Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference
21 July 2016 at 21:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 21 July 2016 at 21:00 UTC. 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:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-21jul16-en.mp3

as well as the Adobe chat transcript at :

http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-chat-council-21jul16-en.pdf

Attendees

NCA – Non Voting –
Carlos Raúl Gutierrez

Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: James Bladel, Jennifer Gore, (left the Council - absent proxy Donna Austin Volker Greimann –temporary alternate for Volker Greimann
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Donna Austin, Keith Drazek, - absent, apologies proxy to Rubens Kuhl; Rubens Kühl
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA):
Hsu Phen Valerie Tan

Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG);
Philip Corwin, Susan Kawaguchi, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Tony Harris, Paul McGrady,Heather Forrest
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG):
Amr Elsadr, Stephanie Perrin, David Cake - absent, Stefania Milan, Edward Morris, Marilia Maciel
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA):
Julf (Johan) Helsingius

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:
Olivier Crèpin LeBlond– ALAC Liaison
Patrick Myles - ccNSO Observer - absent
Mason Cole – GNSO liaison to the GAC

ICANN Staff
David Olive - VP Policy Development – absent, apologies
Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director
Mary Wong – Senior Policy Director
Julie Hedlund – Policy Director
Steve Chan - Sr. Policy Manager
Berry Cobb – Policy consultant
David Tait– Policy Specialist
Emily Barabas – Policy Analyst
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat
Nathalie Peregrine - Specialist, SO/AC Support (GNSO)
Terri Agnew - Specialist, SO/AC Support (GNSO)
Mike Brennan - Meetings Technical Services Specialist

Operator: Speakers, the recordings have been started.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the GNSO Council call on the 21st of July. I will call your names and could you please acknowledge your name so that we are sure you can be heard and that you can vote because we've got three votes on this call. Thank you very much. James Bladel.

James Bladel: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jennifer Gore is no longer with us but Donna Austin holds her proxy. Donna, are you here for yourself and for the proxy for Jen Gore?

Donna Austin: I am, thank you, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, Donna. Volker Greimann. Volker Greimann is the temporary alternate for Volker Greimann. Welcome back, Volker. I know you're on the call. Yes, he's dialing back in. Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Keith Drazek is absent and he sent his apologies. And Rubens Kuhl has his proxy. Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Valerie Tan.

Valerie Tan: Hi, Glen. Good morning. I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Phil Corwin.

Phil Corwin: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Tony Harris.

Tony Harris: I'm present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Paul McGrady. Paul, I do not see him yet. Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Here, Glen, thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: I'm present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Stephanie Perrin. I do not see Stephanie on the call yet. David Cake. David, are you on the call? Stefania Milan.

Stefania Milan: Here, thank you Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Edward Morris.

Edward Morris: Here, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Marilia Maciel.

Marilia Maciel: Here, Glen. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Julf Helsingius.

Julf Helsingius: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Carlos Gutierrez.

Carlos Gutierrez: Here, Glen. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, our ALAC liaison.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Patrick Myles, our ccNSO observer. I believe Patrick is absent. Mason Cole, GNSO liaison to the GAC.

Mason Cole: I'm here, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. And for staff we have David Olive. I don't think he's on the call yet. Marika Konings, Rob Hogarth, not on the call, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Berry Cobb, David Tait, Emily Barabas, Glen de Saint Géry, Nathalie Peregrine and Terri Agnew.

Thank you very much, James. And just before I say over to you, may I remind people to say their names before speaking for the transcription purposes. Thank you very much, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Glen. Thank you, everyone. And welcome to our GNSO Council call for the 21st of July. I hope everyone is having a lovely summer. And for those of you in North America, I hope you've found a nice cool shady place to have today's call.

Before we get started, just a couple of other points here as part of our administrative matters. First off, we should note that we have a new member of staff. It is Emily. Emily Barabas. Am I saying that correctly, Emily? Don't know of Emily is on audio.

Emily Barabas: Yes, you're saying that correctly. Sorry, it was my audio.

James Bladel: Welcome, Emily, to your first GNSO Council call. And also wanted to note that, you know, just looking at the new recently, I note that we have a number of folks from ICANN staff that are in the area around Nice. I certainly hope that your situation is getting back to normal. And I note that we have a number of folks associated with the

ICANN office in Istanbul, where there's been some instability as well. I hope that everyone is doing well there. So just best wishes from all of us.

Okay, next up is any updates to the statements of interest or any announcements as to your status. If so, please raise your hand in the Adobe room or get my attention on the call. Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes, thanks, James. Just to indicate, as Glen has already said, that I'm currently – have been asked to continue my role by the RrSG until a replacement has been elected so I'm basically my own replacement.

James Bladel: Thank you, Volker. And I would ask that folks please mute as well. Thank you, Volker, for that update. And just as a note to the remainder of the Council, we within the Registrar Stakeholder Group are currently beginning our process to fill the vacancies that we have experienced since our last meeting in Helsinki. But glad to have you, Volker, as your own alternate in this case.

If there are no other statements of interest changes then I would then direct everyone's attention to the agenda that was circulated to the mailing list and appears in the Adobe Connect room. If anyone has any questions, concerns, comments or amendments to the agenda could you please raise your hand in the Adobe room or get my attention on the call? Otherwise we'll consider this agenda adopted and move on. Okay thanks, we'll move forward with this agenda and adjust if necessary.

Okay and then finally just noting the status of minutes for the previous Council meetings. The meeting minutes for our session in Helsinki have been posted to the Council list and I apologize that I also neglected to approve or make this announcement relative to the meeting minutes from the May 12 meeting, which has also been posted. And I do apologize to the Council for that oversight and thanks, Heather, for catching me on that.

Sorry, if you could make sure that you're on mute please when you're – thanks. And, Heather, I saw your hand go up and then go down. Did you have a question about the agenda or the minutes or…?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. This is Heather. Indeed, I have an item to add to AOB. It'll be very quick if possible. It relates to the RPM PDP Working Group.

James Bladel: Sure, okay perfect. Thanks, Heather. Glen, could you capture that in the notes here and we'll try to get that on Item 9.1 since I've already made a brief announcement.

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: I'll do that. Thank you, James.

James Bladel: Thanks. And if we could just remind folks to please mute their lines. If we could add that to 9.1 since we've already updated the Council on the status of the Registrars.

Okay, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to note that Susan had also requested an AOB item concerning an update on the Privacy and Proxy recommendations and the status of the Board consideration.

James Bladel: Thank you, Marika. And thank you, Susan. We can certainly add that as agenda item 9.3. I would note, Susan, just as well that that item – that topic is likely to come up under the discussion surrounding the GAC communiqué, which is Item 6, which might give us a chance to address that a little bit sooner. And so if you see a good opportunity to raise your questions then please, by all means, feel free to take it. But otherwise we'll have a placeholder there in AOB.

Okay, any other rocks to throw at the agenda or should we move on? I see Paul has joined us as well so welcome, Paul.

Okay, next up is the review of the project and action items list. Marika, I don't know if you or your team have that hand and can load that into Adobe and we'll walk through that in a relatively expeditious manner. Okay, thank you. And while I zoom this in for my rapidly failing eyes, thank you. So I don't know if you have anything in particular that has changed from Helsinki that you would like to draw our attention to. But the project list is here in Adobe Connect.

I think just scanning down the things that have moved, change their status into Board vote. Everything seems to be kind of, for the most part, stuck in the same status that it was in Helsinki. I'm looking specifically at the three items in status 6.

Marika, if you have any other items that you'd like to draw our attention to, please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Maybe just to note that, you know, we did close out the PDP improvements project and we've added in the drafting team on the GNSO rights and obligations under the revised ICANN bylaws. So the overall numbers may look the same on the top table but there have been some changes with regard to projects being closed and new ones being created.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Marika. Any other items relative to the action list that folks would like to tee up for discussion? Quiet group today. I guess the caffeine is still yet to kick in. So okay. And then if we scroll down I believe the action list – oh I'm sorry, that was still part of the project list. Never mind, it was just second page there.

Here we go. These are the action items. Looking for immediately jumping out at me is the ICANN 57 meeting planning, which is – comes up later on our agenda, I believe, in Agenda Item Number 8, for discussion. We also have identified the Customer Standing Committee, so we have an updating I believe from Wolf-Ulrich on that and including a motion that is Agenda Item Number 4.

We would also note the – well, I wanted to make one other announcement relative to the transition costs. There will be, I believe, Marika and Mary, you can set me straight here, but I believe there will be a call coming in the next couple of weeks for councilors to go over the proposed project cost support team and the cost control mechanisms for the transition related costs. Is that correct? Yes, okay. I note that that is correct. We're still working to confirm the date.

So just a heads up for that, folks, because we will have a webinar at some point and that will give everyone an opportunity to take a look at those mechanisms and raise any questions with ICANN staff and the Board Finance Committee. Thanks.

And then finally, we have some notes here for the GNSO review implementation team for the recommendations, that's also a motion from Wolf-Ulrich. Wolf-Ulrich has been very busy in the interim since Helsinki. And then we also take a look at the revised timeline for selecting a new liaison from the GNSO to the GAC. And that will come up as well.

Any other questions, thoughts or does anyone notice anything missing from this list? I think this is really essentially our marching orders between now and our next call in September. Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yes, in regard to Item 2, the outstanding IGO NGO PDP recommendations, my working group that I co-chair on curative rights processes for IGOs, met this morning. Mary Wong informed us that the Board had a call with the GAC within the last week, and there is a recording of it, and that this topic of the recommendations came up during the call and that Chris Disspain indicated that the Board would be making public its views on this subject soon and at long last so just wanted to report that.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. Good contribution there. I think you're correct, that meeting or that call did occur in the past few days. There is a recording. As far as I'm aware there's not a transcript yet but I believe that is forthcoming. I tried to listen to it prior to this meeting and I only got about maybe 3/4 of the way through the call where they discuss mostly the Helsinki communiqué, but including this topic as well as some of the other topics that we address in our response. But that will be good to get some indication from the Board on their position on IGO INGO recommendations.

Any other comments on the action list? Okay the queue is clear so we can then move to the consent agenda, which is Agenda Item Number 3. There is nothing on our consent agenda so we can move then to our first bit of substantial business, which is the approval of a primary and secondary liaison candidates for the Customer Standing Committee. A motion has been made and amended by Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich, if you don't mind, I could certainly turn it over to you to introduce the motion and then we can open it up to the Council for discussion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks, James. I can do it briefly and then refer just to the resolve of the motion. Just to introduce a little bit, so you may

remember that we had a discussion on that process in Helsinki. This – the GNSO should provide one liaison to the Customer Standing Committee besides the so-called members of the Customer Standing Committee which are provided from the Registry Stakeholder Group and others as well. So the liaison would not have the status of a member, just a participant or a liaison other than that.

The goal of that discussion and the introduction of the process was, well, to raise attention to that application period and in order to get as a variety of applications for that post. So surprisingly, since Helsinki, there was just one application filed to that position from the GNSO. And as we had prepared a process in order – if there would be more than one that we have a kind of ranking with that so that was also it from that situation.

So we just had to decide or to think about is this candidate – does he or she – does he meet the criteria set and if there is any no or objection from the Selection Committee then that should be raised. So that was just the question between yes or no to that committee.

And in the end so we had a kind of evaluation tool which is also connected, I think, or annexed to the motion or to the mail which was sent by Julie. And so we had this evaluation from that. It came out that this candidate was fully accepted by the Selection Committee. So make it briefly, so we, as the Selection Committee, we suggest, well, to nominate James Gannon to the liaison of the CSC. And that is what this motion about.

We can talk about after that, of the ongoing – about the ongoing process with regards to the coordination with the ccNSO and the full slate of applications which the GNSO has to coordinate as well. But first I would say just introduce this motion, the resolved, and then talk about that. So I read the resolved.

First, "The GNSO Council has reviewed the application and the candidate provided by the Selection Committee and approves James Gannon as the Liaison. Second, the GNSO Council requests that the GNSO Secretariat shall provide to ICANN the liaison name along with his Expression of Interest by the deadline of 22 July 2016."

"Third, the GNSO Council requests that the Selection Committee shall engage, if requested, with the ccNSO Selection Committee to evaluate the full slate of CSC members and liaisons. And fourth, the GNSO Council will consider the full slate of CSC members and liaisons either at a GNSO Council meeting, or a vote outside of a meeting, on 9 August 2016." Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And thanks to you and the other members of the Selection Committee for getting this done and completed so quickly. It is unfortunate that we received only one response, however, we are very fortunate in that that response was from Mr. Gannon, who, I think, everyone acknowledges. And I think the Selection Committee determined was more than capable of fulfilling this role so very good. Thank you very much.

Any discussions on this motion? We'll take a queue. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, James. Pardon me. This is Heather Forrest. Not so much a discussion on the motion but it did want to raise a point that we had raised within the Selection Committee indeed echoing comments you've just made, it was unfortunate that we had only received the one application, having gone through a fairly robust preparations process anticipating more and I'd like to have some formal record of an interest in thinking about how we generate more interest for the position when we next have to go through this selection process. Thank you very much.

James Bladel: Well that's an excellent point, Heather. And the term of this role is – this liaison – is one year. Is that correct?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's three years.

James Bladel: It's two years. Okay, thank you Wolf-Ulrich. But I think Heather's point, nonetheless, is a valid one. We need to be thinking about how we are going to generate a more enthusiastic or, let's say, a broader response next time so that's a good point, Heather, and we should probably start thinking about that.

Susan, you're up next.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I also have a question. And, you know, we did discuss – I'm on the committee also. But this came up in our BC call this morning and since we don't have two candidates, minimum of two candidates, so we were supposed to pick a second candidate and then allow the overall CSC committee pick which one of our candidates fit the diversity. But we also – but it was understood or misunderstood, I'm not sure because maybe I misunderstood it, that that alternate was also fill in for our committee member, the GNSO committee member.

So if they could not make a meeting and sort of give their vote in the same way we do, I don't even know if they're voting, tell you the truth, I do get confused on this issue. So is there any structure or rules for this committee in which if we had someone unable to make a meeting that we still are represented in that meeting?

James Bladel: Thanks, Susan. I think the first part of your questions is all of these liaison positions are optional. So I'm assuming that meant that we could only fill one of the two if necessary. We could have conceivably filled zero of the two. I don't see why we would have done that but I think it was an option.

I guess I would probably, if you don't mind me jumping out of the queue here, I'd jumped to Julie and she can answer your question there as well as the question about whether or not this leaves us vulnerable to any missed meetings. Julie, would you mind?

Julie Hedlund: Not at all. Thank you very much, James and Donna, maybe also speaking to this as well. But the assumption was that if we had more than one candidate then the GNSO would present a primary and secondary. That is that the GNSO would express its preference for the primary person becoming the liaison and the secondary would only be submitted in case there were diversity issues and, you know, and for some reason the ccNSO GNSO, when they met, decided that the secondary person met – better met diversity issues.

So there's no alternate role in the Customer Standing Committee. I hope I'm not…

James Bladel: Can we…

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: No, you're still on, Julie. Can we – okay.

Julie Hedlund: So there is no alternate role so we are not missing out on a role by submitting one liaison. And as you did note, James, yes indeed, this isn't – this is an optional, you know, it is optional for a group to submit a liaison. I would not be surprised if the GNSO was not the only group that is submitting just one candidate for a liaison. That may also be happening elsewhere.

James Bladel: Thank you, Julie. Susan, did that address your questions? I thought perhaps you had another one about who actually selected the slate but I'll let you weigh in.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, it wasn't really about the slate, it was more of, you know, if we're going to the time and trouble to select someone even though we had the opportunity to either select someone to be – to represent the GNSO or not, but since we're doing that if they were unable to make the meeting is there a possibility of just putting somebody else in that role temporarily, sort of handing over that proxy. And so that the GNSO is always represented in these monthly meetings or however often they happen.

James Bladel: Thank you, Susan, that's a good question. I don't know. Perhaps Wolf-Ulrich or Donna in their interventions, could cover that or staff. Otherwise we may have to take that one offline. I hadn't considered that before but it may be something that's already provided for in this role. So we could go to Wolf-Ulrich first. I don't know, Wolf, if you can shed any light on that question or you had an intervention on a different topic.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, James. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, so some points. First to the last comment, I understand, you know, there is no alternate and there is no chance, well, to bring a second in. But, you know, all the members and the (agency), they are obliged, well, at least from the charter to participate in I think at least in 9-12 meetings. So they are obliged to participate. If they can't meet that goal then the committee, the CSC, shall be – it could be possible that the committee sends a note to the GNSO, please take care that your delegate is participating in the meeting. So in this way. That's what I understood from the charter. That's one point.

Another point is because of – let me come back to the low – the low number of applications we just had here. There is foreseen a review of the charter after one

year, after the first year, the charter of the CSC should be reviewed by the group itself, I think. And I think from that point of view we should give to James, well, as a task to that – to the CSC, that they should take care about and think about the modalities of the applicants and the conditions set, you know.

I got the impression – had talks to people from my community who were interested. So one had a problem with the time required, well, to participate in, and the other one was the question or the perception that this job is a little bit, let me say, characterized relatively technical. So and so it's – it requires a technical knowledge on specific items with regards to IANA and that is what people – some people may have had problems, well, to apply for. So I think this group should rethink and review after one year also the conditions of – for the applications. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And I think that you raise an excellent point about the nature of the role and the ideal qualifications and background and criteria that would be used to select future liaisons. I might ask that presuming that Mr. Gannon is in fact confirmed in this role today, that we could task him with also helping the Council to define that modality that you identified. At least I think he would have – because this is the first time the CSC is being created and this is the first instance of the GNSO liaison to that group that perhaps he can assist us in defining it a little bit better. So thank you. Next up is Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. I don't have a lot to add but I think Wolf-Ulrich raises a really important point that the charter will be reviewed by the committee of the CSC after 12 months but they do have to take input from other stakeholders as well. And then in addition to that, the effectiveness of the CSC itself will be reviewed after two years. And that's the method of review will be determined by the ccNSO and GNSO.

So in terms of the charter for the CSC, there is currently additional responsibilities that will fall on the GNSO further down the track. So we've undertaken a process to ensure that we understand where the bylaws affect the GNSO Operating Procedures. We probably – and we don't have to do this immediately and perhaps it's something that James can help us with down the track but there are other responsibilities for the GNSO further down the track as regard to CSC as well. So we probably should keep that in the back of our minds.

And I, you know, I understand there's some teething problems with the inaugural CSC, we did have to put this together in really short order. It was a requirement from NTIA so, you know, I really thank everybody for pulling their Selection Committee together in the process. I understand that we've only had one applicant so people might think it's overkill in terms of the manner in which we went about this but I think it sets a good precedent for any future selection that the GNSO Council has to do.

And I know we ran into problems with, you know, some other committees or representatives who were trying to put together for the CCT. So I think this was a good exercise. I understand it seems like overkill because we only had one person interested, but I actually think it's a god process that we can build on in the future. So I don't think everything is lost.

And I really appreciate the effort that people have put into this to make sure that we hit the timeframe that we've been given. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Donna. Good points all around. And it is something that we'll have to think about going forward as the GNSO role in the new ICANN, not just under the bylaws but just generally, is under review. Marilia is next.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you, James. Actually have I doubt with regards to Paragraph 6 of the motion when it says that the GNSO may appoint liaison to the CSC in addition to two gTLD registry operators. My doubt is, are the registry operators going to be nominated in another moment? Is there a selection process ongoing as well? And what will be the different roles between the registry operators when it comes to their participation on behalf of the GNSO and the role of the liaison? Just don't really understand. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Marilia. So my understanding, and we can certainly task – direct this question to Julie or to Donna – but my understanding is that those registry representatives – the gTLD registry representatives will be selected separately through a parallel process. the entire slate of members and liaisons to the CSC will be approved by the GNSO Council. And then that – those roles will be slightly different in that the registries will be members but this particular role for Mr. Gannon has expressed an interest in, will be a liaison, a non-voting liaison. But, Donna may have some corrections to that statement. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. So you're not incorrect in what you said, but I think the confusion for Marilia might be associated with the linkage between the GNSO appointing the CSC liaison and then in addition the two gTLD registry operators. I think the connection here is that the Registry Stakeholder Group is actually a part of the GNSO so there's a linkage there. But the processes for selection are quite separate.

And the Registry Stakeholder Group has actually undertaken a separate process and selected two candidates. So it's just a – I think it's been linked back here because the Registry Stakeholder sits under the GNSO and that this is talking about the supporting organization of the GNSO. So it might just be that some confusion in the wording. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna. And that is done under – by design because the registries – both the gTLD and the ccTLD registries have been identified as direct customers of the IANA function. So I note in the chat that Marilia says that her question was addressed so thank you for that response, Donna.

Okay the speaking queue is clear. Does anyone else have any questions or comments relative to Agenda Item Number 4? Okay, if there are no objections then I'd like to move this motion to a vote. It's been made by Wolf-Ulrich. It's been seconded by myself. If there are no objections we'd like to move this to a voice vote to save time. Glen, if you don't mind, would you conduct a voice vote on this motion?

Glen de Saint Géry: I will indeed. Thank you, James. All those who are not in favor of the motion would you please state your name? Hearing no one, may I ask all those who would like to abstain from the motion please state your name? Hearing no one, may I ask all those who are in favor of the motion to say aye?

((Crosstalk))

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Stephanie Perrin: Aye.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Thank you. And those who are holding proxies are you voting in favor of the motion as well?

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. And may I just note that we have not got David Cake on the call. He is neither in the Adobe Connect room nor on the telephone. And I have had no regrets from him so we will mark him as absent. Thank you very much, James. The motion passes.

James Bladel: Thank you, Glen. Thank you, councilors, for your attention to that agenda item. And thank you to the selection team, once again, for getting this task completed fairly quickly. Just as a little bit of follow up business on this, if we can ask staff to communicate the results of this to Mr. Gannon as well as the Selection Committee. I believe there is still some work ahead, however, this liaison needs to be reported to the entire slate of liaisons and members of the CSC, and then that will be sent back to the GNSO and the ccNSO for our approval.

It is – this is the item that we talked about in Helsinki that is under extreme time pressure to be done, in fact, in advance of our next formal scheduled call. We have a scheduled teleconference on August 9 to vote to approve that final slate of members and liaisons. I would like to – if there are no objections from any other councilors, I would like to propose that we instead cancel that call and move toward an email ballot where we would have an offline email vote on a motion to approve the entire slate of members and liaisons to the CSC.

I don't know if anyone has any objections to that. Hopefully that is amenable to everyone's schedule that we would cancel the August 9 telephone call and instead transition that to an email ballot. And not surprisingly I see in the chat that that is preferred option.

Julie, go ahead, you're up next.

Julie Hedlund: Hi, yes, this is Julie Hedlund. Just I do have, if Marika is able to bring it up, I have just very quickly a slide that I can just show this timeline that you've spoken to just so people have it in front of them. And thank you, the question that I was going to ask is whether or not you wanted to move to holding this as a vote outside of a meeting as opposed to holding a meeting. And so thank you for clarifying that, James. We'll proceed accordingly.

And just as you see here very quickly, expected next steps, the Selection Committee has evaluated the candidate, sent that to the Council, the Council has approved. And now we will go to the GNSO ccNSO (unintelligible) of members and liaisons and then that will be approved through the vote that will conclude on the 9th. So just quickly moving to the next slide.

ICANN will submit to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils, actually it'll go to the Councils, so we'll look for this on the 23rd of July, the full slate of members and liaisons. The GNSO CSC Selection Committee is actually meeting on Sunday the 24th just among themselves to review this slate prior to their consultation call that will be held with the ccNSO.

I'll note that if we had – there is still the need for a motion, you know, for the GNSO to vote on and that motion deadline is the 30th of July, the CSC will be submitting that. And then the was a scheduled call between the two Selection Committees, ccNSO and GNSO, on the 2nd of August, a backup call on the 4th if needed, probably not needed.

And then immediately thereafter the full slate from the GNSO CSC Selection Committee will go to the Council. And then the vote, according to the GNSO procedures, has to be held open for four days in order for it to end of 9 August then it would have to proceed beginning no later than the 6th. And then with that approval on the 9th of August, we would be prepared to notify ICANN by the 10th of August, it says the 11th there, but I think really we're looking for the 10th. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Julie. Important notes here on the timeline. And I think you've very succinctly laid out the path ahead. I have a question, and this is more of – I don't know if we'd call it a procedural or parliamentary question – that if we need to open an email ballot on the 6th of August because our rules require it to be open for four

days, does that mean that we – the cutoff for the motion is moved back from July 30th to July – I don't know, what would that be – July 26th?

I don't know if we could ask staff to take a look at that and make an announcement on the list exactly when that motion is due. And then if we could also ask the CSC Selection Committee, including Wolf-Ulrich, to be mindful of that deadline and make sure that the motion with the full slate of CSC members and liaisons is ready by that time. Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. Actually I have a draft motion for the CSC to consider that we can discuss at our meeting on the 24th of July. So we certainly could, I think, have that motion available sooner. I think you're right, while the procedures do not address this, it would seem to me that the motion should be made available, the deadline should count back from sort of the start of the vote. But I also see that Wolf-Ulrich has his hand raised so I'll defer.

James Bladel: Thanks, Julie. Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks James. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Julie, one question, so as you can see from the timeline this is the coordination process between the ccNSO and the GNSO. However, the GNSO has to – also to agree to the full slate which comprises also from other stakeholder groups, ALAC, GAC, RSAC, SSAC liaisons as well.

My question is, well, do we have any indication about their timelines? Is that – does their – do their timelines fit to what we are doing here with regards to the 24th of July, for example? And other times? Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: James, if I may address that?

James Bladel: Yes, please.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. The requirement is that all the SOs and ACs have to have their members and liaison choices into ICANN by the 22nd of July. So that deadline for the GNSO to make its submission tomorrow also applies to all of the others as well. I know of at least one that has already submitted their liaison selection, the SSAC has already done so. I don't know of others.

But they are all operating under the same deadline. So the intention is that then by the 22nd of July ICANN would have all of the liaisons and members from the various groups and then thus would be able to submit them to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils by the 23rd.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Wolf-Ulrich; thank you, Julie. I think the takeaway here is that there is still a very critical timeline with very little margin for error between us and the completion of this project. Sounds like we are – we all understand what's ahead of us. My only ask then to the CSC Selection Committee is to please present that motion to the Council list as soon as it is finalized rather than waiting for the deadline so that we can be sure not to miss our window for an email ballot.

And it sounds like we're already underway and perhaps it's just a matter of plugging in the names similar to the way that this motion was originally presented. So if there are no other – Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: I'll just note that the way I currently worded the motion, this is Julie Hedlund, there isn't – we don't necessarily – we just say, you know, approval of the full slate of names without having to plug in the names. But we certainly could do that as an amendment. I'll work with the CSC – the GNSO CSC Selection Committee on the final language, but thanks for that point.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you. And I think, you know, Mary has put some of the relevant operating procedures into the chat but, you know, which is probably open to interpretation as well. But just for avoidance of all doubt let's just see if we can get that motion as quickly as possible even if it's a matter of amending it to finalize the names if we're waiting on one of the other SOs or ACs.

Okay, thank you, again for the work on this. And thank you for the work that lies ahead. And, councilors, please be on your toes for a motion and an email ballot, which will be conducted between now and our next formal call in September.

So moving on then to Agenda Item Number 5, we are, you know, a little bit significantly perhaps behind schedule so let's move on then to Item Number 5. We have another motion which is for the approval of the implementation mechanism for the recommendations of the 2014 GNSO review.

This motion, I believe, was made by Wolf-Ulrich. It has yet to be seconded. And probably one of the reasons for that is that there are actually two motions here. Wolf-Ulrich has, in fact, given us two options. And both of those involve how we not only create this new yet to be defined named and acronym-ized organization to implement the GNSO review recommendations, but also what we do in the interim timeframe with the Standing Committee for Improvements, and how that is managed in relation to this new group.

So I put a note to the list that, and I think these are addressed in Resolve 2. I put a note to the list but I think before we dive into discussion perhaps, Wolf-Ulrich, if you don't mind, you could introduce the motion and read out the resolve clauses.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks James. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well this is a follow up from the discussion we had in Helsinki on how to perform the implementation work of the GNSO review working group or working party's recommendations which were adopted by the Board.

And, well, the fact that there are kind of two motions here is, well, it's a tribute to the timing, you know, we have been under time pressure and Marika was so kind to come up and push me and say, well, to be in time so we have to bring the motion to the table 10 days before the meeting. And then the discussion started on how the motion should look like. And in the end it came up – it should be one motion but it should be one of these both options, so which are here at the table.

Well, the difference between the option lies in the question of how to handle the SCI. So we were discussing in Helsinki about and we were convinced that – what I took from the discussion – that there is – there is knowledge within the SCI which should be used and which should be used in a way that as well as SCI members could participate but also others. And that – on the other hand, that we should not have too many people, you know, where the workload is (unintelligible).

So coming from this question, then there was one idea, well, just loaded over this work to the SCI. That was one point. But on the other hand, there was not the real one because the SCI was not – those are much involved in this work should be open also for others.

So the idea was then, well, to advise further, ask for a working group here to participate in. And where also SCI members could participate and then dissolve the SCI after the SCI has done its current tasks.

So why then Option 2, Option 2 is came up because of the specific (character) the SCI has at the time being, the SCI is called a standing committee, and this is different to a working group. That means it is an ongoing group and is not put together on a project by project basis like working two groups or working teams are done. This is one different.

And the SCI has also a charter, which points out how the consensus-finding process is going to be run. And the SCI is working under unanimous consensus, which is also different to working groups who have more flexibility on finding consensus.

So these are the open questions which could not be discussed before I put the motion here to the table and that is why I put it in this form. This is two options. So we should be aware of that and we should then discuss, well, which kind of option we are thinking about could be – would be the better one or the one which is suitable to that process here.

So having said this, I just reading – going to read the resolved. Resolved is first, "The GNSO Council adopts the charter for the GNSO Review Working Group. Second, the GNSO Council directs the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation, the SCI, to complete the two tasks assigned to it by the GNSO Council and submit the proposed revisions for approval at the GNSO Council meeting by 1 September 2016."

And now the Option 1 is, "Upon completion of these tasks, any new requests will revert to the GNSO Review Working Group for consideration. Following the completion of these two tasks, the SCI will be disbanded as its work will have been superseded by the GNSO Review Working Group." That's one option.

Option 2. "During the course of the implementation of the GNSO Review, the SCI will remain dormant until such time the Council identifies a request that needs to be dealt with. Following the completion of the GNSO Review implementation, the SCI will cease to exist and its responsibilities will be taken over by the GNSO Review Working Group as outlined in its charter."

Resolve 3, "The GNSO Council requests ICANN staff to issue a call for volunteers, both to solicit Stakeholder Group and Constituency appointed members and alternates as well as participants from the GNSO and broader community." And fourth, "The GNSO Council directs the GNSO Review Working Group to submit the proposed implementation plan to the GNSO Council for approval at the latest by the ICANN 57."

So to sum up the difference you could see is, well the goal is the same, let me say, with regard to the SCI. The SCI should be disbanded. The question is when? That is the difference in the options. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And I see Heather has her hand up. We begin the discussion. I'd like to put myself in the queue so I'll wait for a couple of minutes. Rubens is next but we'll start with Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James, very much. This is Heather Forrest. I am – I wanted to raise, let's say, a question or a concern. I'm not sure which category to put it in. That I suppose we need to decide fundamentally, as I understand the two options, we need to decide fundamentally if we want one group or two working – if you like – improvements related things. One of the options before us essentially would have a GNSO review implementation team, so to speak, working alongside the SCI which would continue in the work that it does.

And the other option would be that the SCI would fall away and we then constitute a new group, if you like, that would focus on improvements that arise out of the GNSO review recommendations as those were adopted by the Board.

I suppose if we're not interested in – if we're not interested in that latter option, in having only the one group, then I think we've unnecessarily complicated things by

referencing the SCI here. On the other hand, this is an opportunity, let's say, to streamline the improvements work that happens within the GNSO. And I'm personally inclined towards a more streamlined view and not having multiple groups doing related things.

But I do raise the point that, you know, if that's not the interest more generally then – of others – then we've unnecessarily complicated things by even referencing the SCI here. Thanks very much, James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. Great points. We'll move on then to Rubens. Go ahead, Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl for the transcript. My question is what is the current status of the SCI workload, notably the revision of election rules, which is something that we might need possibly before all the other improvements. This is more a question for staff than for Wolf-Ulrich. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Rubens. And I'll Julie answer, but I believe that issue and on other issue are yet to be completed. And we would be talking about standing down the SCI once those two items are completed. So that is still remaining on their plate. Julie, is that correct?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, the – those revisions are actually out for public comment at this time. And that will conclude on the 14th of August at which point the SCI will address any comments that have been raised, probably unlikely to be, and submit the motion for the GNSO then to approve at its meeting on the 1st of September.

James Bladel: Thank you, Julie. And then presuming, Rubens, just to follow up, presuming that we were to select Option 1 or really either of the options, then the SCI would either go, you know, would either dissolve or go into this period of dormancy once those improvements and recommendations were completed.

Okay next up is Phil .

Phil Corwin: Yes, two clarifying questions. Do we envision that any of the members of (SCI) will become members of the new GNSO review working group or will they be populated by completely different individuals?

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil . I think we're anticipating the possibility of some degree of overlap in membership.

Phil Corwin: Okay, so there's a possibility that we could have two groups coexisting with some of the members to say - being the same individuals on both groups. And second, do we envision any possibility that the (SCI) will have anything further to do following the completion of the two identified tasks?

If there is a possibility, then option two would be more prudent. If there's no possibility, then option one, the more streamlined option, would make more sense.

James Bladel: So, Phil , just to respond quickly, I think that their queue or their work queue would be clear once those two items were completed but there would be nothing necessarily to guarantee that new items wouldn't come up during the course of this implementation work.

So I think the option one presumes that if anything were to arise in the future all this was ongoing, then it would be referred to this working group in lieu of referring it to the (SCI).

Phil Corwin: Okay, thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil , great questions. Next up is Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, James. This is Amr. Yes, just wanted to, on one hand echo some of the thoughts that have already been expressed such as having two groups maybe a little too confusing.

I've personally been involved with both the (SCI) in the GNSO review working party and I would personally probably opt for option one and not have too many groups working in parallel, making reviews and changes to the GNSO operating procedures.

Let's not forget that there will also be the third group working on incorporating some of the new community powers into the GNSO so we could end up with three groups working in parallel performing these reviews.

So I would personally advise moving forward with option one but being cognizant, of course, the fact that if any new issues to come up that may require reviews outside of the GNSO's reviews recommendations, then this may affect the timeframe in which this new group will be able to deliver or provide its deliverables.

I also wanted to make another comment on the charter for this group. The SGI has always worked, as Wolf-Ulrich mentioned earlier, on the basis of full consensus. That's how the SGI makes its decisions.

It's worked very well in the past and it's made it important that everyone reaches agreement, the best possible revisions to the operating procedures may be.

This is not the case for this group. This group has the option of either full consensus or consensus. I think it would be a good idea to maintain a full consensus level of decision-making when making changes to the operating procedures.

Whenever new procedures are put in place there by which the GNSO performs its work, I think it's important that all those stakeholder groups and constituencies are on the same page, which should and should not be in there. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Amr. I'm going to ask staff to capture the question relative to the charter and see if that's something that we need to tee up either as part of this motion or as a follow-on task once we have made our decision relative to this group versus SDI.

It looks like - okay, I guess I'm understanding that this is - that approval of the charter is part of this motion. I'm trying to find out where that is actually in the resolve clause. I don't know if, Marika or - if you can point that out. I'm kind of struggling. It's result one. Okay, there it is.

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Yes. Sorry, I was kind of focused on the options down there in (aisle) two but, yes. So the question is to Amr's point is, is that charter open for amendment to restrict it to operating solely on full consensus as opposed to full consensus (or) consensus, which in my experience, has always been a matter of degree or if that is an item that

we would have to separately take on as an amendment to the charter. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Indeed, the charter currently has the two options of full consensus and consensus. And, you know, obviously the council could decide to change that but I think one thing you may want to consider, indeed, is, is it still required to have, you know, full consensus?

We don't even require that for, you know, PDP recommendations and I know that - I think the reason why it was introduced at that stage was as well we just came out of our review and a major restructuring.

So I think that was a sense of there should be some kind of a safeguard in place there. But I think it's a question for the council to ask, is indeed, the changes like this require full consensus or is consensus a sufficiently high bar to meet?

James Bladel: Well, I think first that - thanks, Marika, and I think first off that would beg the question of what is typically the difference between - in a group like this, between consensus and in full consensus or is it simply left up to the discretion of the TBD chairs?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I can answer that. Basically it follows the working group guidelines. So basically full consensus is everyone agrees. Consensus is most agree but a small minority disagrees.

And again, it follows then that the working group guidelines where, indeed, it's in the chairs discretion through a certain process to make that assessment and there're also, of course, opportunities for members of the working group to challenge that designation. So I think that basically follows the same kind of process and approaches being used in PDP working groups.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you. And I think for consensus, we used to call unanimous or lack of objection. Okay, thank you, Amr. Amr has copied the relevant part of the charter in the chat here.

Okay, well, let's - if you don't mind, Amr, I'd like to - I'm not abandoning your question. I think it is relevant. I think that we just, that we could, please let's go to

Wolf-Ulrich here and then see if any other counselors would like to weigh in on this particular question that you've proposed.

And I do know that you've proposed any sort of an amendment to the charter formally. It's just a discussion point at this stage. Is that correct or are you formally asking that we consider amending the charter?

Amr Elsadr: Well, James, this is Amr again. I did bring up as a discussion point and I only actually read the charter very recently so apologies for not bringing this up sooner. But it would just like to propose making this change at this time and if there are objections to this, I'd be happy to listen. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks. Thank you for the clarification. I think the trade-off, I guess, would be that any recommendations that have full consensus coming out of this group would, therefore, have a stronger sense of adoption by the community and legitimacy.

Of course, that also raises the risk that some of the recommendations may not achieve that threshold, and therefore, or they might have passed, for example, under just general consensus.

It would fail under the full consensus test, so I think that's the trade-off that we're looking at. And I say that without necessarily having any particular motions or recommendations in mind. It just seems like that's kind of the spectrum that we're toying with. Okay, next up is Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, James. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, to that point, that was exactly the only reason why I put these two options here to the table. This is not the question, well, shall we have two bodies in - working in parallel?

In the idea was, you know, was to put (CSEI) in a sleeping mode just in case, you know, in between - during the phase, this implementation phase, if there's something.

But if we can agree, well, that this is not the (unintelligible) in there would also not be any, let me say, prioritization conflicts on that team with regards, well, how to deal with new incoming tasks in parallel to the ongoing implementation work.

And I would be fine with that. So this is not a big problem. With regards to the question of Amr, you know, and the consensus question, this is a thing, while, I think you need some discussion, maybe we could split it in that way if that's - for example, for the implementation work, as usual, we see the working group under the existing working group guideline working with their consensus finding approach.

And after that, after it finishes the implementation work, there shall - I understand that this group is going to act into work like the ((SCI)) did. So they're looking to the then existing GNSO procedures and so on, and if there's something to do, then they shall deal with that. Then they could work on the charter they did until now. So we think over that, so that could be also a point. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And I put myself in the queue but I would just give anyone else an opportunity to speak before I weigh in. I just wanted to make sure that I wasn't picking us off on a tangent here.

Okay, so without going into too much detail, I think, I sent a note to the list and I think it's very much echoes some of the statements made by Phil , by (unintelligible) and by some of the others that option one to me seems to be the most efficient and expedient, particularly given that it will likely - it'll be very likely that the new working group and the ((SCI)) will have significant overlap.

And so standing one down and (unintelligible) up makes a lot of sense to me. That's just my personal view. I think, to Amr's point, regarding consensus, if it makes folks were comfortable with option one, or if it makes option one more readily available to take on the new work that would've otherwise gone to the ((SCI)), then I am also open to the idea of modifying the charter to address the consensus question that Amr has raised to make it match that of the ((SCI)) that is going to be dissolved.

So I don't necessarily see a problem with that, however, it is possible that some of the things coming out of this group may fail to reach that higher bar consensus. But if that's the will of the council that we should consider that.

The only other option that I mentioned in would - in my email - and would just present to the council again is that we should also consider asking this particular group to make a recommendation on whether or not there is a need for and ((SCI)2) or some

other body at the conclusion of its work to deal with the ongoing questions that may come up.

So that once it's completed, its implementation work, at some point in the future, that it would stand itself down in favor of some sort of ((SCI)2). So those are just my thoughts and I don't know of anyone else would like to weigh in on this.

I particularly like to hear from anyone who has any concerns relative to Amr's proposal. I haven't, you know, given it a whole ton of thought but it seems like, you know, like I was just mentioning.

It seems like mirroring that of the ((SCI)), if we're going to absorb that group, makes sense but there's probably something I'm overlooking. So I don't know of anyone has any strong objections to that or if anyone has any final thoughts at all. Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, James. Wolf-Ulrich. Well, combining that, I think it's - it would be a good approach, option one, plus - and, there is no need now to amend the motion in the sense rather than just to take option one.

But to put into the minutes, an action item which, as well, the working group charter should be discussed in the sense, well, which was discussed right here to open it up for or to amend the consensus finding approach here. So that is possible just to put this is an action item, that would be helpful. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. I think you and I are thinking along the same lines is that we would have something in the adoption of this motion as an instruction to this group to ensure that all of this - recommendation, that it expects to be submitted to council for consideration, would have reached at full consensus threshold.

I think that is something that we can incorporate into this motion if it's adopted. And, yes, Heather, you're correct. (SCI2) is looking for down the road, probably at a time when all of us have retired to a beach somewhere hopefully. But just trying to think of how we would transition that I had, but you're correct, it's something we can address as a goes on. Marika, you're up next.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. They be a way out of this because, of course, you know, the charter is currently written as it is and is still has the two options, so maybe, as part of your consideration of this motion that you can just make clear and we can reflect that in the minutes that you're, you know, it seems that you're going for option one.

And as part of the vote - or as part of the adoption of the motion, if staff could then maybe clarify in the charter that, you know, full consensus because I think it is basically written now that recommendations can either have full consensus or consensus (and clarify) the full consensus applies to any recommendation that, you know, that suggested changes to the GNSO operating procedures.

If that is the direction they're going, I think that is a relatively simple update we can make in the charter but we would need to clearly reflect that. And as part of this conversation in the minutes, that that is part of your consideration and vote on this motion.

James Bladel: Thank you, Marika. And I think that's a constructive suggestion and I know from the chat that Amr has also - is on board with that approach as well as Wolf-Ulrich. So the speaking queue is clear. If you don't mind, I'd like to start to bring this one in for a landing.

I think of him hearing correctly, that we want to go ahead and do exactly as Marika suggested and make that note regarding the consensus level, make sure that that is noted in the minutes as part of this motion and that that is communicated as part of the charter in the chartering and convening of this group.

And I'm also, if I'm not mistaken, hearing a stronger consensus around option number one, that this new group would essentially take the place of the (SBI). The (SBI) would finish its current slate of work and then it would be disbanded.

And that any new (SCI) items that would have normally gone to the (SBI) will, instead, be referred to this new group. So if there are no objections, or if there are no further comments are discussions on this particular motion, then I would like to recommend that we, instead, strike option number two from resolved to, which looks like that's already been done.

Hopefully, Wolf-Ulrich, because he designed the motion that way, used that as a friendly amendment. And if there are no concerns, I would be happy to second this amended motion.

And finally - and friendly - thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, for noting that in the chat. And if there are no other concerns, then I would thank everyone for this and then we can move to a voice vote unless anyone would prefer a roll call vote. Glen, if you would please, then, proceed to a voice vote.

Glen de Saint Géry: I'll do that. Thank you, James. Anyone who is not in favor of this motion, please state your name. And there's nothing in the chat. Anyone would like to abstain from this motion, please state your name. Hearing no objections to the motion nor abstentions, would you please all say aye if you're in favor of the motion?

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you and I will note again that David Cake is absent. Is not on the telephone line nor on the Adobe Connect. Thank you very much, James. The motion is (processed).

James Bladel: Thank you, Glen. Thank you, counselors and thank you Wolf-Ulrich. And if we could ask staff to make those notes in the minutes as well as communicate this to the (SDI) as Wolf-Ulrich and Amr have noted in the chat, we will recommend that we begin (the process to) stand up this new group and put out a call for volunteers in the near future.

Okay, next up we have - and just looking at the clock year, we've got some time to make up here. Item number six, which is a response to the GAC communique.

At first off, in order of apology, this was something that Donna and myself and Heather and volunteered to take on and because of the travel back to Helsinki and the holiday here in the US, I was a little late in getting my draft to these two vice chairs so I apologize for the delay in circulating a draft response to the list.

The response to the communique, I think, has a number of key issues and hopefully folks have had a chance to review that. But most important way, I think in terms of time sensitivity, is that we understand, from discussing with staff, that the board will be considering the privacy proxy, PPSAI recommendations (here) in the meeting that I believe is scheduled for the next few days.

So if it's not possible for us to only review the response to the GAC communique for folks perhaps have not had enough time, then I would ask that if nothing else, if we could at least submit our response to item number two which is the response specifically to the GAC advice on privacy proxy services.

Then that would be submitted to the board in a timely manner so that they could consider that as part of their discussions. But otherwise, the response to the GAC communique was developed, as I mentioned, by myself and Heather and Donna and along with (Mary) and Marika who did some fact checking and helped make sure that we were technically and procedurally corrected our statements.

We did align all of our responses with the topics as they appeared in the GAC specifically as it's mentioned in the vice. The major themes are new gTLDs, privacy proxy as I mentioned, the two letter country and territory names at the second level, three letter codes as gTLDs for subsequent rounds, and then I think that was it.

So that is the motion that we have on the table. The - I would like to take any discussion at this point of either the substance of the communique response or any other comments on this document.

So the queue is clear. That either means that everybody read it and loved it or didn't have time to read it and I think it was probably the latter because we submitted it kind of late. Rubens, go ahead.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens speaking for the transcript. James, the only minor issue I have is with the IGO or NGO acronym session. Probably noticed that we just mentioned that GNSO could make changes to the approved policy, GNSO council couldn't make changes to the approved policy.

But during our session we went further than that and said that also the board would make policy themselves which would be a stronger message. So are we sure that we want to (dumb down) this part of the message? That's my question. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Rubens. It's a good catch and I think that it certainly is not the case that we intended to send a dissimilar message on this topic in the response to the GAC advice that we sent to the board in person in Helsinki.

Can you think of any language that could be added to the response of item number five that would close this gap and get those two statements aligned? Is a good catch and I do thank you for it but I'm not sure exactly how to address it except to say that it was not the intention to walk back the statements that we made in Helsinki.

Rubens Kuhl: I can make some (suggestion) but not right now, not on the fly.

James Bladel: Okay, understood. Thank you Rubens. Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. This is Heather Forrest. I just wanted to point out, take the opportunity maybe by way of explanation or owning up to something, there's pretty significantly which in here urging the GAC to engage with PDP working group.

These were comments that we all try to make in our various meetings involving the GAC in Helsinki and just as a point, James, to note that we made an extra effort in

this response to the communique to reinforce the message as many times as we could. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. That is correct and that is, I think, a theme that we do try to have been note as frequently as possible in these responses or in most of our engagements with the GAC generally. I think that's something that we are very consistent on our message, I think, with that. Volker Greimann, speaking for Volker Greimann.

Volker Greimann: Yes, thank you, James. I'm very pleased with the results of the comments of the review and of the presentation especially with regards to the privacy proxy which is an issue that could very well blow up in our faces if it were (done) incorrectly.

I think we have found very diplomatic language that still is very strong showing these are the (unintelligible). This is the point where the (IR can go). This is something that would be out of scope for the IRT.

I think this is a very good way of putting down our concerns with the recent GAC recommendations where, while still not throwing the ball went into the face of the GAC. So I'm very pleased with it.

James Bladel: Thank you, Volker. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. (Donna Austin). Not speaking directly to what we have in front of us here but for those interested, I have listened to the conversation between the GAC and the board that was conducted yesterday around GAC advice.

I pick it really is worth a listen from - of the council members. There was a discussion that Cherine asked a question about. You know, what can the GAC do when there is this situation where GAC advice is different from GNSO recommendations because Cherine feels like the board is put between a rock and a hard place?

And from a GAC perspective, they feel that they're restricted by the current bylaws in the current processes so they only provide advice to the board. They don't have any other way to, you know, any other mechanism to provide advice to the GNSO, for example.

Thomas Schneider did say that they're trying to get more involved earlier in the process but I think there still is a misunderstanding from Alice - Kenya - from the Kenyan GAC representative - spoke to the PPSAI issue and noted that the PSWG was involved in the PDP process but didn't like the outcome.

So that's why they've come back with the advice which they think isn't too bad because it was based on a discussion between the GNSO in the GAC. So I think it's worth a listen or, you know, maybe once we get the transcript, I would certainly recommend that folks have a read of it.

I think there's some interesting things that are starting to boil to the surface that will involve a better relationship our understanding between the council, board and GAC roles, so I think it's worth a listen. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Donna. And I think I would also recommend folks to take a listen to that call. It's about - it's a little more than an hour long and we could certainly circulate the link again or circulate the transcript once it's available.

I also noted - I heard the same things which is that the GAC is saying something along the lines of, well, you know, of course we're sending a recommendations in our device to the board because that's - under the bylaws, that's all we're allowed to do.

But I think going back to Heather's point, we can also say, well, you have another option which is participating in the PDP as well. Not - but I think their point was that we don't advise the GNSO.

We advise the board. So, okay next up is - I put myself in the queue here. I'll drop down to the bottom here and allow Carlos to jump ahead of me and next up is Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yes, I - excuse me - Phil Corwin for the record. I want to briefly comment from my perspective as co-chair of the working group that's looking at curative rights protections for GOs.

And number - just commenting on the GAC language here where they say that the IGOs are best placed to comment upon the compatibility of any proposals with a unique status.

We've been frustrated in that working group and that the IGOs have largely not participated. More recently in Helsinki, three representatives have - three NGOs - WIPO, the World Bank and the OECD - participated and they followed up with a joint memo to our working group.

But in their individual capacity, and then we held the phone call with them in our next - not our meeting held today but last week and asked whether they could, you know, would be able to make that on official position on behalf of their IGOs, and they indicated that would be very difficult.

So while the GAC says this, the reality is that the IGOs are not very willing to engage, and when they do it's more their representatives give personal opinions rather than official positions in the organizations they work for.

I don't know we need any additional language here to encourage the board to do something, given the two years they've been engaged in closed door discussions with the GAC and some IGOs on this issue.

But now that are working group is reaching our final stage and we began today to discuss what we're going to do in terms of a recommendation in the final report with the aim of having that out for comment before Hyderabad, it's - I don't want to say it's difficult but it would be better in making final decisions on curative rights protections for IGOs if we know a position the board was going to take on permanent protections for IGO acronyms.

We're kind of working somewhat in the dark without knowing if and when the board is going to take a position on that after these two years of discussions.

So I just wanted to bring that input. I don't know of any additional language is required to encourage the board to speak on that but it would be helpful to our working group to know what, if any, position they're going to take on that issue of permanent protections for IGO acronyms. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Phil, for that update and I think we did note that there may be something coming from the board on that relatively shortly, certainly in advance of Hyderabad but I don't want to presume.

I just think that we're expecting some sort of a response. If nothing else, response to the letter that we sent prior to the meeting in Helsinki might help set a little bit of light as well. Next up in the queue is (Susan). (Susan), go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, James, and just to satisfy my question and AOB I was not thinking when I made that request that they would be discussing this. But I agree with Donna. I listened to the board GAC session and there was - several concerns were raised in my mind, one on the PPSAI in the PSWG.

You know, I participated pretty consistently on the PPSAI and there was not law enforcement weigh in at the level we needed it. There was law enforcement on the calls a lot or at times but, you know, very little drafting, very little suggestions of what - you know, they didn't ask for things.

And so I'm concerned with the GAC language. Glad they didn't go to formal advice and push, you know a stalemate. But, you know, one of the members, you know, seemed to be under the impression that the PSWG did participate actively so the perceptions are little wrong in my opinion.

And then one of the board members, and I apologize for not remembering who it is, but also made the comment which was made in Helsinki by one of the board members of - that the board was in a position when they had, you know, GAC advice, it was contrary to the GNSO recommendations, that all they could do was sort of bring the two parties together to come to a resolution.

I don't think that is the only thing they can do. So I think we're going to be facing this many times down the road and I'm concerned about that. The language in this document I'm fine with, so.

James Bladel: Thanks, Susan, thank you especially for the last bit about the note that, while, your concerns regarding this and some of the statements made on the call, that the language in the responses is satisfactory.

Can I ask that when we are expecting some movement from the board on this, the PPSAI issue specifically in those recommendations here later this month, that when that that one that is released, that you review that and make sure that it addresses your concerns as well. On the way we may need to amend or weigh in again on this topic if those are not satisfactory.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

James Bladel: But I think - and just to note also that Susan noted that AOB, Item 9.3, which is probably going to be a victim of the time anyway, is no longer necessary.

I put myself in the queue because - to address mainly Rubens' note here, that you know, that potentially we could amend - because I think Rubens', so far, and I may have do something, but to my knowledge so far Rubens is the only person that has noted a deficiency in the language of the response itself.

And I was going to ask if we could fix that and I'm probably going to incur the wrath of Marika by suggesting something so glib on the slide here but that in the response, we would say something along the lines of the GNSO refers the board to the previously adopted recommendations of the PDP addressing this topic, comma, and our statements on this issue in our engagement session in Helsinki.

So that would be comma, and, our statement on this issue during our engagement session in Helsinki. And that's my effort - a little brutal, doing surgery here on the document right here in the table.

But that's my attempt to close the gap that was identified by Rubens between the statement and the statements that we made in Helsinki, is that we essentially just piggyback on to that conversation which I believe the transcript has already been made public.

So I would put that out there and see if, Rubens, if that addresses your subject and if there's anyone on staff that can put that in the language of a document so that folks can read it and see it. That would be fantastic. Okay, it looks like Marika is going to take care of that. Next up is Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, this is Carlos. Thank you, James. I really want just a clarification. We had a discussion on this review of the communique this week. Sorry for wearing a different hat in the NCSG policy call. And I was (unintelligible) because - well, it was not a very - not many people were there, but there was not a great understanding of the purpose of this instrument, the review of the communique. And when I hear the discussion we just had, I have to ask, who are we addressing this review to? Is it for everybody? For the GAC and the Board? Or is it only for the Board, which in my view was the initial intent about a year ago.

Because when I look at the comments, some seem to be geared towards the communique itself or towards the GAC and the other ones to the Board. And I don't know. I'm not clear if we are sitting the three part on the same table - the GAC, the Board, and the GNSO - or if we're talking to the Board only. I hope I made myself clear, but I would really like to have more time and read it and comment and hear the transcript of the call.

James Bladel: Thank you, Carlos. And I would just answer the question. I believe we are attempting to focus our response to the Board. I think it's understood that this will be a public document and that the GAC as well as the broader ICANN community will review this response to the communique. But I think specifically and in particular where we're asking something in particular or want to communicate our interpretation of the policy implications of the GAC communique, then those statements are made to the Board.

But with the - you know, with an eye to the fact that this will be public. And I know that sounds a little squishy and we're trying to have it both ways, but I think you are correct to point out that the primary audience is the Board. Okay. No one else in the queue, but very active chat window. And I note that we have now uploaded the amended language that serves to close the gap that was identified by (Reuben). I would also note that Carlos has at least informally indicated that perhaps he would like a little bit more time to review this document.

That is certainly something that the council could choose to do, which would effectively defer our response to the Helsinki Communique to the early September meeting. And I think, you know - just editorializing here just a little bit - probably none of the topics on here will have suffered greatly from the absence of our response except for perhaps privacy proxy item number two. So it is certainly one of the paths or the options that we could take, but I would encourage folks that if we have an option to - or if we have a path where we can send all or at least that section of this document by the Board's next meeting - which is coming in about a week from tomorrow - that we should endeavor to do so. Any thoughts on that? Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks James. Donna Austin. I really have a preference of being timely in the - you know, in the delivery of this document. If this doesn't go until September, we've kind of lost a window or an opportunity. So I guess I have a strong preference to get it out sooner, rather than later. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Donna. Marilia.

Marilia Maciel   Thank you James, this is Marilia speaking. Actually, it's just a quick comment on how to proceed after we send the response. I think that the question that Carlos asked about who are we speaking to is a very pertinent one. If we start to speak with the GAC, maybe it's interesting that we have some follow up and then maybe the liaison of the GNSO to the GAC has a role to play here. I know that in many parts we invite the GAC to participate in PDPs and I think that is the way to go.

But maybe we should also make an effort to understand what are the difficulties and if there's anything that we can do to make the participation of GAC members something more easy in the ongoing PDPs. So maybe if we can activate the liaison in this dialogue with the GAC after we send this response - the communique. And maybe this would be a good idea to bring them in. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Marilia. Good suggestions. And I would ask that staff capture that for follow up with (Mason) regardless of how we go through this particular ideas. We can get that communicated back to the GAC as well as - not just the GAC - but also the GAC/GNSO consultation group to continue to work on this particular challenge of getting the GAC involved as early as possible.

I'm noting here that - yes, that there's some active questions in the chat here. For example, Paul is asking if we're voting on this today or are there just too many questions. Donna is noting that we could possibly add this to our August 9th e-mail ballot. Carlos has asked on two occasions if we can have just a little bit more time to review this - he said until Monday.

So - okay, let's change gears here. What if we were to defer this particular motion and the document to the August 9 meeting, which means essentially that we would have to have this language finalized fairly quickly by I believe the 26th. So we would have essentially little less than a week to finalize this particular document to address some of the concerns and to give folks another opportunity to review it. And again, I take full responsibility for the delay in getting this out with the short window we had coming back from Helsinki and the holiday that pretty much took all the American's off the board.

So my fault there. If there are no objections then I can simply withdraw this motion and resubmit it. And I may be out of the office, so I may ask for some assistance from one of the vice-chairs to resubmit this motion for review in advance of our August 9 e-mail ballot and then that would mean - just so we're clear - that would mean that there would be two items up for a vote on the August 9th ballot. That would mean that the - this communique document and the (unintelligible) of approval of the (unintelligible) of members and liaisons to the CSC.

And it is also possible that between now and then that the ground may have shifted under us a little bit in that the Board may have actually adopted - for example - privacy proxy recommendations or adopted them with some additional caveats or instructions to the GNSO. That is part of the risk that we're assuming here, but I think it is part and parcel of just the calendar and the way it's shaping out. So Amr's asking why not just defer it to avoid the needing to resubmit. Yes, that's fine. We'll make that easier and we'll just - we'll just defer it and then I just think Paul here is noting that there was no way to control the Board's vote with the GAC, which is the missing piece.

Yes, correct Paul. And that also I think we were a little constrained by the quick time between - the short amount of time between our meeting today and the Board's

meeting on the 29th. So that's also kind of boxed us in a little bit here. So - but thanks everyone for your thoughts. Good thoughts on this and hopefully if we can - to Carlos' point - if we can just take a couple of more days to look at this, get it hashed out on the list, make sure that everybody is feeling warm and fuzzy about this particular response, and then we can get that over to the Board as quickly as possible. And staff is going to assist us in getting the latest version circulated around. So thanks everyone for your thoughts on that.

Then moving on to item number seven and that was the - we've got 10 minutes left, so if I could ask for folks to - since we're taking next month off, mostly, if we could just ask for folks - everyone's indulgence for the next couple of agenda items, we'll tear through them as quickly as we can in order to close out our workload here. We are done with the motions. We now have item number seven, a discussion on modifications to the procedure to address Who Is conflicts with national law.

There is a - I believe - a schedule - overview of the proposed schedule - or, no, I'm sorry. Review of the council discussion. We had a discussion in Helsinki, I know there were some spirited discussions about the process itself and whether or not it addressed some of the challenges that we particularly contracted parties are encountering when their obligations under their contracts with ICANN with respect to Who Is. (Dr. Runn) in conflict with local law. I think we had a lot of comments and discussion about the process itself and whether it solved those issues. I think the answer was no, it doesn't completely solve those issues.

But I think if we could potentially - and perhaps naively - if we could focus our discussion at the council on - the triggering mechanism is what is being proposed. If we can focus on that specifically rather than trying to boil the ocean of all the privacy issues that we continue to encounter with Who Is and some jurisdictions, that would be I think a good use of our time. I'd like to cut the time on this to just 8 to 10 minutes, because I don't know that we have any immediate actions on this.

But I think Marika will probably point out that at some point we will need to examine the changes to the triggering criteria that are under discussion now and whether or not that would be subject to a motion for future council meeting for us to consider. So with that, does anyone have any thoughts or contributions on this particular agenda

item or would like to add to this particular discussion? I didn't see who came first, so I'll defer to staff. Marika first. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to know with regards to the timing that this be - until the moment that the council confirms, you know, whether or not this is, you know, conform - or the post modifications are in line with the intent of the original policy recommendations, you know, no changes will be made by staff to the procedure. So that is basically the timing aspect.

James Bladel: Thank you, Marika. So we control the clock on this one. We're not responding to something externally. Good clarification. I have Donna and Stephanie. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks James. Donna Austin. So just a question for Marika. If we approve this, does that mean there's not another opportunity to have a discussion around possible triggers? You know, just to put it in context, from a registry perspective we don't think the additional trigger is really viable or workable. But perhaps it is in some unusual circumstances. So if we don't approve it, then that trigger isn't available to anybody. But I wonder whether - what's the process if we want to start a - god forbid - start another process to look at other possibilities? So it's more a procedural question, I think. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Donna. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I don't think anything prevents the GNSO from confirming that the proposed modifications are in line with the intent of the policy recommendations and at the same time requesting additional work as undertaking to review whether there are also other potential modifications that, you know, would also not be out of sync with the original policy recommendations. And then that regard it may be helpful as well if the council would at the same time think about what kind of process - I think it would work.

In this case, you know, it wasn't I think what we call an implementation advisory group that was formed, which was I think a kind of a new concept that was used here. You know, maybe not the best approach, maybe there are other ways. So in that sense, if that is the approach that council would like to pursue, it may be worth as well thinking through what kind of mechanism do you think would work to consider

potential other triggers. And as such, I don't think there's a conflict necessarily between the two approaches, if that is what you want to pursue.

James Bladel: Thanks Marika. Next up is Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks - Stephanie Perrin for the record. I see in the chat yes it is Groundhog Day. I'll try to keep this brief; you know I'm probably good for hours on the lunacy of that group. I may be picking up on what Marika just said is there somebody that could set up a PDT to look at this? I'm not optimistic we're going to get a new Who Is conflicts of law policy coming out any time soon.

The original one was not generated through a PDP. It's my understanding it was a Board directed thing coming out of the - one of the first task forces. Many of you know this painfully well, I don't - I wasn't here for that - but it's an odd duck and to agree that this is okay casts it in stone for the procedures. Yes, but the policy didn't come out of a PDP, Marika, that's my point. That policy doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

So is there any way we can simultaneously start looking at this and try to get it to work? Because what we came up with with the new trigger in my view is not going to work and risks precipitating complaints, fines, and all kinds of repercussions under the directive - rather the new regulation in Europe - that are going to hurt the registers. I can't understand why they rolled over on this in the implementation committee except for the fact that they've thought about this for so many years that it's just eye glazing over time. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Stephanie. And just a note that we do have an existing PDP that perhaps - another option would be that we could refer this work to an existing PDP and the RDS work that is ongoing. But I think to your point was that, you know, looking for something a little bit more expeditious than the RDS, which is I think - has a much longer time horizon. But that is one - perhaps not a viable option - but it is an option. Paul, you're up next.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Paul McGrady for the record. I guess I'd like to understand what we're really talking about. Are we talking about reopening things that were already discussed at length and a consensus could not be reached on them? And so we're suggesting a

second bite of the apple? Or are we talking about new and fresh ideas? It seems to me that we should be fairly conservative about deciding that we don't like the outcomes of a consensus process and then, you know, remanding it down to say, you know, try again because we don't like it.

So I guess I'm just - in the coming weeks I guess this topic will continue, because I don't think we're going to settle it in the next 45 seconds, but I'd like some clarity about what's really being proposed, because it's not clear to me at all that we're proposing that we talked about fresh ideas. It seems like we are sending back the same old ideas that were rejected back down. And, you know, there is - as the chat says - a groundhog day feeling about that. So thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Paul. And just in the interest of time I'll probably do a very poor job of noting that - and I am failing in trying to maintain the distinction between the policy itself and the triggering or the criteria to invoke the policy. And I think that's what's being discussed here is that we have this policy that nobody likes and then we have these triggers to invoke the policy that nobody likes as well. And we're talking about modifying the triggers to invoke the policy.

And as far as I know this is not something that, you know, has been, you know, tabled and somebody didn't get, you know, get this and so they're taking another swing at it. I think even the folks who want to see improvements in the policy acknowledge that this doesn't really fix anything. So, you know, I'm probably not doing it justice there, but it's along the lines of there's a policy that exists and there is a recipe to trigger it. And then we're talking about adding a new trigger to that policy but I think that as we're hearing on this call, there's a - quite a bit of doubt that that does any good towards addressing the concerns that people have with the policy itself, if that makes any sense. I probably just made it much worse, actually.

So I put myself in the queue here because I just - I wanted to note that - I'll go ahead and lower my hand. I think I said the piece that I wanted to piece, which was just trying to separate the substance of the policy from the process that's used to trigger and evaluate the policy. And I think that distinction is somewhat lost when we get into these conversations. Not just because it's - the controversial nature of the Who Is policy but just that this is a tricky subject and the landscape is changing as Stephanie

noted. As we speak. Stephanie, is that a new hand or an old hand? Must have been an old hand, thank you. And Volker, you're up next.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, James. Volker Greimann speaks for the transcriptor. And I made most of my points during the last meeting that we had in Helsinki. Don't know what wish to rehash it all. I still think that this is a process that will sloth to the outset by the merit of who was invited to join this. This in my believe should have been discussion in the contract parties and ICANN because it's about the contract, it's about what is possible under currently on the law of the country where it's (unintelligible) are situated and where there is a conflict with that law how to deal with that as a process.

There is a process of the - in the different agreements how to deal with that, what would trigger that. That is a different question, however. I feel very, very - with the outcome - I'm very, very unhappy with the outcome (unintelligible) entirely and start over and try to fix a little tiny bit of something. But in my view (unintelligible). Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Volker. And I think that - it's well said and I think that, you know, before we charge off and, you know, start looking at this in the lens of potentially creating a new PDP or creating a new RDS, unfortunately we're being punished a little bit for having some foresight. I mean, we see the challenges, we see the conflicts and we are - ICANN is nothing if not comprised of very bright people who want to fix something before it becomes a problem, before their industry folks are put into this paradox where they have to acknowledge that they're breaking a law in order to fulfill their contracts.

And we're trying to head that off, we're not doing a very good job of it, and I think it's not something that we're going to solve in this particular call, but it is something that as we noted here that we have some work to do in terms of a council discussion. So let's tee this up for a broader discussion on the list. I'm looking specifically for constructive ways to…

Operator: Your call cannot be completed as dialed. Please check the number and dial again.

James Bladel: You know, constructive ways we can move forward. Perhaps one of the things - I'm noting from staff that the - this particular group that made this recommendation for a

new trigger did not contain any contracted parties at all, so I don't know if that means that their views were not taken on board or if the contracted parties just kind of voted with their feet in thinking this was just not going to address any of the issues. I'm not sure. Maybe it's a question of just, you know, if we can table those recommendations and have the further discussion between now and our next call. But to (Marika's) point, there is no ticking clock here. It is just - we're just waiting for that first conflict to actually manifest itself.

Next if we could ask very quickly your indulgence for the next few minutes to move to agenda item number eight. I took a rough stab at a skeletal schedule for ICANN 57 in Hyderabad. And the objective was - and if you recall there were a fairly extensive (unintelligible) in Helsinki. And I tried to capture all of those and reflect them in this document. And Marika, thank you again for your help as well. I'm sorry, Phil, go ahead. I didn't see your hand there, Phil.

Phil Corwin: James, I have a comment about the - something to do with Hyderabad. But go ahead, it can wait until after you finish your exposition on this.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. And I'll try to just tear through it fairly quickly. The objective of this particular bare bones schedule was to accomplish a few things and check a few boxes that were raised in Helsinki. First off, we didn't have any, you know, high level of support for something like a day zero or a day eight. We tried to work within the constraints of the seven day schedule as it was presented.

We did discuss the lesson learned from Helsinki that we could perhaps have an expedited GNSO Council day - so rather than having two full days of GNSO Council, PDP updates, and engagements with other groups like the Board, the GAC, and other SOs and ACs - that we would tackle that in one day. And so you see that here on day two, Friday, November 4th will be a long day, but it will replace what would otherwise be two days. So hopefully that is a more acceptable alternative.

We discussed whether or not any of the PDPs would have a face to face meeting on day one. That survey of - has been sent to the different leaderships of the ongoing PDPs. But one of the ideas I think that we're kind of starting to grow some favorites - favoritism towards is this idea of having two PDPs meet on day one. An early - or a morning session and an afternoon session. And that's reflective of the fact that

there's a high degree of overlap in some of these PDPs. And that one of the other takeaways from Helsinki is that having a four hour meeting in some ways is a little bit more productive than having an eight hour meeting because there are fewer breaks and folks are a little bit more focused and the ability to change topics at the second part of the - keeping everyone on task.

Next up we would have the standard what we would call constituency day on - or would normally fall on a Tuesday is happening on day four, so Sunday. We would have our face to face meeting on day five, which is Monday - the GNSO Council meeting and then immediately moving to our wrap up, which I think also from Helsinki it was nice to have the wrap up immediately following the council meeting when everything was fresh in our minds.

Day eight would be, you know, the typical board meeting public forum. And then we would have our council development session dinner on day six. That is optional and - but that is something we would offer both to existing - I'm sorry current outgoing, incoming GNSO councilors. And then day seven - the morning of day seven - would be the GNSO Council development session, which would be open to current, former, and - former I mean outgoing - and incoming councilors.

So that's kind of how we shook this out so far. I would encourage folks to please take a look at this. Give us your thoughts. We need to start to plan for this in earnest and start filling in some of these blanks. I note that there is potentially another group - I believe the CCWG is talking about a day zero meeting potentially - so that, you know, doesn't create conflicts but it does extend this already long trip to India for some of us even a little bit longer. But this is our first stab at meeting format C and want to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to weigh in with their thoughts. So with that, very quickly we'll go to Marika and then Phil. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to note on the PDP face to face working group meetings, we did already send out a poll to both the RDS and the new GTLD (unintelligible) working groups and feedback from (unintelligible) to date is 20 are yes if need be respondents from the RDS - or the new GTLD PDP and two remote. And the RDS PDP we have 32 yes' if need be and 12 remote. I believe on the RPMs one poll is still due to go out but I think informally there's some feedback that a face to face may not be needed.

However, I think we did get feedback - at least from the RDS PDP that I'm aware that, you know, people do need a confirmation as soon as possible on whether this is going to happen or not as, you know, everyone's in the process of planning their travel. And also some feedback from people that completed the poll suggested that either a half day might be ideal as, you know, a full day can be, you know, very strenuous and less effective than maybe having a, you know, four hour block to focus on conversations.

And also to note that I do believe - I think that the confirmation for funded travelers is I think early August. So again, confirmation on the PDP working group meetings is probably time sensitive in that regard as it, you know, it does require people to be aware of whether or not they have this meeting at start of the meeting or not.

James Bladel: Thank you. And - yes, I note that folks are getting ready to drop off, so we'll go with Phil next. Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yes, two quick comments. In regard to the potential face to face meetings on day one, I'm reporting as a co-chair of the RPM review working group we surveyed participants in our call last week to get an indication of how many folks were planning to go to Hyderabad and frankly it's not a lot because of the - you know, people hadn't budgeted for it and because of the travel time from a lot of place as well as the fact that it's not a particularly - I don't want to say - it doesn't have a lot to attract people, you know, looking for things besides the ICANN meeting. We won't have a majority of the working group there. Just a minority.

And second, the group felt that a facilitated face to face meeting would make more sense in Copenhagen or Johannesburg. And Copenhagen will be completing our work on the trademark clearinghouse and moving into URS. In Johannesburg we'll be at the stage of beginning our initial report - putting our initial report together. So based on both low attendance and the stage of our work plan we're in, there's not a high degree of interest in having a face to face for the RPM review in Hyderabad.

The other thing I wanted to bring up as a result - we discussed this on the BC call today - at least for U.S. residents, there's a necessity to get a visa for India. There's different types of visas. Some of them may require an invitation letter from ICANN or

the Indian government. So we'd like the council to - staff to get ICANN travel to clarify what type of visa is needed and provide whatever assistance is required from ICANN to get that as soon as possible, because getting that visa requires turning in your passport for some period of time before you get it back from the Indian Embassy. So those are my two comments. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Phil. And just quickly if we have three active PDPs and one of them is essentially taking its marker off the table for day one, then that makes planning very easy. We would just simply decide which of the two remaining would go in the morning and which would go in the evening. So thanks for that update.

Secondly is that a good point on the visa. We will ask staff to take that back to (Nick Tomaso's) group and get some clarification on that. I do remember that - sending my passport out for ICANN New Delhi a few years back. I think that they have since moved to an electronic visa that you can do completely online. But it would be good to get some clarity on that, not just for the Americans but also for the Canadians and for the other Europeans and Latin Americans and all the other folks on council. So let's just put a note down there for staff to take a look at that. That is something that we should get ahold of as well.

Just a note here - again - I think we've got still some open questions and topics for this schedule, but I think, you know, if we can get at least an indication from the council that this is starting to take shape in a manner that meets their expectations, that there's no red flags, that certainly there's still a number of blanks that need to be filled in. Let's, you know, let's continue to iterate on this schedule as we go forward. But I think we have a rough skeleton here that we can start to hang some flesh and bones on.

Okay, just noting the time and I thank you again for your patience and indulgence. We'll move then to item number nine, which is AOB. The first step is AOB item number 9.1, which I believe was added by Heather. Heather if you don't mind can take 9.1.

Heather Forrest: James, thanks. Heather Forrest. In light of the time I'm going to be very, very quick. And I'm also about to get on a noisy bus. Look, we have an issue in the RPM PDP working group. You might recall from the main meeting accountable that I noted to

council attention that a member of the working group had been quite disruptive and in this formal communication with that member asking the member to desist with disruptive communication but was ignored. And the member was subsequently removed from the working group's list.

That member continues to individually cause issues for certain members of ICANN staff and the leadership of the PDP working group. And I'd like us to consider on the council what we do to support our PDP chairs, to support ICANN staff who receive personal messages from hostile individuals. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thanks Heather. I do remember that incident and it is unfortunate that it continues. I understand that, you know, we're in a little bit of a time constraint here. So what I would ask is I would ask Marika and her team to consult with ICANN legal on specifically what actions are available to us as a council and to ICANN staff when we believe we have an individual who has essentially worn out their welcome, either on a particular working group or has now escalated it sounds like to individual - unsolicited and unwanted and unwelcome communication with other folks and if there's something that we can explore to take care of that.

This is unfortunate but I think we certainly do not want to set the precedent that this sort of things is tolerated or acceptable. So - and Phil is noting that as a co-chair he is also a target of these communications and I would just ask that - we will take away is that is an action item to consult the GNSO leadership and myself, Heather, and Donna as well as the co-chairs of the working group and ICANN staff and legal, we'll take this as an action item. It's something that I think we all take very seriously in our responsibilities. Thank you for that, Heather. And it is - again - unfortunate.

Item number 9.2 is an update on the status of the process of the drafting team to identify new and additional rights, responsibilities for GNSO under the revised bylaws. I am - I know we approved this motion in Helsinki. I don't know where we stand in terms of convening that group. I think that is also a casualty of the compressed schedule. I would ask that staff please provide an update on the timeline - prepare a timeline and submit that to the list for council review.

And Donna, yes, it says the deadline for submission is for tomorrow. I think that's correct. I know that we have - I believe that there is one registrar and one registry rep

authority has been identified, but I think that there will be others as well. So - yes. So if you can - and I think if other stakeholder groups and constituencies could at least weigh in to the list with their plans, the deadline is tomorrow. Make sure that if you haven't already had a good understanding of who your group has selected that you light a fire, because the time is running short.

Status of PTSAI was taken off by (Susan). And that is the end of our agenda. So I would note that we're 20 minutes over. I do thank you all for your patience.

Our next call is scheduled for September, but in the interim it looks like we have a number of items coming through the mailing list, including at least one if not two motions for a mail vote that will be posted later in July and open for mail - e-mail ballot August 4th to August 6th. So please be on the lookout for that.

Okay, if there are no other objections, then I would like to close the call. I know a number of you had to drop off early and I apologize for that. But I think we got a lot done, considering the fact that we're going to take the next month off.

So if there are no objections we'll close the call and say thank you to everyone for your work and enjoy your summer and your holidays and we will catch up again on the list and in early September. Thank you.

Man: Thanks everyone. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you, James.

Man: Thank you.

                                    END