ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Council call
Thursday, 19 July 2018 at 12:00 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-19jul18-en.mp3

Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p4cbllu86zg/

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

List of attendees:
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): **– Non-Voting** – Erika Mann
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Pam Little, Michele Neylon, Darcy Southwell
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Donna Austin, Keith Drazek, Rubens Kühl
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Carlos Raul Gutierrez
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo, Susan Kawaguchi, Philippe Fouquart, Tony Harris, Paul McGrady, Heather Forrest
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Martin Silva Valent, Stephanie Perrin, Tatiana Tropina, Rafik Dammak, Ayden Férdeline, Arsène Tungali
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Syed Ismail Shah
GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison
Julf (Johan) Helsingius– GNSO liaison to the GAC
Adebiyi Oladipo – ccNSO observer

Guest: Thomas Rickert, CCWG-Accountability WS2 Co-Chair

ICANN Staff
David Olive -Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional (apology sent)
Marika Konings – Vice President, Policy Development Support – GNSO
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
Ariel Liang – Policy Support Specialist
Caitlin Tubergen – Policy Senior Manager
Sara Caplis – Technical Support

Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Operations Support
Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator

Coordinator: Recordings are started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 19th of July, 2018. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you. Pam Little.

Pam Little: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rubens Kuhl.

Rubens Kuhl: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Darcy Southwell. Darcy, we see you in the Adobe Connect room. I cannot hear you on audio. Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Carlos Gutiérrez.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Here. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Marie Pattullo.

Marie Pattullo: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Philippe Fouquart. I don't see Philippe in the Adobe Connect room and I don't believe he sent an apology. We'll try to ping him right now. Rafik Dammak.

Rafik Dammak: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Stephanie Perrin. I don't see Stephanie in the Adobe Connect room either we'll have to get her on Skype. Arsene Tungali.

Arsene Tungali: I'm here, Nathalie. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Arsene. Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Here, Nathalie, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Tony, we tested your audio earlier we could hear you. Maybe you're on mute?

Tony Harris: I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Tony. Tatiana Tropina.

Tatiana Tropina: Present. Thank you very much, Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Martin Silva Valent.

Martin Silva Valent: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Ayden Férdeline.

Ayden Férdeline: Present. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Syed Ismail Shah.

Syed Ismail Shah: Yes there. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, Nathalie. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Erika Mann. Erika I see just joined in the Adobe Connect chat. Thank you, Erika. Johan Helsingius.

Johan Helsingius: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Abediyi Oladipo. I see Abediyi in the Adobe Connect room. I would to note for the record that Philippe Fouquart as just joined us. From staff we have Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Caitlin Tubergen, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Ariel Liang, Terri Agnew, (unintelligible) for technical support and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes and for people listening in on the audiocast. Thank you ever so much, Heather and it's now over to you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much, Nathalie. And welcome, everyone, to our ordinary GNSO Council meeting for the month of July 2018. We have of course a notable and full agenda in front of us today so I would suggest we go ahead and get started. Item 1.2 on our agenda updates to statements of interest, does anyone have an update to note of the Council. Ayden, please.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks, Heather. This is Ayden. I made a small correction to my SOI yesterday and I apologize for not doing it sooner. While reviewing it, I noticed that my declared country of residence was listed as the United Kingdom and as some members of the Council may now, I relocated to Germany in January so this was incorrect. I apologize for the oversight but my SOI has now been corrected to include that. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Ayden. And it's a good reminder to all of us to periodically check our SOI so thank you, Ayden, for providing us with a good opportunity for that reminder. Any further updates to SOIs that anyone wishes to notify? No, excellent. All right, Item 1.3 is our review of the agenda. Does anyone have any items to add or amend to our agenda? Okay, seeing none, which is very convenient as we have a full one, we'll take our agenda as drafted and work our way through.

You'll note Item 1.4, the status of the minutes, minutes of the extraordinary Council meeting on the 12th of June, and the minutes of our ordinary Council meeting in Panama on the 27th of June have both been duly posted in the timeline as required so up to date on that.

With that, that takes us to Item 2. Could we pull up the projects list please? Excellent. Thanks very much. So as always the projects list is circulated in redline and in clean form prior to the GNSO Council meeting. I will make a note that the only substantive change on the projects list at this particular point in time is the shift of IGO INGO Curative Rights from working group,

which is Category 4, to Council deliberations, which is Category 5. You'll see that here right in the front page Number 1 that's on the AC room screen.

There are of course edits, let's say, progress edit in relation to other efforts but that is the only major substantive change to note at this point in time. Does anyone have any questions in relation to the projects list? No, I see no hands, so that's great. Oh and Marika says, "To note as well that the same change has occurred for the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2." And that has also moved to Council deliberation. And of course both of these items are on our substantive agenda for today so we can leave discussion about those until we get to those agenda items. Thanks very much, Marika, for noting that.

Any further comments on projects list? Seeing none, let's turn to action items. Excellent. Thanks very much. So you will see we have a number of items here that have been completed. We'll focus our attention today on items that are outstanding. The first one of those is the Board request in relation to the use of emojis in domain names. Steve Chan has posted a draft letter, you see that only outstanding item is submit letter to the ICANN Board. A draft is on the Council list and comments have been requested of councilors by Monday. So this is a reminder that anyone – and as well a thank you to the small team that worked with Steve, any comments in relation to that letter to the Board responding to the Board's initial request that we consider the matter need to get into that draft by Monday.

Next – or before we move on. Any questions on that one? Michele.

Michele Neylon: It's not a question, it's more of a comment. The – if anybody has any feedback or input if they could share it, I think the document was already circulated on the Council list. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele, that's exactly right. Steve did post it to the list, if you look for Steve and emoji in your – as you search terms, I'm sure it'll pop right up in

your inbox. And thanks very much to Philippe and Michele and Martin and Tatiana, the small team that worked to put that together. Any further comments on emojis? No? All right, then let's move to next steps following adoption of ICANN Board temporary specification. Indeed we might even say this is not on the substantive agenda; this is the substantive agenda.

Certainly something we'll spend quality time on today so I think we can leave it here for now. You'll note that the only item that remains in this very long list of things that we've done in this particular context is to come back to the RDS PDP and specifically post mortem from leadership, so depending on how things go today we can take that up as an action item immediately after this meeting.

Any questions in relation to that specific aspect of things? Let's leave aside the substance of what we have on the agenda later, but any specific questions on that? All right, I see no hands. Great.

Next option – or next item then on the list is short and long-term options to adjust the timeline for specific reviews. Michele, I've just seen your hand go up, is it in relation to this one or the previous one?

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Heather, it's in relation to the previous one. I just notice on the…

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: …it says, "Receipt of the post mortem will mark the closure of the RDS PDP." Do we have to vote to close that or how does that work?

Heather Forrest: Michele, it's a very good question. So this is Heather. There are really two options here. One is that the Council takes an affirmative action; the other is that the Council is guided by the PDP to the extent the PDP presents Council with a recommendation we can act on that; to the extent the Council let's say,

wants to act unilaterally it can do that as well. So those are really the two options in front of us.

And what I would propose that we do – we've been putting off the RDS question until after we had the EPDP underway. Depending on how we go today what I would suggest we do is that leadership work with staff to get a very clear sense of – and indeed with RDS leadership – to get a very clear sense of exactly what those two procedural options look like and we can present those on the Council list for discussion and tee that up for the next Council meeting. Would that suit, Michele?

Michele Neylon: That's fine.

Heather Forrest: Cool. Cool, good question and good to keep a marker on it, Michele, so we'll note that as an action item. Great. And Marika has noted in the chat for those who are following us by audio cast, that RDS leadership appears to be planning to come back to the Council following the initiation of the PDP with its recommendations, so that will push us down one of the two paths so there we go.

Excellent. Any further questions on RDS? No? All right. Short term and long-term options to adjust the timeline for specific reviews. This item is on our substantive agenda today following our motions so we'll leave this one for now.

As is PDP 3.0 on our substantive agenda. Which brings to SubPro RPM consolidated timeline. You notice that this work is ongoing. The work of the liaisons with the PDPs to cooperate with the leadership of those respective PDPs to develop timelines and each of those PDPs work towards let's say key milestones, that cooperation would be – will be important so we'll keep an eye on that.

Is there anything, Donna, Paul or Keith, that needs to be said at the moment in relation to timelines?

Donna Austin: Heather, it's Donna. I'm sorry I'm not in Adobe at the moment.

Heather Forrest: Donna, go right ahead.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks Heather. Donna Austin. So we haven't had a conversation around this for a little while so it's probably timely that we do so in the next few weeks. There has been some movement more likely with SubPro and their timeline than the RPM Working Group, so we do need to have a conversation and see where we're at on this so we should – Paul, Keith and I should commit to do that soon. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Thanks very much, Donna. And that in and of itself serves as an update to us and a notice of what's going on so thanks very much for raising that. Any further comments, questions, concerns in relation to SubPro RPM consolidated timeline? No, seeing none. Keith is typing into the chat. Excellent. We can move on then to CSC and IFR review.

This effort is being led by Donna Austin and by Philippe Fouquart in his role as liaison to the ccNSO. Donna or Philippe, is there anything that we need to know at this point in relation specifically to the CSC and IFR review? We also have charter review next.

Donna Austin: Heather, it's Donna again.

Heather Forrest: Go right ahead, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. So Philippe and I met with Debbie and Martin Boyle in Panama. We think we have a path forward for how to overcome the potential duplication between the IFR and the CSC effectiveness review requirement.

And we're in the process of working on that. So perhaps by the next Council meeting we'll have a more fulsome update that we can provide. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: That's great, Donna. Thank you very much. That's a helpful update in terms of that – of that overlap and resolving that. Any questions for Donna or Philippe? And noting Philippe's thanks in the chat in relation to that CSC and IFR review. No, okay. Seeing none.

Then CSC charter and, Donna, I'm afraid despite the horrible hour for you, I'm going to put you on the spot once more if I can. So I think we need to work together, Council leadership according to this last item to work on a joint communication with the ccNSO Council. I understand Katrina has actually poked us on that one so if I can add that collectively to our to-do list, Donna and Rafik, then we will do that.

And, Donna, anything further that needs to be said in relation to that charter review communication?

Donna Austin: Just that the ccNSO also approved the charter amendment in Panama so we're both on the same page; we just need to finalize that communication. And we're good to go. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Perfect, Donna, that's great. And also good to hear that we're not, let's say, behind in the effort despite, you know, the focus that we've had on other things. That's brilliant. Any questions then on CSC charter review? No, all right. Also in progress is the updated charter for the Cross Community Engagement Group on Internet Governance. Again, we have Tatiana and Rafik who serve on this effort and are able to inform us.

Of course we knew and foreshadowed to the group that our time over the last few weeks was going to be very much preoccupied by the expedited PDP that we're discussing today so we fairly well assured them that we wouldn't get to this at Panama but once we have some progress in relation to the

EPDP we can come back to this so we'll make a note to do this and follow up when we have let's say some breathing room in our agenda. Any questions on that one? No? All right.

The drafting team on the charter related to the next steps for the ICANN procedure of handling Whois conflicts with privacy. This is also an item that we said we would return to after the July meeting. You'll note that we've updated this item since the last Council meeting to say to be discussed at the August 2018 Council meeting so you can expect to see this on next month's agenda. Any questions in relation to this one? No? All right.

ATRT3, it's on our substantive agenda in the form of instructions to the Standing Selection Committee. We can talk about the process of how to move forward from there and get some input from Susan as chair of the Standing Selection Committee at that point. So other than let's say discussions that would be happening during our substantive agenda, is there anything we need to mention now? Okay, I see no hands on that one.

Which takes us to IGO INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms, which is on our agenda today in the form of a motion so we can come back to that one and – we can come back to that one, let's say, after we've worked our way through the agenda today.

Finally the (CPIF) consensus policy implementation framework is on our agenda as any other business so we can talk about that when we get to that. I would also like to note I apologize, I missed a prod from staff here that we do need to add one item to any other business which is the – now I forget what it is. The review of the GAC communiqué. So we will come back to that question. It normally would have been on our agenda as a motion and we simply didn't have sufficient time, let's say, to prepare the draft to have it appear on this agenda as a motion, so with your indulgence I will belatedly add that to any other business.

All right, that takes us through action items. We'll leave the action items that relate to the strategic planning session as there's really nothing that we directly need to point out at this time. We can come back to these in the context of discussing PDP 3.0 which is on our agenda for today. So any final comments or questions before we leave action items?

Excellent, I don't see any so we can move on. Item 3 in our agenda is consent agenda and we do not have any consent agenda items, which takes us to Item Number 4, the Council vote on the IGO INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP Working Group. Before we begin, Article 3.3.3.1 of the GNSO Operating Procedures require us to have a second for this motion before we begin discussing. Can we have a seconder for this motion? Michele, you're a star. Thank you very much. We'll note that Michele Neylon has seconded this motion.

With that I turn it over to Susan Kawaguchi, the GNSO Council liaison.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you, Heather. This is Susan Kawaguchi for the record. So the – this PDP has been working for over four years now and made substantial headway until about last fall and then ran into a few hurdles. We were able to work through some of the issues and came to agreement on some of the recommendations but not all. There were full consensus on some of the recommendations but the last one there was definitely dispute, so – but the group has finished its work and provided a final report. This motion is just to send this report to the Council and – but please note that there are several minority report included so when you are reading and reviewing the report please note that these will be attached.

And other than that, this – the work for this PDP is complete. So should I just read the resolved clause?

Heather Forrest: Go right ahead, Susan. Thanks very much.

Susan Kawaguchi: I'm just trying to get it – make it large enough that I can see it. "Resolved, the GNSO Council thanks the working group for its hard work and acknowledges receipt of the final report. In view of the need to consider the topic of curative rights protections for IGOs in the broader context of appropriate overall scope of protection for all IGO identifiers including IGO acronyms, the GNSO Council intends to review this final report from the IGO INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms PDP Working Group between now and its August 2018 meeting with a view toward developing possible path forward that will also facilitate the resolution of the outstanding inconsistencies between GAC Advice and prior GNSO policy recommendations on the overall scope of IGO protections."

"The GNSO Council confirms its intention to act on the recommendations that have been developed by the working group at the earliest opportunity following its review and deliberations on these topics. To this end, ICANN staff is directed to inform the ICANN Board and the GAC that the IGO INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanism PDP Working Group has completed its work and forward a copy of the final report to them."

Are there any questions? Heather, please go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. Just a question, so I understand based on the Council list we received one minority report in relation to this final report. And I understand there are some other minority reports that are in the works but haven't yet been received. Do we need to work out a plan for how those can be communicated, let's say, assuming we adopt the motion here. The motion essentially says we're going to submit all of this information to the Board in view of all the inconsistencies that we have. What do we do I suppose in relation to the outstanding minority reports if there are some? Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: So if you'll see in the chat that – and Steve sent these out – sent out an email sometime this week. There are three minority statements that are attached to the report as annexes I think, or appendixes, I'm not sure. And so

those will be submitted. There could be another minority report that is filed and I'm not sure that we do have a process for that.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. This is Heather. Sorry, I didn't want to interrupt. So I appreciate that. I think what we ought to do, given that we don't have a clear process here, is that when that report is received it should be communicated by staff in the same manner as the final report and the submitted minority reports have been – so I think that will assure that that happens.

Susan Kawaguchi: That makes sense. You know, if the community has a voice then – and go to the work of drafting a minority report we, you know, seems like we could at least forward it onto the Board too.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Susan. Anyone else have questions for Susan? Susan, anything further from you before we take this one to a vote?

Susan Kawaguchi: No, I'm just glad that we were able to wrap this one up. It looks like Donna's got her hand up.

Heather Forrest: Donna, over to you.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks Heather. And thanks, Susan. One question that's kind of burning in the back of my mind is, what's the path that we're going to develop for resolving the outstanding inconsistencies? I know that, you know, we're tight for time on this call but I think we – the sooner we can have that conversation and understand what that is, you know, all the better because I expect that there will – it will require a conversation of some sort between the Council and the Board. Thanks, Heather. And thanks, Susan, for all the work you've done on this; we certainly appreciate it. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: I'll let you answer that one, Heather. I have no idea what the next steps are. And thank you, Donna, for the nice – the kind words.

Heather Forrest: Sure, Susan. I was holding my breath hoping you were going to answer. Look, here's what I think we ought to do. Donna is very right to say that this is a discussion that needs to be had. The logic on the motion, just so everyone is very clear, is we have not faced this type of problem before where we had a final report that, let's say, has directly conflicting already GAC Advice and is already the subject of other Board deliberations, hence, this motion is designed around some of the discussions that we had with the Board in the PDP 3.0 discussions to say we need to work out a mechanism for what to do in this situation.

Now this situation has arrived. We have not yet worked out that plan so this is something that we need to do. I would suggest that we come around to that before the next Council meeting. And Mary is going to provide us with more insight here. Mary.

Mary Wong: (Unintelligible) everyone. This is Mary from staff. Apologies for my voice as I'm somewhat under the weather. Just two points here, the first is to the minority statements, there was an agreed deadline for receipt of minority statements to be incorporated into the final report. There was one member who indicated somewhat near the end of the deadline that he would not be filing his report by that deadline and intended to file it for the Council before its next meeting.

The advice of the working group chair on this is that because of the deadline and because other working group members have actually sent in their minority statements for the deadline, then anything received after the deadline by any working group member will not form part of the official formal final report but of course that member and any other member is free to send his or her views to the Council in the form of a letter or other communication. So I just wanted to get that on the record at the advice of the working group chair on that particular point.

On the point about the possible next steps, as Susan has said, and as Heather and others have acknowledged, this is somewhat uncharted territory. The difference here is that the Council has not yet voted on the recommendations in this report and so the bylaws process is not yet triggered. There are several possibilities that the Council may want to consider, and as Heather said, this is something to discuss further between now and your next meeting.

One possibility may be the kind of facilitated discussion that took place in respect of the previous IGO policy recommendations and those took place I believe about a year ago facilitated by a former Board member between representatives of the GNSO and the GAC and IGOs. So just an idea for you to consider as you think about this between now and August. Thank you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Mary, thank you very much. And I very sincerely apologize for having, you know, posited an idea that was contrary to the directions of the PDP chair. I – in all of circumstances think that it's best to defer to the, you know, the expertise of the chair as they're closest to this. So to the extent that the chair has established a decision in relation to what happens to reports that are filed late. Then by all means, my view is we need to support that. So thank you very much for correcting the record and my very sincere apologies to the chair and the PDP for sticking my foot in it.

So this one is to be continued but in its present form are there any further comments or questions before we vote on the motion? All right, I see none. May I ask does anyone have objections to a voice vote in relation to this motion? Okay, Ayden is noting in the chat, "Voice vote is okay." And I'm not seeing any hands. I'm not seeing any objection symbols in the AC room. So, Nathalie, may I ask you to take us through a voice vote please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Yes of course. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion, please say "aye." Hearing no one, would anyone like to object to this motion? Please

say, "aye." Hearing no one, would all those in favor of the motion please say, "aye."

(Group):   Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. With no objection, no abstention, the motion passes. Over to you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Nathalie. And Susan, to echo Donna's comments, thank you very much for all your hard work here. Let's also express our thanks to Petter Rindforth, the Chair, and prior Chair – or prior Co-chair, Phil Corwin, as well. So we will then move forward as the motion indicates with informing the ICANN Board and the GAC and progressing our discussions here so to be continued. Thanks very much, everyone.

Let's then move to the much anticipated Item 5 on our GNSO Council agenda, which is the Council vote on the initiation of the expedited policy development process on the ICANN Board temporary specification on gTLD registration data. Again, under Article 3.3.3.1 of the Council procedures, before we begin discussing the motion, we need a second.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. I'll second that.

Heather Forrest: Thank you. Thank you very much, Michele. So we'll note please that Michele has seconded the motion. So this is a motion which will be very familiar to all of us having lived, breathed and eaten the EPDP charter and initiation request for the past 10 weeks. We have in front of us a motion with four resolved clauses. You'll note that those point to the EPDP initiation request, and the EPDP team charter as has been circulated on the GNSO Council list. We also have Item 3 and that deals with the chair of the EPDP team and the recommendation that was posted by the selection panel earlier in the week.

I suggest we take each of these, the topic of each of these resolve clauses one by one. I'll read the resolves into the record and ten we can go through and discuss these. So any objections to my reading the resolve clauses in? All right, I see injection – no I see no objection.

"Resolved, 1, the GNSO Council hereby approves the EPDP initiation request and as such initiates the EPDP. Resolve 2, the GNSO Council approves the EPDP team charter and appoints, insert name, as the GNSO Council liaison to the EPDP team on a temporary specification for gTLD registration data. Resolve 3, the GNSO Council hereby appoints, name, as the chair of the EPDP team. Resolve 4, the GNSO Council direct staff to communicate the results of this motion to the GNSO SGs and Cs as well as ICANN SOs and ACs and to make arrangements for the EPDP team to commence its deliberations as soon as feasible."

That is the motion in front of us. Let's begin with 1 and 2, the initiation request and the EPDP team charter. Are there any comments, questions, concerns, that anyone would like to raise at this time in relation to the draft of the initiation request and the team charter as posted to the Council list? Michele, over to you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Heather. Michele for the record. Look, I just think, you know, with this being what we've had intense discussions, intense debate, as per the kind of multistakeholder model we all hate it equally so I think this is probably the best we're going to get. We've had plenty of backwards and forwards, there's been give, there's been take. We need to move this forward. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Michele. I think that's a very fair summary of what it's taken to get us to this point. Any further comments, questions, in relation to the text of the initiation request or the team charter themselves? Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I understand the merits of moving forward. Goodness knows we're running out of time. But I wonder if

we could consider a remedy in the event that the compromise that we have made in order to facilitate work on the, in air quotes, uniform model for access, if any of those compromises that we have made result in un-useful discussions during the discussion of the interim spec, what's the remedy? Can the EPDP come back to Council and request a change in scope?

You know, what – in other words what if those of us who objected to the simultaneous work on the two and who objected to removing the concept of phasing out and instead focusing on answering core questions, what if we were right? Just a question. If we could address my concern I'd feel a lot better about voting this through. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Stephanie. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Madame Chair. Michele for the record. Stephanie, if you look at the deliverables and timeframes, there's the way that the language there covers this I think resolves your issue. Now, if for example, members of the working group were to try and I don't know, jump ahead and try to address something out of sequence, that it'll be up to the chair of the working group to rein that in. So I think that's part of the reason why the choice of the chair and their neutrality and everything else was so important.

But I think what we have here in the terms of the deliverables and the framework and everything else means that, you know, the temporary specification, the core issue that we need to deal with can be dealt with within the timeframe that is needed to deal with it and yet there is the concession that these other things will be dealt with. But they don't have to happen within that strict timeline. So I think it's perfectly fine, but you know, your concerns are noted.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele, very much. Philippe.

Philippe Fouquart: Thanks. Philippe Fouquart for the record. Yes, indeed, that's a discussion we had within the ISPCP. There were concerns over the fact that the charter might be a bit broad. You know, that is the uniform access but also other things. In the spirit of moving forward we don't, as Stephanie said, we don't want this to be a hindrance or a reason to delay this but the ISPCP was adamant that should there be significant disagreement within the team to – as the way forward then they should come back to Council for guidance. But I think that's an understanding that's within the charter. But just for the record, that's something that – a concern that is shared by some of the constituencies such as the ISPCP. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Philippe. So based on those interventions, Stephanie, thanks for raising the point, I think we're all on the same page there and it's very, very clear that, you know, A, we put a great value on that neutrality of the chair and likewise the power of the chair to come back to Council and indeed, as I've put into the chat, that ability to come back to Council is integral to our role as the manager of the EPDP. So all of those things, not only baked into the charter but baked into the bylaws.

Any further questions on the text of the EPDP initiation request or the EPDP charter? Of course the product of many, many, many hours of work here so brilliant that we've gotten to this point and don't have too many lingering questions.

All right, without foreclosing, let's say returning to those two, can I invite us to consider the blank that needs to be amended as maker of the motion? I need to propose an amendment here for the appointment of the GNSO Council liaison. Of course a very important job here and likewise integral to our role as manager of the process. Do we have any volunteers? Do we have any suggestions for this role? Rafik, please.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Heather. With regard to the role of GNSO Council liaison I put my name if people think I can take that role. But also I'm looking forward to hear if others want to volunteer, putting my name for this one.

Heather Forrest: Rafik, that's very kind of you to volunteer. We thank you for that. And I think it's a marvelous idea in the sense of I think there's some brilliant continuity in Council leadership having that responsibility or a member of Council leadership. Donna, over to you please.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks Heather. Donna Austin. We have had some conversation among, you know, Council leadership and we think that continuity is going to be important for, you know, this EPDP. So Rafik will be staying on Council through October so I would support Rafik if he's interested in fulfilling this role. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna, very much. And as do I wholeheartedly lend my support to Rafik and think he'll do an excellent job in this role in terms of keeping Council and Council leadership current and future apprised of what's going on. So, Martin, thanks for your plus one in the chat. Any objections to – and I see tremendous – Rafik, the support is (unintelligible). So, Keith, Stephanie, Paul, Philippe, that's brilliant. And so I then need to propose, as maker of the motion, that we amend Resolve 2 to insert the name Rafik Dammak into the liaison role and Michele as seconder, you need to approve that change as well.

Michele Neylon: It's Michele. Consider it approved.

Heather Forrest: Marvelous. Thanks very much, Michele. All right, let's move on then to Resolve Clause 3. The GNSO Council hereby approves, name, as the Chair of the EPDP team. The small team met very, very mindful of the lengthy discussions that had been had within the drafting team on the weighty responsibility that that panel had. And the need, let's say, to balance all sorts of concerns by ensuring that the group came to unanimous decision. I will say

that on behalf of the selection panel, we received three really strong applications and each applicant brought their own special skills and expertise to the application and to their vision of the role.

It was, however, unanimous within the selection panel – which just to remind everyone involves myself, and Rafik representing Council leadership, Donna recuesed herself on the announcement of the EOI applicants. And then Susan Kawaguchi and Maxim Alzoba as the Chair and Vice Chair of the Standing Selection Committee.

So we came to the unanimous recommendation that Kurt Pritz would be really the ideal candidate in terms of his skills and experience and background and his explicit answering of the criteria as they were advertised in particular skills in relation to facilitating dialogue and discussion, knowledge of GNSO procedures, and being able to work within those procedures so that the Council could maintain its role as manager of the PDP, fundamentally, you know, respecting the role of the Council and the GNSO have here. So those were key points that came out in our deliberations.

And I'll ask Susan as Chair of the SSC, if there's anything she'd like to say here as well?

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you, Heather. Susan Kawaguchi for the record. Not – I don't really have comments but I do think that we all work together well and had a good discussion, evaluated the candidates thoroughly and came to the right decision.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Susan. And to pick up on Marie's very timely comment in the chat about volunteers, so, you know, we emphasized to the candidates who were not successful that we very much hope that they would consider bringing their enthusiasm in relation to EPDP through as a member of the EPDP team.

And I very much hope that they will consider that as a path forward because again, they brought some, you know, really unique attributes and strong skill sets and could contribute those in a very useful way to the EPDP. So that is a public acknowledgment of that fact and we thank everyone who applied, you know, it's not an easy thing to do answering an EOI like that, so it's an honor to have received the applications that we did.

Any further comments on this? So as maker of the motion I suppose that we amend Resolve 3 to replace "name" with "Kurt Pritz." Michele, any objections?

Michele Neylon: Can I object just to upset you? No, joking aside, no, that's fine.

Heather Forrest: You're a good man. You couldn't upset me, Michele, I promise. Any objections from councilors to the amendment to Resolve 3? Michele.

Michele Neylon: Heather, it's Michele. I'm not going to object. No just I think we needed to find a good neutral chair. I think we've done that. You know, just a matter of seeing if Kurt is able to deliver so the pressure is on Kurt.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. Just noting that we don't want to scare him away before we put him into the role. So very good. All right, look, that takes us through the resolved clauses. Is there anything anyone would like to say before we put this motion to a vote?

Okay, I see no hands and comments in chat are not in relation to objections or comments here. I'm going to propose in light of the significance of all of this to all of us and the very lengthy discussions that we've had over the course of some time now that we put this through to a – to a roll call vote unless we don't think we need it. Is there – so there's a request for a roll call vote, that's acknowledged. So we will then go through a roll call vote. Nathalie, could you take us through that please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Heather. And as a reminder for this motion to pass it needs a super majority vote. I will call out names. Please reply by "aye" or "no" or "abstain" depending on how you'd like to vote. Thank you very much. Carlos Gutiérrez.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rubens Kuhl.

Rubens Kuhl: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Ayden Férdeline.

Ayden Férdeline: Abstain.

Nathalie Peregrine: Philippe Fouquart.

Philippe Fouquart: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Martin Silva Valent.

Martin Silva Valent: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rafik Dammak.

Rafik Dammak: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Syed Ismail Shah.

Syed Ismail Shah: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Pam Little.

Pam Little: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Tatiana Tropina.

Tatiana Tropina: I would like to abstain, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Would you care to say your reasons for abstaining, Tatiana?

Tatiana Tropina: Yes, thank you very much. I hope it will not delay the call or the vote. Shall I share them now or shall I share them after the vote is finished?

Nathalie Peregrine: Proceed…

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: …if you would like to share them now please, Tatiana.

Tatiana Tropina: Yes. Yes, then I will share them now or – I would like to say that while I really highly value this work that has been done in such a short time, and I really want to thank everyone who worked on this especially the small drafting team, I cannot work for this chapter. I cannot work now of course because I really want this process to move forward but I cannot vote yes for this document because in my opinion it is not properly worded and instead of taking the scope of this EPDP it's just multiple possibilities to get the work side tracked. And we expressed many concerns that the Part G of the scope section has not been properly worded.

I also think that it doesn't address all the concerns that Non Commercial Stakeholder Group expressed in the drafting process. For example, the Part D of the subsection J1 of the Section J uses very vague terms. It poses the questions that first of all imply by default that the issues related to intellectual property protection, for example, or consumer protection require the disclosure of personal data. Secondly, it puts cyber crime investigations together in the same basket for the intellectual property protection consumer protection. And as a criminal lawyer who is working in the field of frameworks for cyber crime investigations, this version just fails me. I did not see the reasons to put them together.

And especially the third question is even more vague; it refers to the provision of access which is based on legitimate interests. And what is this? It can be anything. And if this EPDP group is to come with any response what kind of (unintelligible) shall the group come up with exhaustive list of legitimate interest and corresponding frameworks or shall the group just answer this question in general? It is totally not clear to me. And so I really think that these texts in Subsection J instead of clearly outlining the scope of this EPDP provides for as many as interpretations as possible. This can delay the work.

And secondly, I also think that we are setting a precedent by giving other ACs and SOs the same weight in reaching consensus in this process. I think that

the fact of it is now a CCWG and I think that this policy development process on a very important for GNSO issue has GNSO as its whole…

((Crosstalk))

Tatiana Tropina: And while – yes, so I do believe that while the…

((Crosstalk))

Tatiana Tropina: I'm sorry. I hear the echo. So I understand the importance of participation of GAC and ALAC but I do not understand why the groups – the group is suggested to be populated in equal numbers by the parts of the community which has no stake in Whois or this EPDP whatsoever. And I think that we are setting a precedent here by giving away this important process just for the sake of unachievable and unnecessary equality.

And I would like to highlight that my stakeholder group and I personally will contribute to this EPDP as much as we can, I can, no matter what the composition is. But I just want to have this on the record. So while I don't want this process to fail, I really can't vote yes for this motion. Thank you very much, so abstain.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Tatiana. And I would like to record that Ayden did abstain from this vote and I misheard him earlier so Ayden please provide your reasons now. Thank you.

Ayden Férdeline: Thank you for that. And I apologize, I must have muted my line too soon before. It is with great reluctance that I must abstain from voting on this motion and it is for many of the reasons that Tatiana just outlined. I greatly appreciate the work that everyone has done in drafting this charter. However, I have deep concerns about the charter that is before us today in the second resolved clause. I believe that Section J is first and foremost questions that

unnecessarily expand the scope of this EPDP and put perceived answers rather than genuine open ended questions into this very important document.

Overall I think this section of the charter's scope is unnecessary and will now allow the EPDP team to complete their work in a timely manner. There was never a consensus that Section J should be in the scope and the NCSG has made our objections to it clear for three weeks now. I have reviewed the mailing list for the small drafting team and I feel very comfortable saying that.

Even if we were to accept it, the questions in Section J in Part 2 should form a part of the EPDP's work, these questions are not in the correct location in the scope. Surely the questions that follow up in Section K in Part 3 would need to be discussed before Section J could reasonably be answered. I think we are doing a disservice to the members of the EPDP by burdening them with the scope that is not clear, not sufficiently focused and which will require that questions to do with access be litigated in Part 2 and then again Part 4 where these questions actually belong. This is not efficient.

In addition, we know that ICANN Org is engaged in a parallel process seeking, quote unquote, clarity from the Data Protection Authorities to receive their advice on how to proceed in relation to access. I think it would be a more effective use of the PDP team's time and resources to not address this question until such time as ICANN Org has received and shared what the EPDP the advice that is has received from the Data Protection Authorities as their recommendations as the enforcement body of what will be followed by ICANN anyway.

And finally, as Tatiana noted, I'm troubled by the volume of participation in this EPDP by the other supporting organizations and advisory committees. While I do see a clear role for the GAC to participate I do not agree with submitting such significant participation from other members of the ICANN community and extending invitations to so many others, we weaken the GNSO's balance and by extension, our role in the broader ICANN

ecosystem. This is not a cross community working group, this is GNSO-initiated policy development process. And it is for these reasons that I am abstaining today. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Ayden. This is noted. Returning to the vote please. Darcy Southwell.

Darcy Southwell: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Marie Pattullo. Marie, you might be on mute.

Marie Pattullo: I'm so sorry, I was. Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Arsene Tungali. I know we're having issues getting a hold of Arsene and he typed his vote which was "yes" for the record in the Adobe Connect room chat. Stephanie Perrin.

Stephanie Perrin: I would like to abstain from the vote.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Stephanie.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: …if you'd like to say your reasons?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, and I think that Tatiana and Ayden have eloquently expressed many of my reasons. There is one issue that I would like to add to those and that is that it is plainly evident from the way that we have approached this question and the EPDP that we've not yet, as ICANN, and as the GNSO addressing

the problem of GDPR, some of us don't think it's a problem, some of us think it's an improvement, but at any rate we have not addressed the issue with the benefit of the advice that we have received from the data commissioners, in other words, with the perspective of data protection law.

And I feel that it's long overdue to address these concerns. I don't wish to delay the progress; we have to get busy. I have a remedy and I will try and bring remedy throughout the work on the EPDP. We have a volunteer from the Council of Europe to assist us in legal interpretation, that would be Peter Kimpian, a data protection lawyer from the Hungarian Data Protection Office who has worked extensively with the Council of Europe on GDPR and on Convention 108 and the revised Convention 108.

They have offered to assign him to us. I would recommend that the Council accept that offer because at the moment we have a – we have a charter that is not framed the way it should be in terms of data protection analysis and we need to remedy this. And I share with both Ayden ad Tatiana the concerns that we have many members that are turning this into a cross community working group but none of them who could, are bringing a data protection expertise t the table. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Stephanie. Returning to the vote, Anthony Harris.

Tony Harris: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. So for the Contracted Party House we have seven votes in favor and no objections, no abstentions. For the Non Contracted Party House we have 10 votes in favor, no objections and three abstentions. The motion passes with 100% vote in Contracted Party House and 76.92%

vote in the Non Contracted Party House. Thank you very much. Over to you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Nathalie. So for the avoidance of doubt we'll point out the language that we've inserted into the agenda here that remarks – taking this action is within the GNSO's remit as outlined in ICANN's bylaws. As the GNSO quote, shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the Board substantive policies relating to generic top level domains and other responsibilities of the GNSO as set forth in these bylaws, Article 11.1. Furthermore, the action complies with the requirements set out in Annex A1, GNSO expedited policy development process of the ICANN Bylaws as well as the EPDP manual.

Rafik, please.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Heather. This is Rafik speaking and just will make short comment here. So just to clarify, I think you heard a different position and that show kind of the diversity we have in NCSG regarding this matter. But I can ensure that the NCSG is really to participate in the EPDP process even when - I mean my colleague expresses her concern in a different area but we - the goal is to participate in the PDP and to - we really defend that the GNSO as a policy manager and to defend its role in such process.

So I - that's what I can say. I can ensure that that participation will happen and I mean representatives will be appointed and so on to alleviate any concerns that may be with regard to the vote but just I think that show how we are diverse in terms of position.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Rafik. Very well said. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Heather. It's Michele. Just on the - a couple of quick comments, following up on Stephanie's thoughts about Peter Kimpian. My understanding is that nothing in the charter to stop NCSG from appointing somebody who is

not a member of their stakeholder group. So if they want to appoint him they can. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. Any further comments on this one? If not I'm going to close this off for some remarks. Keep putting comments in the chat. No. All right. So for the purposes of the folks joining us by audiocast and for the ICANN community at large, this is make no mistake a major milestone for the GNSO Council and really ICANN as a whole. It's proof that the multi-stakeholder model works in the GNSO, and I think Rafik has summed that up very, very well in his comments just now.

So for all of those out there who have ever doubted our ability to do what we just did, to come together as a cohesive and effective functioning organ of ICANN, here is the proof. The post is not easy. In fact it is really rather difficult but it works. We work. It's - you know, we need to remark here that this is uniquely our achievement. From start to finish the GNSO Council has responsibly carried out its obligations under the bylaws.

I feel very strongly about including that bylaws language in the motion because I think this is a watershed moment for us. We're really, you know, fully acknowledging our responsibility and it's the first time that we do so as members of the empowered community. And we will continue to do so throughout the life of the EPDP.

I think we can all walk away and feel enormously proud of what has been achieved here today together in only 12 weeks, and it's so beautifully summed up by the statements that have been read in the objections and all of the comments that have been. Let's close this chapter by wishing Kurt Pritz, who's chair of the EPDP, and all the participants on the EPDP team our very, very best wishes for collaborative, constructive and not least timely outcome. And with that folks we have done something serious here. Thank you very much.

It's time to move on in the agenda. (Sam), I suspect you are. That takes us to the next item in our agenda, which, Donna, I'm so sorry that you have to follow that but item six is our discussion on short and long-term options to adjust the timeline for specific reviews and organizational reviews. So back to day-to-day business. Donna, over to you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. So short-term and long-term review options. Some of you might recall that in San Juan there was a lot of discussion around the ICANN budget and Göran was keen to find opportunities to, you know, take away some of the costs for the budget over the coming years.

One of the, as a result of community discussion, one of the options that was put on the table was that perhaps there is a way to stagger the specific reviews and the organizational reviews that are required in the ICANN bylaws. So what ICANN has done was put out two option papers. One was on the short-term options, and you might recall that, you know, that related specifically to what to do with the ATRT3 and also the RDS Whois 2 Review Team.

ICANN had to backtrack on the short-term options because the RDS Whois 2 team had already kicked off their work so it didn't make sense to have an option paper that suggested that that work not proceed. So that was taken off the table. So. All we have in terms of the short-term options is for the ATRT3 and those are options - and I will provide something more fulsome to the list following this call.

The options for the short term is, you know, that that work begin as soon as feasible, and the estimated timeline was July 2018, so I think we're past that. The second one was to limit the review to implementation of prior recommendations, so that's a second option. And I think this is in light of the fact that there is substantive work being done on accountability mechanisms as a result of the CCWG, so restricting it to the implementation of prior recommendations seems to make senses. And then there's to, you know,

delay until perhaps June 2019 to enable some time to consider the recommendations from the CCWG Work Stream 2.

So there're the options that are on the table. The first one there would be no savings, the second one there's a saving of 250,000, and then the third one there's a savings of 320,000. So bear in mind that this isn't really a saving, this is just pushing the work out until 2019, so it doesn't show up in the 2018 budget. But they're the short-term options and I'll put that to the list to see, you know, try to get a sense of what councilors consider would be the best option in that regard.

The longer term options are a conversation, as I said, around, you know, what - bearing in mind that the primary aim what ICANN has done here is to try to save money by not having seven reviews happen in one year. So they're trying to stagger these things to push them out. And I have to recognize that Carlos has helped me in relation to reviewing the two items that were put out for public comment and I think Carlos' approach is the right one.

What ICANN has done is suggest that the staggering of these reviews primarily for to overcome a budgeting problem, but what they haven't done is gone to the, you know, source of the problem. So Carlos has correctly identified that the specific reviews and the organizational reviews should not be lumped into the one bucket because they are very different reviews and have a different requirement.

So the specific reviews should be considered on their own as a separate issue. Carlos is recommending that, you know, one of the things that would be important for those specific reviews is that they are kept to a 12-month timeframe. I don't know if some of you are aware but we're still waiting on the CCT, the Competition Consumer Trust Review Team to finalize their report, final report, and that's been outstanding I think for about eight months at least now. So I'm not sure what's holding them up. But there has to be a firm

requirement that the review be done within the 12-month period that's allocated.

I'll also say on this specific reviews as well, some of you may recall that ICANN put out for comment some time ago I think it's called operational guidelines for conducting the specific reviews, and that work hasn't been finalized either. And I think that's an important consideration when we think about, you know, whether it makes sense to change the timing of those reviews. So I would in any council comments I think we need to tie that back to the other.

On the organizational side of things, most of you would be aware that the GNSO is at the tail end of implementing recommendations from the GNSO review that started, and I don't have the date, but I think it's over two years ago that that process was kicked off. What I would like to include in that comment is just a timeline of how long that took and what we as council think would be a reasonable timeframe for kicking off the next one.

So I think there's a requirement that it's 18 months or two years from the implementation of the recommendations from the previous one, but I think there's an opportunity here for us to take a look at that from the GNSO Council perspective and think about what we think would be reasonable in terms of kicking off the next one. And I think we should include that in our comments.

The other thing that Carlos raised on the organizational reviews is that there needs to be some kind of benchmarking or calibration of those reviews. You know, I'm very much aware that the ALAC review from - specifically from the ALAC perspective wasn't done well and reflected a, from the ALAC perspective, a misunderstanding of what the ALAC does and how it works.

So if we're getting expertise or if ICANN's getting outside expertise into doing these reviews and they're not adequately conducting the reviews, then

something needs to be done about that. So we need to understand what the problem is there in order to fix it.

So I think our - the comments that Carlos and I will prepare aren't going to be straight down the line on yes we agree that, you know, it would make sense to have one specific review and two organizational reviews in any 12-month period. I think it needs to go deeper than that, and that's what we intend to do. So the timeline for this is the 31st of July, so hopefully Carlos and I can get our collective act together.

We'll have comments -- excuse me -- on the council list early next week for consideration and I think the path forward, Heather, is, if there's no objection, we'll be able to submit those on behalf of the council. And I apologize, I had hoped to have some kind of outline to the council list before this meeting but other things overtook that.

But it's safe to say Carlos and I have had a conversation. I think we have a path forward, and if it's acceptable to the rest of the council based on what I've just said, we'll go ahead and prepare those comments for consideration. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Okay. Thanks, Donna, to you and Carlos for the, you know, extremely comprehensive thoughts there, and entirely understandable that you didn't have the opportunity to get something to the list. We do need to get something to the list let's say as a matter of formal process so that everyone can have a look let's say and express any comments. So we will look forward to that.

Are there any objections to that as a path forward? And Donna's asking a very valid question. So, Ayden, before we come to you, let's just follow and see Carlos is typing, make sure that Carlos, as the other person involved in that effort, has an opportunity to speak here. No, Carlos says. Back to the

drawing board and we will meet the deadline. So great. Thanks very much, Carlos. Ayden, over to you.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks, Heather. This is Ayden. And just to be clear, not an objection. And thank you very much for that, Donna. I just wanted to put forward a perspective on the short-term reviews in the hope that perhaps this could be reflective in the council's comment, if not at least this is my personal position here.

So while I understand the rationale behind ICANN Org's proposal for postponing the ATRT3 review, I would be unable to support options B or C and I would hope that the council would support option A that was proposed, option A being that the review goes ahead as planned. And the reasons being, I find the argument that ICANN Org put forward rather disingenuous.

They claim to be delaying the review because of community capacity concerns but this is difficult for me to believe. If ICANN Org did care they would not (unintelligible) by public comment on the one day like they did when they publish a particular request for comment. I think that this is more borne out of a desire to delay accountability commitment and not the community's convenience.

The community is always going to be strained. The volunteers are always going to be exhausted. I find the condition personally any point in the future where we will have volunteers that will no other professional burden, and as Donna noted, this is not about cost savings, so I would like to encourage us to advocate that the short-term reviews go ahead as planned. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Ayden. Carlos?

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Yes. Thank you very much, Ayden. I wouldn't ascribe any bad faith but I think the question what we do in the short term and what can we do in the long term is the wrong question. We certainly have a problem. We have

to fix it, but we have to go beyond the pure resources being volunteers, time, and money and staff. I mean this is too simple.

I mean we have to dig a little bit deeper and, as Donna said, we have to strictly look at organizational reviews separate from the specific reviews and approach it from another corner. I really support your thoughts about the accountability review and - but let's - give us a few days and we will come will a comprehensive approach, a little bit different, not long term and short term, and we hope to get good feedback from you guys. Thank you very much, Ayden.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Carlos, and Ayden for your comments there as well. Any further comments on this one? Otherwise we will adopt the path forward that's been proposed and put this to the council list and to the extent, bear in mind as well, we actually receive the commenting that that will happen through a separate post, as this is really just council. So again we're in that situation of council making comments on something that SGs and Cs might also have acted on.

No. Tatiana said it exactly right there in the chat. Thank you very much to Donna and Carlos. Carlos, your hand is up. Is that an old hand before we move on?

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Sorry, it's an old hand.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Carlos. All righty. That takes us then to item seven, which is discussion of the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 final report, and we have with us Thomas Rickert, who is co-chair of that effort, and we also have I believe some of our GNSO representatives of that effort on the line as well. What I would suggest that we do, Thomas, is focus in particular on the things that council needs to know in order to inform itself adequately for next steps. So with that, over to you, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Heather, and good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is Thomas Rickert speaking and I haven't prepared a long presentation because I trust that everyone heard and hopefully read the CCWG Work Stream 2 recommendations. We put out individual reports for public comment which came out of the sub-teams. We put those together into one big report. Put that out for public comment to check whether the community found any inconsistencies, and there were none, and now we've put everything into our final package.

And this is probably the area where I should spend a minute or two, and it's what happened, let the council know exactly what the differences between draft final report or the aggregation of the sub-team report versus the version that has now been circulated to the chartering organization is.

And that is that we received a heads up from the ICANN board a couple of months back and they said that they did have issues with a total of four recommendations out of the almost 100 recommendations coming out of our cross-community working group and that they would probably be - see themselves forced to point to global public interest considerations and potentially reject our report on the basis thereof, which is why we sat together with a sub team of the board, (rapators) from our team as well as the co-chairs in Puerto Rico and we looked whether actually these concerns that the board raised are such that require us to, you know, either stand firm on our original recommendations or reopen the discussion on our recommendations, which as you know have gone through public comment and CCWG consensus call before.

So what we turned out doing is we thought that the concerns that the board raised could be sorted out by offering so-called implementation guidance so that the board or ICANN staff as it operationalizes our recommendations know how these need to be read. So we tried to come up with guidance on how to implement, how to read our recommendations, and this is not far from what would probably be offered by the Implementation Oversight Team that

we constituted over the years when our report and our recommendations are being operationalized.

We're just offering this guidance at the outset so that the board knows how the recommendations need to be read, the community knows how it needs to be read, and the expectations are transparent to everyone. So that's what we did between the version that you saw and the version that we have now circulated to you, and the guidance that we offered was relating to the advisory panel with respect to transparency of board deliberations, they were related to government engagement and ultimately to open contracting.

So I'm not sure whether I should go into glorious detail. I have shared a slide deck that we used to inform the community at a high interest session in Panama a couple of weeks back with Nathalie, who I'm sure will be able to circulate that slide deck to the council list so that you can go through more details of those implementation guidelines, should you wish so.

Now what we hope the board will do is - sorry, what the council will do is approve our final report as one of the chartering organizations. We've asked the other chartering organizations to do the same by Barcelona but you don't have to wait that long obviously. And then hopefully the board will also adopt our recommendations quickly.

And what I can say for full disclosure is that I've reached out to ICANN and the CFO that I think once this is all through the community that's been working so hard on this Herculean task really deserves a (unintelligible). So you are one of the roadblocks that are in the way between us today and the party so the GNSO Council and chartering organizations (unintelligible). If you have any questions (unintelligible) or on the report itself.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Thomas, thanks very much.

Thomas Rickert: (Unintelligible)

Heather Forrest: Sorry? Go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: Go ahead.

Heather Forrest: I wasn't sure if I'd lost you, Thomas. Go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: No, no, I'm still there.

Heather Forrest: Good stuff. Thomas, are you happy to take questions?

Thomas Rickert: I'm more than happy to take questions.

Heather Forrest: Super. So anyone have questions for Thomas? Thomas, you might be off the hook. Thomas, if we have questions after the fact, bearing in mind the timing of this meeting is a bit rough for folks in Europe and we've had a pretty big day here leading up to this, if folks have questions let's say after today, how best to get them to you?

Thomas Rickert: I would suggest that you write to my email address. That is Thomas@rickert.net, most of you will have the email address, copying acct-staff@icann.org on that email. Then it will go to the excellent support and then we can ensure that this is - that would have priority.

Heather Forrest: Super, Thomas. That's very helpful. And what we might do is just circulate on that on the council list just so everybody has it. Thomas, any last words from you? It doesn't look like we have any hands.

Thomas Rickert: No. I just thought there would be questions. Sorry, I meant there wouldn't be. Sorry.

Heather Forrest: Well done, Thomas. Thomas, please don't take it as, you know, as a slight in any way. I think we're all just a little bit fuzzy from EPDP. So it's not at all a

lack of interest and I note that chat has - the chat's full of comments commending you on your work, Thomas, and let's do that for the folks on audiocast so that they can hear. Thomas, it's been a huge effort. Yes, it makes the EPDP look pretty small in comparison. So thank you very much from all of us to you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much to all of you for supporting this initiative and I do know that this was a big task but the team was great, staff was great, the co-chairs were great, and I think that one of the reasons why we didn't have questions is that you've heard the substance of the recommendations already and we're, you know, on the last mile of getting this done. So thanks again and take care all of you. Bye-bye.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Thomas, very much. So let's then progress to the next item in our agenda, which is our discussion on PDP 3.0. We have this down really as a marker. We haven't spent as much time directly on PDP 3.0 as we maybe wanted to, certainly not in Panama. We didn't have as much time because we were focused on the effort of getting to this point let's say about half an hour ago.

So my question let's say for everyone, let's bear in mind the way that this is presented on the council agenda is really a marker. We've asked the SGs and Cs to provide input by the 15th of August. We've given, you know, about a month more time so we can all shift gears from what we've been working on. Thanks very much to (Marie) for following through with the action item from our wrap-up session. (Marie) has recirculated - or has circulated to the council list the BC comments, and thanks (Marie) for doing that.

So we all have about a month to get our SG and C comments in. What do we want to do once we get that input? Let's say of course we can incorporate that input into the document that we have but I think we have some bigger-picture questions here, which is what do we do from there? How do we first of

all integrate some of those recommendations into the PDPs that are already live? Do we want to have broader community consultation?

I will say that this was a key point that was raised in our meeting with the GAC at ICANN 62 with the GAC wanting to know when they would have an opportunity to make some comments on what we had proposed in there by way of recommendations. How does everyone feel about this in terms of next steps? You know, how do we take this forward and what do we want to do vis-à-vis the community? Any strong thoughts here? Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. So I don't have any big plan as to what we do next or how we deal with it but I just want to draw a line under something. There are a number of us that have been involved in this work since the January session that will move off council in October. And just wonder whether we can get some commitment perhaps from the council that is here today that whatever we do that we can finalize it or wrap it up so it's in reasonably good shape by October.

Because I, you know, we've all done a fair amount of work on this. We're pretty familiar with how we got to this point. Any new councilors coming in will have to ramp up and try to understand and pick this up if we don't get this to a near final state. So I wonder, Heather, if it's something that we could make a commitment to reach some kind of end point so that we're not leaving a little bit of a I don't want to say mess but we need to leave this in good shape for the next council that's coming in.

I know that, Heather, yourself and I will - we're term limited so we can't continue. I think Susan that's the case. So I think there's a few of us that are in that situation and I think it would be really good if we could commit to having something finalized or wrapped up by Barcelona so that we can, you know, have this wrapped up in a bow for the next iteration of the council. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Beautifully said, Donna. Thank you very much. Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Heather. This is Rafik speaking. I support what Donna said. I mean unfortunately this report or reports was kind of a collateral victim of the EPDP for the last weeks. So I think we can aim I mean to finalize, to get this done so the next council can take ownership and focus on implementing (unintelligible) that we extend it (unintelligible) to get input and just to remind the different stakeholder groups, for those who didn't do that yet to send their input.

If we can target maybe mid September, that's one month to kind of to amend or make changes in the report and so to have a final version in that time. So after - because prior to Barcelona, maybe three weeks is quite hectic and we don't know also how much we'll pay attention be again on the EPDP discussion. So if we can maybe agree on some specific date that give us - I mean a timeline that gives us some guidance, I do agree with Donna.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Rafik, very much. And I'll carry your comments and Donna's further. Let's say, Rafik, you made some excellent points about timeline there and I wonder if we could put forward as a proposal for what's due here some sort of broader community consultation, put it into the schedule for ICANN 63. That actually gives us a firm deadline for whatever it is that we want to do and let's consider that we're working towards that as a target for telling the community what we have done.

Mind you we are working towards the ICANN 63 schedule right now. And Rafik's got a tick there. So that at least gives us a solid target, you know, that we have to tell the community what we've done by October. And by community, we include there the new council as well. I think it's the steps for how we get there that need to be decided. So we've got then if you figure from mid August to mid September to mid October, so two months effectively following the receipt of all of that feedback. To the extent that we have conflicting feedback, we'll need to take that into account.

So, you know, don't want to discount the fact that we'll need some time maybe to integrate and resolve any sort of inputs that come in amongst ourselves here within the GNSO. As to this question of community consultation, do we want to do something more than let's say telling the community what we have done in - at ICANN 63? Do we need to have some sort of a feedback loop before that point or are we comfortable with simply reporting to the community in Barcelona? That will have a pretty significant impact on the timeline.

So Carlos is suggesting in the chat some kind of a webinar or some way to package it nicely. I agree that having some way to communicate it is going to be helpful. But do we want to take input from the community beyond the input that we receive in Puerto Rico let's say? So noting Carlos in the chat saying (unintelligible) is too long, something in that direction.

All right. I think it's probably the case that we need to do a little bit more thinking on this. Is everyone comfortable with as an action item if leadership puts heads together to come up with a bit of a proposal for how we get to that public consultation, community consultation at ICANN 63?Anyone object to us coming up with some ideas? Ayden's got a green tick. Yes, we'll come up with a bit of a straw man and everybody can bash it up. Rafik's got a tick. Great.

All right. And I don't see any objections. So, Donna, Rafik, if you're willing the three of us can work together on that and see if we can work out a plan forward and get us that objective of some sort of tangible outcome that we can deliver to the wider community in Barcelona. Cool.

All right. That then takes us to item nine, which is a discussion item instructing the Standing Selection Committee to reconfirm the GNSO appointments on the third ATRT review team. This is of course a tragic but

necessary obligation here that we need to fill in terms of filling Stephane Van Gelder's vacated spot.

We have a pool of candidates that were initially considered by the SSC. That was the product of the EOI that was issued by ICANN Org. Does anyone object to instructing the Standing Selection Committee to returning to its candidate pool in order to fill that vacancy? Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. So this is something that I've had a conversation with the chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group about. Obviously Stephane was a member of our group. We also don't know if one of the other candidates will be willing to continue in the role given there's been a change in circumstances. I'm referring to (Brian Cute). So we're unsure whether (Brian) will be able to or, you know, is interested in still being a part of the ATRT3.

But Paul Diaz and I had a different conversation and that's given the candidate pool is now about 18 months old, whether there should be a new call for candidates. And the reason for this is that, you know, people's circumstances will have changed over that 18-month period and I note that, you know, Tatiana has informed council leadership that even though she was interested 18 months ago, circumstances have changed and, you know, it's no longer - she's no longer not willing to serve but circumstances have changed that's she's withdrawn her candidacy.

So, Heather, I wonder if we could perhaps have, you know, a conversation about whether there should be an opportunity for another call for volunteers, given folks' circumstances may have changed. And I know that puts some pressure on Susan and the SSC and, you know, we also recognize that I'm not sure that there's, you know, the mechanism to be able to do that. But I think, you know, given it's about 18 months since that call for volunteers actually went out, whether there should be an opportunity to renew that in some way. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Donna. So let's come back to that point about a new call. Before go to that, let's clear the queue. So Susan and then Tatiana.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Heather. Susan Kawaguchi for the record. And, Donna, you know, you actually were hitting on some points that I was going to make so I appreciate that that we're on the same wavelength. I do think that at the very least we need to go back and ask the current candidates if they're still willing to stand and participate.

And then, you know, I don't know, I guess we could - if we call - did a new call for volunteers, I guess we could - if we ask them each -- I'm sort of thinking through this on the fly here -- but if we get a response that they would like to continue then just add them, you know, acknowledge that they've already volunteered.

What do we with those that we did select that are willing to move forward still? Do we, you know, we have Stephane's and Tatiana's spot and maybe (Brian)'s spot. So it looks like we need almost a full slate. But, you know, I haven't gone back and looked to see who was actually on the list, who we picked. But I also want to be really sensitive that there is no way that this could get delayed again because I think that would be harmful to future calls for interest in volunteering. So do we know for sure the ATRT is going forward or do we need to wait until after the comments from the community come in on that?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. I made a note of that question as well, which I think we can comment on, but before we do that let's go to Tatiana.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you very much, Heather. Tatiana Tropina for the record. While in principle I don't mind issuing a new call, especially because particular stakeholder group candidates cannot serve anymore, I would like to protect NCSG's interests here and suggest a compromise solution. Because when

(unintelligible) was elected - selected as one of primary candidates and he is our candidate and he is very capable and willing -- well I hope he's still willing -- but he's very capable and knowledgeable to serve on this ATRT review.

So would it be possible if he's still willing to issue an additional call but still hold this place for him? Because he's already selected. If it's possible then of course I personally wouldn't mind an additional call but I think that we need to find a compromise here. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Tatiana. So a few points here, (unintelligible) on all the comments that have been raised, and we'll pick up Ayden's in the chat as well. So the first thing to say is that, you know, might recall, then again it feels like 100 years ago, that out of our January strategic planning session one of the action items for leadership was to contact our representatives on ATRT3 to ask them if they were still at that point willing to serve. So it certainly is high time to do that again given that more than six months have passed since them.

In terms of the question of can the GNSO have another call, because that is actually a question, the GNSO did not run the call the first time. The call came from ICANN Org and it went out to the wider community let's say. So if we are going to have a call, I think we probably need as a starting point to ask ICANN Org if there are obstacles to us doing so.

I think for efficiency's sake, since our staff are pretty busy with things, we could also ask Org more broadly to run that for us, but I would also suggest that we ask other SO/ACs, we can do that through the SO/AC chairs list, if they maybe need this as well. And it could be that the GNSO is not the only group in this position.

And finally on this business of should we wait until after the long and short-term review comments are in, I think that would be very sensible based on the comments that were made to the SO/AC chairs by ICANN Org. They

were effectively waiting for that feedback to happen. And you remember, I was actually the main person to ask for the delay in that until the end of July because I knew there was really no way we were going to get that done on top of the EPDP charter.

So Org has been pushed back a little bit because of our requests by me. But I think we could also seize the opportunity to ask Org why we're asking about having another call, what they envision the timeline to be. And if we get the answer back to be we don't see the timeline happening any soon, then that gives us some pause before we go ahead and ask for that call. So three responses there and with that I'll turn it over to Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Heather. And agree with the thought that, you know, GNSO may not be the only part of the community that's, you know, have - may have volunteers that would not still be able to commit this time. So that's a good point. I just wanted to respond to Tatiana and I can't, you know, I do not remember exactly how this all played out on the Standing Selection Committee.

But we each and every time we select candidates for a review team, we take a hard look at the representation we've selected from each of the stakeholder groups in the GNSO and try to make sure that, you know, if for some reason, you know, a different stakeholder group got two seats the last time that we wouldn't - we would balance that in the next selection. So, you know, it does depend on the pool of candidates of course but, you know, we try very hard to make sure that all of the stakeholder groups are represented. So. And we can do that again.

And I can't answer I think it was Ayden's question about (Wolfgang). It seems to me if he was - if we selected him once, and this is my personal opinion, but if we made - went through and made that selection then - and he's still willing to volunteer, it just seems like a natural point of view just to keep him on there and then select new other, you know, for the other seats, new people for the

other seats. So. But, you know, I would have to go back to the whole Standing Selection Committee too and talk about that.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. Are we comfortable with as a path forward, one, contacting the current ATRT3 let's say additional candidates, two, with communicating with ICANN Org to determine if another call can be done with the SO/AC chairs to determine if they have the need of a similar procedure, and, three, should we or what is Org's timeline in view of long and short-term reviews?

Does that sound like a procedural path forward? Susan, your hand's up but it might be an old hand. Okay. Cool. Any objections to those three action items? Multiple attendees are typing. No objection from Pam. Cool. I don't see any hands up. Rafik no objection. Brilliant. Excellent. And I agree with the statement that Keith has just made. It seems logical that the previously selected candidates should continue if still interested.

I think that's the starting point so I've got that down on the list as number one is, you know, let's contact the candidates, let's contact then that primary additional. Let's understand the scope of what we have. It's unquestionable that we're dealing with extraordinary circumstances here at least as it relates to one candidate. So I can't see that Org would have difficulty with that.

All right. I see no objections. That gives us a path forward. Then for those things that will maybe start on those action items after the meeting. Any further comments then on item nine? No. Brilliant. Okay. Let's move to item ten of our agenda, which is any other business. Item 10.1 is ICANN 63 planning.

I will make a note here to say that the leadership communicated with all of the PDP working groups in relation to the travel support pilot and a decision is forthcoming on that. We were aiming for the 20th of July for having that announced in view of the fact that there is a 22nd of July deadline from

constituency travel, so a reminder to all of us to make sure that our SGs and Cs have this recorded in relation to our own SCC travel.

So we will do our very best to communicate with those a funding pilot applications in time to notify those folks by the 22nd. So that is one point to make. Staff has also put up here the ICANN meeting block schedule. It feels like we only just looked at this and here we go, new meeting.

Donna, I wonder, I don't mean to put you on the spot. It might be Donna or Marika or Nathalie at this point. So Donna did attend the ICANN 63 planning session which overlaps with our GNSO Council wrap up. Donna, I want to put you necessarily on the spot, Marika, Nathalie, I'm not sure, what do we need to say about this block schedule at this point?

Donna Austin: Heather, it's Donna.

Heather Forrest: Go for it, Donna. Thanks.

Donna Austin: I think probably what we can say is that so you'll see that there's a reference to a high interest topic and then cross-community topic session. High interest topic is now loosely defined -- I think if you scroll down underneath, yes -- so high interest topic session is a session on an important topic of interest led by a single SO or AC or SG group.

So what the Registry Stakeholder Group did in San Juan we had a session on a walk in the shoes of new gTLD registry operators and that, you know, it wasn't a cross-community thing but we felt that it was still an important topic given, you know, we're discussing new gTLDs. So that is considered a high interest topic.

And then the cross-community topic sessions are, you know, more the cross-community panel type sessions that we saw in particularly we saw in

Panama. So there's now a distinction between those two. Among the - our planning committee that's always been an area of contention.

So I think it's good that it's - we might have hit on something that's acceptable to everybody. I'll also note that there's only three of these, you know, high interest cross-community sessions planned for Barcelona, and I think that's probably because we - the public forums are back given this is the bigger meeting. So I think that's only thing I'd note, Heather. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna, very much. That's super helpful. Michele, over to you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I mean this is good to see that there's better clarity around what exactly is what. The only issue I have though with these cross-community high interest things is that a lot of them have way too many speakers and just seem to be a kind of let's reiterate what we've - the positions that everybody knows we've held but here I'm going to get bonus points for actually saying it in a different setting.

It's very rare that any of those sessions bring any new content or add any value. The level of interaction with the broader ICANN community at most of these sessions is abysmal. So the question I have really is, you know, what value do they really bring in their current format or is there something that can be done with the format?

I mean be that reducing the number of speakers down to something more manageable but I mean in many cases seeing these panels where there's like what seems to be like dozens of speakers -- obviously I'm exaggerating -- but there just seems to be a lot of speakers, and as I say there's very little new content. There's no dialogue, it's just a here's the opinion you know I'm going to take. I just don't see the value.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. Any further comments on this? So this is of course an ongoing thing. I think we have the next production call -- I know it's fairly

imminent -- so we'll have a bit better sense of -- and Nathalie might tell us in the chat here -- we'll have a bit better sense of -- 2nd of August, cheers, thanks, Nathalie -- we'll have a better sense of how this is going to look as we continue.

But I think what we want to plan into this, building on what we said in the previous agenda items, is we want to work in some sort of time here for a way to talk to the community about PDP 3.0 and by community we mean GNSO and all of us. So we'll keep an eye on that as well.

Any further comments? Any instructions from anyone in relation to advice, in relation to leadership before they sit in on another one of these deeply joyful production calls? No. All right. Well keep feedback coming via the list. We'll remind you before that 2nd of August call comes around and to the extent that we've got any developments between now and then, then we will let you know. So this one is to be continued.

Excellent. All right. That takes us to item 10.2, which is an update on post updates to the council - excuse me, the consensus policy implementation framework and post implementation consensus policy review framework. Staff - otherwise known as CPIFs. Staff has asked me to remind councilors that we have until the end of July to provide input on this. This is something that's been raised several times along the way.

We've had staff here with us to explain what it is that we needed to know about this and give us some sense of where the proposed changes where. You see the document on the screen in front of you with the proposed amendments. We have said before but I think it's worth saying again, you know, we all recognize this is an important effort and it is integral to the GNSO Council's work, and unfortunately it just hasn't been let's say it's been overshadowed by some other things, which is why we're dealing with it now.

So Donna's asked a very good question in the chat, which is what happens if we don't provide input by the end of July? Donna, what I understand is -- and to Carlos' point about an extension -- it's not so much an extension, you know, this is GNSO staff or Org staff that are working on this on our behalf. And Marika can make some comments here. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. Thanks, Heather. This is Marika. So basically what this is, and as Heather noted, I think we circulated already, you know, back in March, you know, the update that Org has made and specifically our GDD colleagues are merely to, you know, clarify some of the roles and responsibilities that Org has and, you know, add some clarity.

You see here on the first page for example instead of saying ICANN, it's ICANN Org. So from our perspective, there is really nothing in here that, you know, changes or alters the way in which implementation is conducted. It's merely that it's, you know, from our perspective an additional clarification and further detail on how some things work on the Org side.

And this was also something that was actually foreseen as part when this document was originally developed as part of the Policy Implementation Working Group activities, it was specifically foreseen in there that Org would keep this up to date and make updates to it as needed. So this has been shared. You know, again, of course this can be further delayed but from our perspective it would be great if that is done because there is indeed a significant concern about what is being proposed.

You know, there are a number of redline changes in here and I think as you can see, again, most of these are just clarifications or further detail with regards to how certain things are done when it comes to the implementation stage of things. There are no changes to, you know, what was originally proposed by the Policy Implementation Working group or anything that affects, you know, existing processes and procedures.

What we can maybe ask, you know, (unintelligible) council got an extension till the end of July to maybe have a quick look and if we do believe that there are issues of concern, of course, you know, we can extend the time, set up a separate time to talk through this or reflect them on what the concerns are and consider modifications.

But I'm a big worried that we're kind of delaying this for no really good reason apart from, you know, we haven't had the time to look at it, noting again that, you know, this is not a change to what is in place or what is being done. This is merely intended to clarify and further detail some of the steps that go into implementation of GNSO adopting policy.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marika. So that let's say is an answer to, you know, the question of can we have more time. We can but I think we want to do it in a structured way. So just noting Donna's question in the chat can we provide this to the list along with (Karen)'s presentation? That gives us that additional information that we can go back now with a bit of peace and quiet, look at this document again or for the first time if you didn't have a chance to look at it in the other points it's been raised with the council, and specifically focus here on the amendments that have been made.

So let's take that as a starting point. Marika will recirculate that information to us to give us a bit more background. And maybe what we'll do is we'll say we'll give it a week or ten days. Let's give it till the end of the month and - which puts us at a number of points let's say of things winding up at the end of the month. But we had said that - anyway, by the end of July let's make a determination of what we need our next steps to be.

If we need something tangible to have more information, then I think it might have been Carlos that suggested it further up, you know, let's have a webinar or something like that where staff -- maybe Marika's suggestion -- staff can walk us through, you know, any questions that we might have at that point, or anybody's who's still not quite caught up at that point, we can do it that way.

So I think let's take stock on the 30th of July and we'll work out at that point either we're establishing, you know, a time for a webinar or we're instructing staff to move ahead. Does that sound like a reasonable way forward? Anyone object to that as a way forward? No. All right. Fabulous.

The last item is the one that I, sorry not in a timely manner, had to add to any other business, and I'm mindful that we're six minutes over time, which is the GNSO review of the GAC communiqué. And that is the able hands of (Yulf). (Yulf), I wonder if you could give us a quick update please.

(Yulf): Sure. This is (Yulf) for the recording. There is a version that's been distributed. It has a couple of small corrections needed to made and it needed to be adjusted a little bit based on what we discussed today. So the status is that there will be an updated version circulated and we have about a week before we need to get it to the board. So hopefully we can get it approved by email before then.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thank you, (Yulf), very much and for championing that effort in the face of some pretty significant distraction. So please keep an eye on that for - on the list. I note Erika has to leave and I note folks have hard stops. So that takes us to the end of our agenda. Any comments, questions, concerns before we wind up our July meeting? (Felipe), please.

(Felipe): Thank you. I'll go very quickly. Just for your information, the DNR work - or the ccNSO from DNR were approached by Bart Boswinkel to develop a - some sort of webinar on the ccNSO with elements relative to the GNSO. We haven't responded to that. I haven't responded yet. It's probably a good idea. But as you might know, the ccNSO Council is in the process of trying to do outreach and improve participation, and that should be seen as attempt to do just that. So that's one thing.

Another thing for people's information, the - as you might know, the (unintelligible) that's sort of still in progress I think within the ccNSO Council and hopefully we'll have an update for the next GNSO Council meeting -- hopefully. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Thanks, (Felipe), very much and thanks for your able service as our representatives to the ccNSO. Any further comments before we close off our July council meeting? No? Excellent. Congratulations everybody. Big day today and big times ahead. Brilliant work by everyone, and thank you very much, particularly with a small team, for all the hard yards that they've done here in the last few weeks.

This ends our July GNSO Council meeting. Thank you very much everybody.

END