path I think.

So with that thank you Martin and you can put your hand down, thank you. So I think, you know, sort of my last comment on this before we move to a vote is that this is obviously a sensitive subject. Not all of us agree on everything. And I appreciate everybody's focus and time on a subject that is rather complex and, you know, legal and not something that we necessarily follow on a day to day basis.

So I think the key here will be proper communication of our discussion and of our deliberations to the GAC into the ICANN board. So I think that that will be an action item, you know, following this decision, following this vote that basically, you know, indicates how we've come to see this and how we hoped that there is a constructive path forward where interested parties among the IGOs and the GAC will be able to participate and where it will be focused and where there will be time frames associated with it that are ensure, you know, a timely delivery and a timely conclusion where we want all interested parties to be able to contribute and that, you know, we're not kicking the can down the road, we're not burying it and we're certainly not approving all five recommendations that we're signaling that this is something where we recognize some additional work needs to be done and that we're doing the best that we can within our GNSO processes and procedures to make that happen. So I'll – I have an action item to ensure that we develop that appropriate communication and of course that will be circulated to everybody

before we send it. So with that in less there are any other questions, comments going to hand it over to Nathalie for a vote.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you Keith. This is Nathalie. Just to confirm would you like a voice vote or rollcall vote?

Keith Drazek: I'm fine with a - let's see let's do the rollcall vote.

Nathalie Peregrine: All right, perfect. Thank you very much. We'll proceed with the rollcall vote. Martin Silva Valent proxy for Arsene Tungali?

Martin Silva Valent: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Martin Silva Valent?

Martin Silva Valent: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you Pam Little?

Pam Little   Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Marie Pattullo?

Marie Pattullo: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Ayden Ferdeline for Elsa Saade?

Ayden Ferdeline: Yes, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Ayden Ferdeline for yourself?

Ayden Ferdeline: Yes, thanks again.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Maxim Alzoba?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Osvaldo Novoa?

Osvaldo Novoa: Yes thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Syed Ismail Shah? Sorry Syed Ismail Shah?

Syed Ismail Shah: Yes, yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Carlos Gutierrez?

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Rafik Dammak?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Scott McCormick?

Scott McCormick: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Keith Drazek?

Keith Drazek: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Darcy Southwell?

Darcy Southwell: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Tatiana Tropina?

Tatiana Tropina: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Flip Pitillion?

Flip Pitillion: No.

Nathalie Peregrine: Flip would you care to mention the reasons for your objection please?

Flip Pitillion: I referred to the reasons we've given before. It's a one, five all in one package please thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you Flip. Michele Neylon?

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rubens Kuhl?

Rubens Kuhl: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Paul McGrady?

Paul McGrady: No.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you Paul. Would you like to expand on the reasons for your objection?

Paul McGrady: Yes thank you. So again this is Paul McGrady for the record. First of all the IPC would like to thank those members of this working group who acted in good faith and tried really hard to get something across the finish line. However looking at the history of this particular working group it's pretty clear that the process was broken. And even the co-chairs I believe indicated that they thought there were significant issues with regard to the process.

And we just think that is dangerous to vote even for one through four which has various levels of innocuous notice when it could be viewed as rewarding those who were involved perhaps in disrupting the process of the working group. We also don't think that the – that this really got to the heart of the need that was raised by the GAC in the first place. And so both procedurally and on the substance we think this is one that should not – and it shouldn't go any further. So that is why the IPC is voting no. That is not in any way to as I said, detract from those who engaged in good faith in this particular working group and we do not vote no lightly. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much Paul. Philippe Fourquart please?

Philippe Fourquart: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. And for the Contracted Party House we have seven votes in favor no votes against and no extensions. For the Non-contracted Party House we have 11 votes in favor, two against and no abstention. The motion passes over 100% for the Contracted Party House, 84.62% in the Non-contracted Party House. Thank you. Over to you Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much Nathalie and thanks to everybody for again your patience and for your willingness to engage on this. And (Paul) and Flip I should say, you know, from the IPC perspective I completely understand your view. And, you know, that's exactly why we, you know, conduct the votes and have the opportunity to, you know, sort of explain the rationale. So thank you very much for participating in this and as I said this was a difficult one. And this one where there was no perfect answer and I'd just like to thank everybody for your continued engagement because this one while we've come to a decision now as I noted before the board could take our Recommendations 1 through 4 and accept them or they could reject them. They could send them back to us and we of course still have the work to do on Recommendation Number 5, the chartering of the small group, the integration, you know, to the extent necessary with the RPM PDP Working Group. So this issue is far from over and of course there will be some ruffled feathers, you know, some unhappiness among our GAC colleagues that we'll be – we'll need to manage carefully.

I think they were hopeful that we were, you know, looking to do, you know, a standalone EPDP and not approve anything. And I can understand that desire but I think this is a compromise that we were able to end up with as it relates to, you know, following our own procedures and recognizing that, you know, we can do better moving forward with our three PDP 3.0 work in terms of managing processes. Thanks.

So with that and in the interest of time we need to move to the next item on our agenda which is the council discussion on managing IDN variant TLDs. So with that I'm going to thank Sarmad for joining us. Thank you for your patience Sarmad as we work through some, you know, some delicate issues there. But let me hand it over to you then for a discussion on the managing IDN variant TLDs.

I think of everybody remembers we - the ICANN board passed some resolutions at its board meeting in Kobe related to this topic and let me just hand it over to Sarmad. Thank you.

Sarmad Hussain: Thank you Keith. Can you all hear me clearly?

Keith Drazek: Yes we can hear your fine. Thank you.

Sarmad Hussain: Excellent. So thank you for inviting me to introduce the work on IDN variant TLD implementation. Next slide please. And the main focus of this presentation is to first of all understand what IDN TLDs are and understand the status of where we are with IDN variant TLDs. And then I will based on the resolution from the board I will list possible next steps GNSO could take.

And before we go into the IDN variant TLDs I was asked to give a very brief introduction to the bigger picture on how different pieces of IDN work fit together. So we'll start from there and then we'll come back to the IDN variant TLDs. So next slide please.

So basically IDN – can we adjust the size so that we fit in the presentation? Thank you. So as far as a big picture is concerned IDN top level domains as you understand means that the domain names are in, sorry IDN domain names basically mean that domain names are in the script which is beyond our language which is beyond the regular addresses we see which are comprised of letters, digits and hyphen from ASCII characters.

The basic IDN standard is based on what is a Unicode standard which encodes all the scripts of the world. And you can see that their current version or Unicode 11 version, encodes 146 scripts and 137,000 characters. The standard

for internationalized domain names is based on the work on IE by Internet Engineering task force which developed the IDN 2008 standard which basically – which shortlists these characters and tells us which characters can be used in domain names for the internationalized domain names. And they use formulas so to speak on Unicode with short lists the characters to about 900,000 on exactly 97,973 characters and 145 scripts.

And the way its short list is that it excludes symbols like emoji and punctuation marks like, you know, semicolon and parentheses so those are not allowed in domain names. But what is allowed is digits and letters and many scripts including old scripts like hieroglyphics scripts. However before these are the IDN 2008 standard is applied the standard itself notes that it is still a very liberal short list and each registry or zone operator should restrict the characters further and possibly use variant techniques to ensure that the IDNs can be used (skilledly) in a stable manner.

Next slide please. So for the second level domains the short list of these characters is done by the registry operator which is managing the appropriate top level domain and that is normally done through the mechanism we call the IDN tables. So registry operator would develop multiple IDN tables for the languages and scripts they want to support and that obviously then is used to kind of offer the second level domains for registration.

In addition, we have IDN guidelines which are applied in that process. And these guidelines are basically focused on enabling a (secure) well a use of second level domain names and specifically to reduce consumer confusion as well as second-level domain names are concerned. Next slide please. In addition we also need a similar IDN table for – could we go back to the previous slide please? Whoops no next slide. Yes thank you.

So for the root zone or for the top level we also need this shortlisting of characters. And the characters are further shortlisted as you can see for top level domains where the number of scripts are sharp reduced to about 28 scripts we are doing at this time and a number of characters reduced from 100,000 to about 33,000.

This exclude old scripts like the Egyptian hieroglyphics. This excludes digits because digits are not used at top level and so on. So based on the what we call the MSR or Maximum Starting Repertoire of (can be) working with the community to define the shortlisted characters and variants which are possible for the root zone that is normally referred to as the root zone label generation rules which we are currently working on with the communities. And that those will eventually be used or are proposed to be used for the top level domains.

And while in this process the IDN variant TLD recommendations are proposed for the GNSO and ccNSO to be considered so this is the larger context of the work. Today we will be talking specifically in IDN variant TLD recommendations. Next slide please.

So when we are defining TLDs or when we're realizing TLDs community has very early indicated that there may be multiple labels which could be considered the same by the community. And as you can see on the screen it actually there is at least a security issue needs to be resolved by identifying these same labels which we call variants. And the example at the top gives you a bit of Latin label.ebic but you can see that we have a syllabic label which looks exactly the same. So obviously such labels must be identified and blocked at least.

But in case of Chinese which are visually not identical but and they mean the same thing so in the case of Chinese you can have simplified versus

traditional Chinese. And we need both of them not only reserved for the same applicant but also delegated an activity because we need to both variations for users to access these domain top level domains. And the reason is that simplified Chinese is used in mainland China whereas the more traditional Chinese which is the label at the bottom is used in Taiwan, Hong Kong and certain other areas. So to have a access from across the different geographical spread both versions need to be activated.

Similar is the case for Arabic script where different versions of label actually need to be used at the same time to access the label from across different regions globally. So there is a security angle for variant TLDs but also usability for at least two scripts, the Chinese script and the Arabic script.

Next slide please. And in our analysis we've seen for the 28 scripts we are currently working on that variants at least from a security perspective are not something which is very unique to one or two or three scripts. We've seen within script or across script variants for many of the scripts we are currently working on so it is something which obviously has to be realized.

Next slide please. So the - we need to - sorry can we go back to the - yes. So very early on the community had requested for variant TLDs but in 2010 the board has said that we don't understand variant TLDs so they should not be delegated at this time and asked that the community to do more work. And sorry, the slides are moving. Could we go back?

Yes so basically the board has said that we should work on identifying what are the problems and how to solve problems around IDN variant TLDs to solve them or resolve them. So there are two problems identified. First there was no consistent definition of variant TLDs at the time in 2010 and then

there was even if we knew what variant TLDs were there were no management mechanisms for them.

Next slide please. To define the variant core points as I just shared we are currently working with the community to define the root zone LGR. We've identified 28 scripts which cover most of the commonly used languages in the first phase. And currently we've finalized 19 of the 28 proposals for 19 of the 28 scripts. And this work continues and at root zone LGR is incrementally being finalized.

Next slide please. So that root zone LGR solves the first question which is how to define variant labels. The second question which was raised was once these are defined how do we manage variant labels? And that was the work which we've actually done internally within ICANN for some years and have developed some recommendations on how to manage them. These are based on is all the work which is already done by the community and also the existing processes within analyzing the existing processes within by ccNSO through fast-track process and GNSO through the Applicant Guidebook for the new gTLD round.

Next slide please. So this work actually took a bit of time to develop. This is just a summary of just internal work. This was being directly supervised by the board IDN Working Group. They were looking at the work which was being done. And eventually the recommendations which were finalized were released for public comment in the summer of last year.

Next slide please. Based on the public feedback which was received we incorporated that and updated the IDN variant TLD recommendations and they were then published as a set of six documents in February of this year. And in the Kobe meeting in March the ICANN board approved these

recommendations and requested GNSO and ccNSO to take these into account in their policy development as they move forward and see if they can, you know, see if they can do that in a manner consistent across the ccNSO and GNSO because eventually these guidelines apply to both ccTLDs and gTLDs because both of them are TLDs so there is some consistency which is desired.

Next slide please. So as far as next steps are concerned we have the nine recommendations which are out. In addition we've actually done analysis and impact on various, you know, the application process for TLDs for the delegation process and operations. And that analysis is also presented in the reports which are published. We've also published some associated materials. For example, the rationale for why root zone label generation rules should be used and there's some other documents. So these are all presented to ccNSO and GNSO for their consideration and for the policy development process. And again as I said if GNSO and ccNSO are being requested by the board to see if they could look into how this could be done in a way that it is consistent across the two SOs. So thank you very much, stop here and take any questions.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you very much Sarmad. This is Keith and thank you for the level of detail being able to get through it as quickly as you did so thanks for that. I see Maxim has his hand up and Rubens has his hand up so I'll go directly to them. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the transcript. I had a question. What happens to IDN tables for the current TLDs which were approved by IANA? And actually during the conversations with GDD yes it was promised that those are going to be like legacy and not going to be touched and going to be valid. Is it going to be changed is the first question. And the second is historically a similar activity between one and small L zero and small or capital O caused way more

trouble than hypothetical issues with IDNs. Were there any investigation of the persons of hypothetical damage from IDLs and those quiet I'd say (futigates) old issues with those digits and letters? Thanks - in English ASCII script? Thanks.

Sarmad Hussain: Right so if you could – if we could go to Slide 4 I think, so sorry the next one. Yes. so as far as the IDN tables are concerned those are relevant for the second level domains. I guess the current focus of the presentation was on the top level. So that's the IDN tables in a way are the top level domains don't focus directly on the IDN tables which are for the second level. But just answering your questions the IDN tables which are currently approved will obviously are already approved and it already applies. So I think moving forward unless there is some changes proposed where they need to be reevaluated or new tables are added when they're evaluated the current IDN tables obviously continue to apply.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much Sarmad and thanks Maxim.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: And in the interest of time we probably need to move on. We've got one more agenda items that we need to get to but I want to get to Rubens next. And Maxim if there's further follow-up questions or reactions we probably ought to, you know, pull together a small group of council…

Maxim Alzoba: Yes.

Keith Drazek: ...expertise and an interest in this to continue coming up with questions and to engage with ICANN. So Rubens over to you.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks Keith. Something that had been noticed by the (unintelligible) looking into this question that even though the guidelines are sometimes mentioned as IDN guidelines sometimes mentioned as IDN implementation guidelines they're pretty much like policy in defining obligation. So they walk like policy, they quack like policy and so they are probably going to require policy efforts from both GNSO and ccNSO according to their own procedures.

The brand gTLD recommendations include some recommendations from main policies like UDRP, TMCH, PDRP which have been (unintelligible) into a current PDP RPM. They also go into subject matter for the next round which of this which is part of subPro PDP. So why are they sometimes mentioned as implementation? What their actual substance looks more like policy and more like something for (unintelligible) both organizations GNSO and ccNSO to look into. And in the interest of time like let's stop there. There is some more (unintelligible) I would like to go into, but there is no time. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Rubens. I'm sorry if I missed it. Was there a question for Sarmad and Sarmad did you have any response or reaction?

Sarmad Hussain: I'll just make a short comment again.

Keith Drazek: Great.

Sarmad Hussain: So the question was again on IDN guidelines I guess and not on the IDN variant TLD recommendations. So as far as the IDN guidelines are concerned these are developed by the community. So the – these are basically revised. They're focused on reducing consumer confusion and they're revised from time to time on the request of the community and they are recently being revised based on requests from GNSO. Back in the London meeting at ICANN 50 there was some work done by recently by the community.

There was a working group which had members from GNSO, ccNSO, and also ALAC and SSAC which looked at these guidelines which are currently applicable and did an updated version recently which is currently being considered. So IDN guidelines are -pertain to, you know, consumer confusion and they are developed by the community. And then our – we use those guidelines for basically reviewing – oh no, those are eventually implemented based on community feedback.

Keith Drazek: OK thanks very much Sarmad and thank you Maxim and Rubens for the questions and the good discussion here. But in the interest of time we need to move on so Sarmad I'd like to thank you for your participation here today. And this is really for everybody's benefit just the beginning of this conversation on IDN variants. I know that this is really technical and really complex and it doesn't always apply to every one of us. But we do have a developing situation where, you know, new rules related to IDN guidelines are being developed and implemented and contracted parties are taking on new obligations outside of a typical PDP.

And we do have this new information from the board on IDN variants at the top level and the need to coordinate with the ccNSO and there's just a lot of moving parts here. And we as a council are going to need to take a look at this topic of IDN variants I think a bit more holistically moving forward. So with that thanks very much Sarmad and we'll go ahead and move on to the last item on our agenda. So if everybody can please bear with us for another ten minutes and no more and we will receive an update from Russ Weinstein on the ongoing work of the EPDP temp spec Phase 1 informal Implementation Review Team. I covered some of this in my email to everybody but I'd like to get a quick read out five or ten minutes no more with Russ. Thanks.

Russs Weinstein: Sure, thanks Keith this is Russ Weinstein from ICANN and thank you for having me today. I'm pinch-hitting for Dennis Chang who usually will give these updates I believe as needed. He's our leader on our Internal Implementation Team. So we've established our what we call our Implementation Project Team. It's a cross functional team we do for all policy implementations. In this case it includes those staff members had participated in the EPDP plus the others that typically get into policy implementation representatives from GDD compliance, legal, technical services and so on.

We've been revering the recommendations. It's a big package of work trying to define what the required deliverables are in creating the implementation plan. We do note that the recommended effective date of the policy is 29 February 2020 and are developing worktrack plans accordingly to try and fit that date. As you probably all know, this is a new feature in policy recommendations putting a target date in the policy recommendation and we're still assessing the feasibility of this date but we're doing what we can to align to it.

Also in accordance with the Final Reports Recommendation we've initiated a call for volunteers for an informal Implementation Review Team I think we're calling it a pre-IRT. As you know we typically don't establish IRTs until after board adoption of policy recommendations but based on the special circumstance and the request from the council here we're doing so. That pre-RT work is intended to focus on clarifications. It's especially helpful that the bulk of the membership comes from the EPDP Team and so clarifying things to this IPT team at ICANN.

You may have seen a recent email from Dennis recent to the council asking if you'd like a council liaison on this pre-IRT. We know that's a feature of

regular IRTs and we don't think it's mandatory but wanted to give you the opportunity.

The pre-IRT assembled thus far is comprised of 12 community members with affiliations in RySG, RSG, IPC, BC, NCSG and SSAC. And all members were a part of the EPDP Phase 1 Working Group.

There's also an observer email group for the pre-IRT and they have the read-only access and that list is growing. It's already up around 28, 30 members or so. We have our kickoff meeting a week or so ago on the 10th of April and the team agreed to meet every couple weeks on Wednesdays to support the ICANN team preparing the policy implementation. Those are the main points I wanted to share with you all but I'm here for questions if necessary.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Russ and appreciate you being here as you said pinch-hitting for Dennis but thanks for the update. And let me just see if anybody has any questions or comments. We did forward the note that we received from ICANN about the any volunteers for a council liaison. We have not had anybody step up yet but we'll keep after that and advise if we decide that it's something we'd like to have. So any questions or comments for Russ?

Okay I don't see any hands Russ so thanks very much then for the update and we'll look forward to ongoing and further engagement on this particularly as we move from the informal phase to the formal phase of the IRT following the board's approval of the Phase 1 recommendations. So thanks again for joining. And with that…

Russ Weinstein: Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Russ. I'm going to move to the very last item on the agenda which I will handle very quickly which is an update on the timeline for the RPM PDP Working Group. As I noted in my email I hope everybody read it all the way down to the bottom that in Kobe the Council Leadership Team along with Paul McGrady met with the co-chairs of the RPM PDP Working Group.

We basically indicated that we wanted to receive from the co-chairs working with staff an updated timeline with working methods and decision points and, you know, to get a better and clearer picture as to, you know, how the group is going to move forward to deliver its Phase 1 recommendations.

And so we had given the co-chairs a target date of today. They have just requested I guess last week requested an extension and we gave them an extension until the 26 April. So we will have another update scheduled for our May meeting which I believe is May 16. And where we as the council will discuss and review an updated proposal from the co-chairs of the RPM group in terms of helping them to deliver and to drive forward on the Phase 1 final report.

So with that any questions, any comments? We'll take the any other business to the list but if anybody else has any, you know, final thoughts or final discussion points feel free to put your hand up. And seeing none with that I will bring this meeting to a conclusion. So thanks to everybody for your participation and your patience in going seven minutes over and have a great rest of your day. Thanks all.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you everyone. Once again the meeting has been adjourned.

Man: Thank you very much.

Nathalie Peregrine: You're welcome. Operator if yo11u could please stop all recordings. Everyone else please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END