ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Council Meeting
Thursday, 26 April 2018 at 21:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-26apr18-en.mp3

WebEx Recording URL:
https://mytrials.webex.com/mytrials/onstage/playback.php?RCID=39f7ea5d885bd78f1cea09f049af0945
Recording password: pY4b8PvC

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

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

Guests: Thomas Rickert for CCWG Accountability WS2 & Brian Aitchison and Karen Lentz from ICANN org for CIPF

ICANN Staff
David Olive -Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional (apology sent)
Marika Konings – Vice President, Policy Development Support – GNSO
Mary Wong – Sr Director, Special Adviser for Strategic Policy Planning
Julie Hedlund – Policy Director
Steve Chan – Policy Director
Berry Cobb – Policy Consultant
Emily Barabas – Policy Support Senior Specialist
Ariel Liang – Policy Analyst
Caitlin Tubergen – Policy Senior Manager
Sara Caplis – Technical support

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

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, operator. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody, welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 26th of April, 2018. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you ever so much? Pam Little.

Pam Little: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Donna Austin. Donna, you may be muted.

Donna Austin: Can you hear me now, Nathalie?

Nathalie Peregrine: Perfectly. Thank you, Donna. Rubens Kuhl.

Rubens Kuhl: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Darcy Southwell.

Darcy Southwell: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Carlos Gutiérrez.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Here, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Marie Pattullo.

Marie Pattullo: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Philippe Fouquart.

Philippe Fouquart: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rafik Dammak.

Rafik Dammak: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Stephanie Perrin. I'm not sure we have Stephanie yet on the call, we'll circle back. Arsene Tungali.

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

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Arsene. Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Here, Nathalie, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Tony Harris is an apology for today's call and he's given his proxy to Philippe Fouquart. Tatiana Tropina.

Tatiana Tropina: Present. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Martin Silva Valent.

Martin Silva Valent: I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Ayden Férdeline.

Ayden Férdeline: Present, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Syed Ismail Shah.

Syed Ismail Shah: Yes, here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

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

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Erika Mann.

Erika Mann: I'm here, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. And Julf Helsingius.

Julf Helsingius: Here, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. We note that the position of ccNSO liaison to the GNSO
               Council previously held by Ben Fuller has not yet been filled. We will
               welcome guest speakers on the call today, there will be Thomas Rickert, Co
               Chair of the Cross Community Working Group Accountability Work Stream 2
               and Brian Aitchison and Karen Lentz from ICANN.org.

From staff on the call we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Caitlin Tubergen, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Ariel Liang, Terri Agnew, (Sarah Kaplas) for technical support and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names for recording purposes and just a few housekeeping rules regarding the WebEx room today, so please remember when typing in the chat to make sure you select All Participants and not All Attendees as this will only target a specific group of participants on the chat, so please remember, All Participants to send a message to everyone. This will ensure also that your communication is captured on the chat transcript.

If you also have any issues viewing the shared documents in the WebEx room you can refer to the wiki document page where we're posting the link in the chat in a few seconds. All the relevant materials being shown on the call today have been posted there.

Scrolling is available in the WebEx room if you notice at the top of the final proposed agenda there, there is a little box with a number and arrows so you can scroll through the pages that way. If you have any questions regarding the WebEx features, please don't hesitate to type them in the chat and we'll be happy to help. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Nathalie, very much. So welcome, everyone, to our April meeting. I might add a few comments about WebEx and logistics to follow up on Nathalie's, which is to say it is fairly difficult to manage the queue or a bit more challenging than usual to manage the queue of hands up, having let's say, the box open to look for hands up often means you're not able to see much or any of the chat when you do that, so if I miss something in chat I apologize.

The other thing about hands up is that it appears that it doesn't really keep things in order, it just kind of puts things up in alphabetical, so I apologize if

you feel that you've been skipped in the order and you know, to the extent that you feel like you have been missed, please let myself or staff know, ping one of us and we'll come back around to you as soon as we can. So apologies for all of those things; we're finding our feet.

And a reminder on this very topic, since it's timely, to complete the survey about the online tools that was circulated on the Council list as, you know, our experiences with each of these products ought to be recorded and factored into whatever decision is made for what comes next.

With that, let's turn then to Item 1.2, does anyone have an update to their statement of interest that they would like to make known? I see no hands and I'm hopeful that that means I'm not missing anything. And no one's shouting that I've missed a hand so excellent.

One point three, review of our agenda. Does anyone have any changes that they'd like to make to our agenda before we get started? No, hearing none, all right, we've progressed to 1.4, noting the status of the Council minutes for our meetings of February and March, you'll see that they were posted in good time as shown in the agenda. So we are well on track with our minutes, thank you very much to everyone for that.

All right, next item in our agenda, Item 2, is our review of the projects list and action items lists so let's start with the projects list. Here I will say that you can see the document in the screen, and you remember that the projects list is circulated by staff prior to the meeting in both clean and redline version form. We have the clean document here in the room.

It is the case as well that all the documents for our call today are loaded up into the Council wiki page. It makes it easier sometimes to see WebEx's, you know, just as Adobe was, sometimes it's easier to see the document in a different format, let's say, than the WebEx room, so I will be moving back and

forth as well in the course of the meeting so that might be another reason I miss a hand so bear with us.

Projects list, we have the projects list in front of us. There are a few changes to the projects list. Of course the usual course of events is the update in relation to each of the various PDP efforts, those updates are here. You'll see that a few changes have been made in relation to items that are on our substantive agenda for today including for example IRTP policy review, and we have updates to various PDPs that will be provided to us in the course of today's agenda. Marika, is there anything that we need to note specifically here and consider in relation to the projects list?

Marika Konings: Thanks, Heather. This is Marika. I think the main change that you note is that we've added to the issue scoping phase the transfer policy review conversations that we're having as well at this meeting and that have basically commenced with that the conversation. Those were before captured in the other category as kind of outstanding items that at some point would be kicked off so that has been now moved up the list.

I think similarly we updated as well in that other category references to the work that's ongoing on the CPIF and the post implementation policy review framework that will also come back later in this meeting to basically reflect that, you know, some of that work has already commenced even though there's of course the full review that is still pending and as such captured in the other category.

I think the other notable item is that we've marked the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance as complete as by the end of ICANN 61, GNSO formally withdrew as a chartering organization but of course whenever the new vehicle will come back and will be considered that would then get added back to the list. But at least that project for now is from a GNSO perspective, completed.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thanks very much, Nathalie, for that concise summary. Anyone have any questions or comments on changes to the projects list? I didn't see any on the list but this is a good opportunity if you've picked something up between now and then to raise those. No, I see no hands up. Excellent. Then let's progress to the action items list please.

All right, you see that staff has been working continues to work on our action items list. It is now in a clearer format and has, let's say, multiple categories of types of topics. Our main action items appear here at the top. A number of items marked as completed which is brilliant, a few things in progress and many of those are things that were are responding to and not let's say, the proactive movers on so we're including the timing of bylaw mandated reviews, we're waiting for next steps from the organization.

PDP 3.0 is very much in our hands and we have – we have work to do in that regard. And we'll – the agenda for today for April is really quite full so we haven't included any PDP 3.0 items on that but the Google document is in the works in formulating into a final report and we shall have some updates on that in our next meeting.

GNSO review of the GAC communiqué is of course on our content agenda for today. We will come back to that. The SubPro RPM consolidated timeline, likewise on our substantive agenda. Board request regarding emojis is in progress, our – two of our three action items have been completed and we now have the small team that will have a look at that effort.

And is there anything that we need to do to get that small team going? I think Steve, I apologize if I'm putting you on the spot, Steve might have been the one that chased down our first two action items. Is there something we need to do to move this one forward to the small team?

Steve Chan: Sure. Hi, thanks…

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: …this is Steve Chan from staff. No problem. So the next steps are in fact we prepared a summary of the Council's understanding of the status for emojis within the gTLD space. So I believe the next step that has been agreed upon amongst the small team is to send that brief summary to the SSAC. And to the extent that there are gaps in the GNSO's understanding to then invite the SSAC to present on a future Council meeting perhaps to help the GNSO understand where those gaps might be and then from there determine what additional next steps might be needed. So hopefully that's helpful. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Very helpful indeed, Steve, thanks very much. So we're making progress there. ICANN 62 meeting planning is in our AOB for the end of today's meeting so we'll come back to that. You would have seen that Nathalie circulated an updated draft GNSO schedule just 24 hours or so ago, we're responding to the very recent, let's say, 36 hour ago initial post putting forward ideas for cross community topics. Donna, please, apologies for missing your hand. Over to you.

Donna Austin: Yes, no problem, Heather. Just on Board request regarding emojis, what consultation are we doing with the ccTLDs, because they seem to be a little bit further down the track o that. So if we haven't factored that in to have some discussion with the, it might be helpful to do so. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. I think that's a great question and one that we need to refer to the small team. Donna, do you want to chase that down now or do we just consider that referred to the small team and they follow up on the list?

Donna Austin: Yes, I think just note it for the small team that we think it would be valuable to do that.

Heather Forrest: Great. Perfect. Noted, Donna. Thank you very much. We'll make sure to record that. Next is another item, Donna, in fact that you're involved in, the

CSC and IFR review. Donna, would you like to give us just a very quick update on where we are with those two things?

Donna Austin: Sure. I think I sent the CSC Review Team report that's been posted for public comment, I think I sent that to the list last week so that report is now out for public comment. And the piece that relates to the CSC effectiveness review and the IANA function review is a recommendation contained in that report. So now that that's open we can – Philippe and I have been in contact and at some point we will start a conversation with the ccNSO about that. And it is – Philippe was able to alert me that it is on the agenda for the next ccNSO Council meeting, I'm not sure when that is but it's either happening soon or it has happened so it's certainly on the ccNSO's project list as well. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: That's great, Donna, thank you very much. And, Philippe, your hand is up. Please, over to you.

Philippe Fouquart: Thank you, Heather. Yes, to Donna's question, it was on the ccNSO Council's agenda this evening – or this morning, whatever that is, and it's very, very early stage at this point, just gathering interested parties. The idea is to – as to the CSC charters review to go to approval sometime around the Panama meeting I think, so we'll still have time to further discuss that within our small group.

And since I can speak, I'll just mention on the previous point, likewise, the ccNSO Council initiated a sort of survey within their community on the emoji issue and particular with at the top of my head that's (unintelligible) (SSAM) and (WS) to those who actually implemented the emojis to hear their arguments and figure out how – what their position might be moving forward and there might be value working with them on that point too. Thank you. I hope that helps.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thank you very much, Philippe and Donna both for updates on that item. Donna, your hand is still up, old hand? New hand? Old hand. All right, excellent. So let's progress to our last remaining items on the action items list, review of the IRTP is on our substantive agenda today so we can leave that for the moment. Draft FY'19 operating budget – marked as completed and thanks, again, very much to Ayden and the SCBO for their efforts there.

Updated charter for the Cross Community Engagement Group on Internet Governance is still a work in progress. This is an item that was initially slated to be on our agenda for May, or excuse me, for April, but came off in light of the very many items that were proposed to be on our agenda for this month so we shall come back to that one in due course.

Council liaisons, the notification has gone around in relation to the new appointments to Subsequent Procedures, that was our last item on that list so that one is now marked as completed. So that takes us through our action items list. Any comments, questions – oh I'm sorry, there's a Page 2. And in fact there are other action items at the end of this, so my apologies.

Council's input to the consultation on the Fellowship Program marked as completed. Drafting team on the charter related to the ICANN procedure of handling Whois conflicts with privacy, that of course is on our agenda coming up, that's parked until June, so we will come back to that effort. The discussion of the draft post implementation review framework, on our substantive agenda for today. The ATRT 3 is a watch and wait in that we are waiting for the – for ICANN Org to let's say come back to particular questions around specific reviews I think and we were anticipating a formal delay of that from the organization.

Any comments, questions, concerns on our main action items list there? No, I see no hands up. We have a number of action items to come out of strategic planning session. In light of the time, because we do have a full agenda that will take us right up to the last minute, I would suggest that we follow up on

strategic planning session action items on the list rather than in this call. Anyone object to that approach? No? Excellent. And Donna's made a note for us in the chat about the CSC charter review and Rubens supports plowing ahead so fantastic, thank you very much.

All right so let's then move to our consent agenda. We have two items on the consent agenda. The first is the motion to adopt the GNSO Council response to the GAC communiqué for submission to the ICANN Board, which you will see presented here in the screen. And we can thank the small drafting team for putting this together. That team was very capably led by Rafik.

And we have a second item in the consent agenda, the Council agreeing that ICANN Org should continue to treat the community gTLD change request process dealing with amendments to Spec 12 a matter of implementation. And in that regard we had a comment period and this is just following up on the public comment period.

Those two items in the consent agenda we've reviewed the agenda and no comments made to this effect, but would anyone like to pull either of those items out of the consent agenda? Are we happy to leave them there? No? I see no hands. I think we have an open line on one of our councilor's lines.

Excellent. Nathalie, could I then ask you to take us through a voice vote for our consent agenda, please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Of course, Heather. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say, "Aye." Hearing no one. Would anyone like to vote against this motion? Would all those in favor of the motion please say, "Aye"?

(Group):   Aye.

Donna Austin: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Philippe Fouquart, proxy for Tony Harris, please say, "Aye."

Philippe Fouquart:Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: No abstention, no objection, the motion passes, Heather. Over to you.

Heather Forrest: Many thanks, Nathalie and again, thank the drafting team and Rafik in particular for leading the team that worked on the response to the GAC communiqué. And the second item on that list was something that's been on our agenda for quite some time as the explanation for that motion shows, it's been on Council's agenda in some form or fashion since September so very nice to have both of those done. So thanks very much to everyone.

Item 4 of course a very unfortunate thing to have on our agenda which is a motion in memory of former Council Chair, Stéphane Van Gelder. And for this I will turn over to Rafik. Rafik, you might be on mute.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, sorry, seems I have problem what my phone. So as you said, Heather, it's – it was an unfortunate but this is the least what we can do for someone who was on the Council and also in leadership position. And I think we have this motion to recognize the work that he did during this term and, to be honest, it's hard for me to say much more. I was with Stéphane in the Council between 2009-2012 and he was good to lead.

So I'm going to read the motion and I think it includes now the amendment I suggested. So Stéphane Van Gelder first entered the domain name business in the late 1990s when he founded Indom, a registrar in France, which later become part of the GroupNBT based in the United Kingdom. It was while Stéphane was General manager of INDOM that he was elected to the GNSO Council by the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Stéphane served on the GNSO Council from 2008 through 2012, as an elected representative of the Registrars Constituency. Stéphane served as

Vice Chair of the GNSO Council in 2010 and was elected and served two consecutive terms as Chair of the GNSO Council in 2011 and 2012.

As Chair of the GNSO Council, Stéphane was an impartial and neutral facilitator on all issues. For Stéphane, remaining neutral was key to ensuring collective dialogue.

Stéphane made significant contributions to ICANN and was a strong and respected community leader. During his tenure as GNSO Chair, Stéphane oversaw and shepherded the completion of an extensive update of the GNSO's operating procedures; establishment of the DNS Security & Stability Analysis working group jointly with the ALAC, ccNSO and NRO; completion of the Fast Flux, Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery and Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy IRTP Part B Policy Development Processes and the joint ccNSO-GNSO Internationalized Domain Name working group; launch of the IRTP Part C, Thick WHOIS and Locking of Domain Names subject to Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy Proceedings PDPs; and continuing work on WHOIS studies, registration abuse policies, and multiple other GNSO projects; the completion of the Applicant Guidebook for the 2012 New gTLD Program and the launch of the Program.

Stéphane was a well-respected and much liked member of not only the GNSO, but of the broader ICANN Community. He was admired for his passion, his fairness, his ability to find the best in people and his true gift for uniting people.

Stéphane's passing is a great loss to the many people in the ICANN community that had the pleasure to work and interact with him, and for his many friends at ICANN the loss is significant.

Resolved, The GNSO Council wishes to recognize the significant contribution Stéphane made to the GNSO Council during his tenure and his notable achievements during this time.

So that was the remembrance motion. Yes, I'm not sure how – yes, I think it may be we give opportunity to people if they want to intervene here. Sorry. Yes, sorry, it seems I missed part of the resolve. I can blame on the WebEx here.

Okay, Stéphane's genuine passion, energy and commitment to the Internet and all that it brought to the world was second to none and we will miss him dearly. On behalf of the current and previous GNSO Councils, we offer our deepest and heartfelt sympathies to his family and friends at this most difficult time.

Yes, that's the last two resolved. Okay, yes, so thanks, everyone. So if you want to – I cannot see anyone want to speak or to intervene. Okay, Donna, please go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thank you, Rafik. So I am the seconder of the motion. And I understand there are others on the Council that would also like to second the motion so I don't know what's appropriate here. But I would recommend that perhaps we change the seconder of the motion to the Council rather than an individual. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Donna. I think that's appropriate and I think if you want support this so, okay, I think we should change – amend the motion to reflect that, so. Sorry. Okay so I don't see anyone – sorry if I missed, but maybe over to you, Heather, I think maybe it's time to vote and with the amendment that we just did to make it from the whole Council to second the motion.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Rafik, very, very much. A very difficult task to be sure. May we note for completeness an amendment was made and accepted by the

Council as by the full Council as seconder of the motion to correct the text in Whereas Number 1. You see the corrected text in the brackets, that's just for good order.

And, Nathalie, may I ask you please to make a call for support in favor of the motion?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Heather. Would all those in favor of the motion please say, "Aye"?

Michele Neylon: Aye.

(Group):   Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Philippe Fouquart, proxy for Tony Harris, please say, "Aye."

Philippe Fouquart: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much. With full support from all those on the call the motion passes, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Nathalie, and again, thank you to Rafik, thank you to all of you. Just to provide a very slight bit of context here, the motion that you see here was actually based on text that was read by former head of the GNSO Secretariat, Glen de Saint Géry, who was asked to say a few words at the memorial service that was conducted in Paris. Flowers were sent on behalf of Council to that service and Glen very, very kindly and beautifully provided this statement at that service so that is the basis for this motion.

We'll make sure to communicate this motion to Stéphane's family. I understand that there is a way – it might be email or a link to still send messages to the family so anyone who would like to do that we can make that available to you. Any statements that are made in the chat and so on we

can communicate those to the family as well. So thank you very much. Extraordinarily unfortunate to have to have that on the agenda.

With that, let's make a final call for any comments here. I suspect Rafik has done a beautiful job and that may be all that we need to say. And you note Mary's comment in the chat there on communicating with the family. So thanks very much, everyone.

Let's turn our attention to Item 5 in the agenda, which is an update on CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2. Thomas Rickert, we have you with us. Are you happy to take us through this update, please?

Thomas Rickert: I am. Thanks very much and hello, everyone. Let me say that it's truly difficult to go back to other more or less (unintelligible) agenda items. I'd like to just very briefly review the current status of the work of the CCWG Accountability. As you know, we have completed all of the individual sub teams reports. They have all undergone public comment. And we have then assembled all the sub teams reports into one final report which we have put out for public comment.

And this public comment period is still – still running. So if I'm not mistaken we have 15 days left in the public comment period. So far we haven't received a single comment which you might say could be interpreted as a lack of interest by the community, but…

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: …because in this public comment period we've only asked for inconsistencies between the various work packages because we worked on the work packages in sub teams and all those reports have undergone public comment periods already but now that we put everything together we wanted to make sure that nobody has an issue with something that's in one sub

team's report so that – are probably conflicting with information in another sub team's report.

So we will now try to get comments, if any, and should you now consider to file public comments, please note that we will only process reports on those inconsistencies which we think there are none but we wanted to check this with (unintelligible). We will record those and make them available to any of the future activity with respect to ICANN's accountability. So, you know, please really stay focused on inconsistencies.

So I think you all have scroll control. Let me go to the last slide and if you have to do that as well, please go to the third and last slide which is a visualization of the approval process. And let's go to slide Number 3, sorry for that. So we're now in the second, you know, the second visualization of the (unintelligible), that's where we currently are. We are hoping to get feedback should there be any inconsistencies, not only from the community but also from the chartering organizations, and the Board, because what's going to happen next is that we're going to (unintelligible) make any amendments (unintelligible) adopt our final report hopefully quickly and we're going to submit it to the chartering organizations subsequently.

We want to get this done by Panama by ICANN 62. And our hope is that the chartering organizations that have been continuously monitoring the output of our CCWG work will help us getting this over the line quickly. So our hope is – and this is what I'm trying to drum up support of at the moment, we are trying to get you guys the line to actually study the report now, shouldn't you have done that, and that you sort of come to Panama feeling comfortable that the final package is okay, because at best we're going to have only some very minor edits (unintelligible) we've currently put out for public comment.

(Unintelligible) Panama then we can pass on the report to the Board for its consideration and formal adoption. And that would actually conclude the work of our team. And we would then, as was discussed earlier, we would then just

have a sort of an implementation oversight team that looks at the implementation that the Board might authorize ICANN Org to conduct. So I think I should pause here and see whether there are any questions.

Heather Forrest: Thomas, it's Heather. You have a hand up from Tatiana.

Thomas Rickert: Tatiana, please go ahead.

Tatiana Tropina: Sorry, I was on mute. Thank you very much, Thomas, for this presentation. It might be a bit early to ask but I would really like to ask you about this implementation phase because I saw a bit of a discussion going on the CCWG Accountability list but my question is, do you think there is anything we have to anticipate like for example some of the recommendations consider supporting organizations and advisory committees directly for some developments of some internal frameworks like for example human rights recommendation.

Do you think we already have to have a look at this or when we have to start worrying about this? Because for me it's not clear who would be authorized, ICANN Org but at the same time some of the implementation will be completely left to ACs and SOs. So could you maybe elaborate on this like one or two minutes maybe to tell us when should we start worrying about implementation that concerns us directly? Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Tatiana, for that question. And in fact there has been a couple of questions from various parties on the implementation. Let's be perfectly clear, you only have to start worrying about implementation once the Board approves our Work Stream 2 report, you know, before it is approved there will be no implementation whatsoever. But then Work Stream 2 or the CCWG only had a mandate to come up with the recommendations. Other than the work that we conducted in Work Stream 1, we're certain implementation work needed to take place in order for the IANA stewardship transition to be able to move forward.

This is different (unintelligible) and that means that we pass on the recommendations to the chartering organizations and ultimately for the Board for its approval and then implementation needs to take place elsewhere. We have started a discussion about this in the CCWG, and what we concluded is that we would install this implementation oversight team to ensure that the implementation is done in the spirit of the original CCWG Work Stream 2 recommendations. And this team will consist of the rapporteurs for the individual sub teams.

Also we have suggested to the Board that the Board and Board will likely authorize Göran and his team to work on that, that the Board comes up with proposal for implementation because you can't (unintelligible) quite a number of recommendations and they are probably quite cumbersome to implement, not all of them but some require substantial work. And ultimately the community needs to decide what needs to be done first i.e. the community should weigh in after ICANN Org proposes a roadmap for implementing Work Stream 2 recommendations. They need to weigh in whether the community agrees with that.

You know, we – I don't think that ICANN will have the bandwidth or the budget to start implementing everything at a time so it needs to be sequenced in one way or the other and certainly I can't speak on behalf of the Board but I wouldn't be surprised if they actually came up with a proposed implementation plan, probably (unintelligible) 3-5 years implementation efforts and present that to the community for its review.

And then, Tatiana, you will be in a position to see when your respective recommendations that might require some other part of ICANN to start working has its turn and then you can chime in and make sure that things take the direction that you wish to. I hope that this answers the question. There's a lot of second guessing here because we don't really know how

exactly ICANN is going to go about with this but from the talks that we had so far I guess that's the quite likely scenario.

Heather Forrest: Thomas, thank you, you've got a hand up from Rafik.

Thomas Rickert: Rafik, please go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Thomas, for – yes for the presentation and (unintelligible) how to say, since from (unintelligible) what we have to do, by (unintelligible) the final report of the chartering organization for (unintelligible) and timeline for each chartering organization and probably you have to synchronize on that matter, so.

Thomas Rickert: Rafik, thanks for the question. You were breaking up on – in the meantime. I hope that I've understood it correctly. So the – let me therefore rephrase it. So you were asking what the concrete steps would be for the GNSO Council to take, is that correct?

Rafik Dammak: It's more about the exact timeline, for example, by when the CCWG is going to submit the final report for approval. I think you have different timeline for each chartering organization, but for GNSO by when you are envisioning to submit that so to – are you expecting that we have to approve it by Panama meeting or just before?

Thomas Rickert: No, I think it would be excellent to approve in Panama so that the Council can have a discussion about the approval while we're there. The cochairs and probably the rapporteurs will stand by to do sort of a little road show in Panama to see the various groups and answer all questions that you might have in order to facilitate the approval process.

I can't predict (unintelligible) going to have a consensus call and actually adopt the final report but we do hope to get it out to the chartering organizations within the timeframes required for the (unintelligible) groups to put those on the agenda which, for the GNSO Council would be the motions and document deadline. But that would really be the latest point in time.

You know, we want to submit early but having said that, let me remind you of what I said earlier, i.e. that I think that the substance of the final report will not change materially and therefore you can basically start reading what we've put out for public comment now and we would then come up with a redline or with a markup version of that you just need to read a few lines probably if we need to make any tweaks to the report.

Heather Forrest: Thomas, it's Heather. I don't see any other hands up so we might make a last call for questions, comments for Thomas. Paul McGrady, please.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Heather. Paul McGrady. So, Thomas, just so you know if the – even a redline version goes up in – at the last minute of our deadline for documents with everybody scrambling to get to Panama and everything else it's going to make it very difficult to get approval especially on something as far reaching as this from constituencies. So I know everybody's already asked you this but anything you guys can do to get it to us well in advance if you want a Council vote in Panama, would be super appreciated, thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Paul. Understood and we do what we can in order to get it out to you as early as possible. But let's remember, all the recommendations you've already seen, right? So all the sub team reports with the respective recommendations have gone out for public comment already. And we're just talking about potential inconsistencies. Our group has reviewed the report, we checked for inconsistencies, we couldn't find any. So we're just talking about changes to the recommendations and the unlikely case that there are inconsistencies, right?

So if you are concerned about material changes to the recommendations that we presented to the community earlier or even if there's a fear of us introducing new recommendations (unintelligible) all the recommendations that we already published will, I guess, stand and remain (unintelligible). But nonetheless, Paul, your point is well heard so we will try to get the package wrapped up and ready for you guys well before Panama so that you have sufficient time to review.

Heather Forrest: Thomas, it's Heather. I don't see any remaining hands so let's make a last call for questions or comments in relation to Thomas's update. No, I don't see any. Thomas, last words from you.

Thomas Rickert: Let me just thank you for your time and attention and I'm looking forward to seeing you guys at the GDD or in Panama.

Heather Forrest: Thomas, thanks very much for your hard work on this. We appreciate your updates and we'll look forward to next steps on this, so thank you very much for joining us today.

All right, next item on our list is Item 6, which is an update from the Council liaison to the IGO INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP. That is Susan Kawaguchi. Susan, over to you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Heather. As you all know, we've – there's been some concerns about the Curative Rights PDP and a 3.7 objection was – or appeal, I'm not sure, was filed by George Kirikos in December. And so we've been working hard, heather and I and staff, Mary Wong and Steve, and the two cochairs, Petter and Phil, to you know, sort of dig in, figure out where the working group was. And we – during the Puerto Rico meeting, we held office hours in which, you know, everyone that was in Puerto Rico or would just like to call in, could schedule a 10-minute conversation to provide their input on – there was actually sort of a straw man document that outlined six different possible recommendations.

And so we've – we held office hours in Puerto Rico, we held office hours again after Puerto Rico when it was convenient to others. We accepted submissions via email. And had about 10 working group members that presented their thoughts on the next steps and the – and what they thought of the recommendation. This is just simply the last bit of work this working group has been working on but they didn't seem to be able to come to a final recommendation.

And we took all that and with staff – help – tremendous help – created a summary report that you should have all received, and then had another working group call where we also presented that to the working group and allowed them to give us their impressions.

There was sort of a joint – several of the members were very interested in continuing on with their work. But part of the Council's issue with this is that, you know, we, you know, our job is managing PDPs is to make sure that the PDPs are working well and that there aren't roadblocks in that anything we can do to assist in moving the work forward and coming up with a final report is, you know, any way we could assist in that is important. And when we see things not working as well as they could then, you know, sort of stepping in and getting everybody's opinion on Council.

So several of the working group members, as I said, were very interested in moving forward with working on a final report. There's definitely been some disagreement about that report, the summary report that staff and I provided, but, you know, that was our impression from the – all the extensive phone calls. So that's about where we are now. Heather, is there anything you would like to add to that?

Heather Forrest: Yes, thanks Susan, very much, for your update. No, I think it's important to note that the you know, the group seems willing to take steps to move things forward, which is very good. And no, I have nothing to add to what you've

said, Susan, so I think we can turn it over to questions if you're ready to do that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, I cannot see the hands so you'll have to be the…

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: I will do my best. I'll say I'm not sure I can either but I'm going to do my best. So at the moment – at the moment I don't see any. Any comments, or questions for Susan on this update of the status of the IGO INGO Curative Rights PDP? No, Susan, I suppose I see no hands, I suppose it would be helpful just to summarize on next steps.

Susan Kawaguchi: So our next step is to figure out, you know, maybe create a small working group within the, you know, along with staff and I to create a draft final report and then, you know, bring – sort of wrap up the PDP. This PDP has been going on for 3-4 years, they did have a year off because they were waiting for a memo. But as you all know, we're pretty, you know, we have a lot of PDPs right now and need to free up these members to move onto other things.

And anybody who has any, you know, suggestions on methods or ways that this would be – that we haven't thought about, that – those comments would be greatly appreciated.

Heather Forrest: Great, Susan, thank you very much. Last call for comments or questions on this agenda item. No, seeing none, Susan, thank you very much for all your work there and we will look forward to subsequent updates. Excellent.

Okay, then as a reminder – sort of a constant reminder, you have power to scroll the document yourself, we're on Page 2, Item 7, which is an update on the – it's listed as ICANN Board temporary policy proposal, this is an update on the discussions that have been happening in relation to overlaps between the existing RDS PDP and GDPR initiated by correspondence from the

Board, from Cherine. Donna, Rafik and I and the RDS leadership team posted an update after our call with certain Board members. That went out to the list within a few days of us having that meeting. You see the briefing note here.

We included at the end of that briefing note, which again you have power to control in your WebEx screen, three specific proposals or recommendations for next steps. You'll see them at the sort of the middle and bottom of Page 2 on the document that's in the WebEx screen and some questions let's say, oops sorry, I might have the wrong page. sorry apologies, but proposals are on Page 3 that relate to those numbered points on Page 2.

We raised a number of points as, you know, as a small group putting our heads together as to what we think the questions are that need to be answered and how we might go about doing those. I think the priority here is the timeline. We're working to a very, very short one and anything that we might do in advance with each day that goes by we lose time to try and do some advance prep work. So with those three proposals on the screen I see Erika's got her hand up. Erika over to you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. I wonder if you actually can hear me? It looks like I have a bad connection. So I have to apologize because I wanted to read it and wanted to send you comments but I have to – I'm having a very difficult case in the moment to handle and it's very hard for me to do this but there are two things I wanted to add to whatever decision we take all about the ongoing PDPs and potential changes.

I think there are two things you need to consider. So first is I believe the ICANN approach to globalize a European legislation is very problematic because it will automatically clash with other legislation in other countries. So I think a careful approach and the one which I have seen recommended I find quite problematic. So and the – that the European data officials did refuse to

give a moratorium at least did not comment on it right now it's an indication how problematic it is.

The second I think is to consider that once you would totally have a dark Whois it would actually mean that more data need to be captured. So the idea that less data will then have to be captured is not correct but it needs to be probably collected even more. The data retention phases will become more problematic for registrars and registries again because they differ from country to country.

And actually many law enforcement agency are in the process of requesting from their government more data accuracy and a better access. And this is true and this is my last point, this is true for the European Union as well. That's one of the reasons why I believe and I have some indication it will be very tough, you know, to imagine a world where access to the Whois even if it is going to be dark in certain regions will not mean an easier approach than just to the classical one system or something similar like this because it's much too complicated.

So I'm pretty certain that we will see legislation merging very soon which will request access to Whois data even if it is publicly not visible. Sorry for this long one. And I just wanted to say and I will write it down as soon as I'm next week I'm pass this critical period I can write it down and can explain this and written a bit better. Thank you for your patience.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much Erika for that input. What I would like to do is provide a quick update let's say before we turn to the substance of these proposals one, two and three, provide a quick update. So you see in relation to the first proposal there that Rafik, Donna and I suggested that the RDS PDP Leadership Team which has already done quite a bit of work in thinking about these sorts of things that they perhaps direct their thinking to a specific question. And that was the options that council has in relation to how to

respond if the board would go down the path of implementing a temporary policy specification.

And the RDSP Leadership Team very kindly took on that task and produced a paper that we circulated a few days ago on the council list that we can show the WebEx screen. Donna, Rafik and I had a chance to discuss that with them and I wondered if anyone had any questions specifically on the options that have been presented here. You see it's quite well thought out, quite detailed, quite a thorough document in its analysis. And I – my feedback initially was that I found the structure in particular, the breakdown of each of the individual elements or factors affecting what council might do this idea of a new PDP, repurposing the existing PDP or an expedited PDP was particularly helpful.

So we have this document in front of us. I think there's – there are questions on the way in the Contracted Parties House as to, you know, whether we even get to this point and whether it's appropriate to go down the path of a temporary policy specification. I wonder and we might just throw the floor open here. Any comments on where we are now? I think ultimately if I can frame this a bit, say we need to be thinking about what council will do now. And I see Michele's hand up. So Michele please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks madam chair. And so along with Susan I'm one of the co-chairs of the RDS PDP probably the least active of the co-chairs since I've been a little bit distracted by GDPR and across all aspects of our business. So the issue is that you got two things. On the one hand you have a clear statement which has been repeated on multiple times by ICANN org that contracted parties cannot break local law and then we had the statements about the suspension of compliance.

Now so we have the situation from the contracted parties side we're not exactly clear on how that's going to play out in practical terms I mean how we're going – what is ICANN going to do? And then as kind of more important

kind of multi-stakeholder GNSO council and policies and all that how on earth what's how on earth do we move that forward? Is that a temporary policy? Is that some kind of dictate from the boards? It's quite and clear.

So the document that has been shared with you gives a number of options. I'm not sure Heather did you share the kind of pluses and minuses one as well or is that - am I speaking out of school? Oh it is there yes. Sorry yes it's kind of the pros and cons.

Heather Forrest: You're safe Michele yes.

Michele Neylon: So the, okay well I tend to wander into unsafe ground at times. And it go - you know, that goes through various pros and cons based on both things like timelines and the experiences we've had in that particular PDP. Now this is all based on what we can guess or expect as icann.org and the board might do. We don't know for sure. So they could come out with something completely different which would render some of this kind of obsolete but we would still have a situation where the policies and that as currently written would be in sync with reality and there has to be some way of fixing that. So the – that's part of the challenge that we face. I don't know if that helps anybody or have made things worse. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much Michele. And Erika I'm just going to check in with you. Your hand is up but I suspect that that was an old hand from your previous intervention. If it isn't do let me know please.

Erika Mann: I thought I took it down. Let me see. I don't know why it's not working, apologies.

Heather Forrest: All good Erika it's down now. Thanks very much, good. I just didn't want you to think I was ignoring you. Any other questions here on the additional information Michele's provided? So this instance actually saw it happen. Donna your hand went up first and then Stephanie. So Donna first please.

Donna Austin: Thanks Heather, Donna Austin. I guess I just wanted to make the point that regardless of if - well not regardless, this becomes an urgent issue for the council if the board decides to trigger the temporary policy. Now there's a discussion about whether, you know, that's the right approach and that the validity of that and that will happen.

But in the event that the board decides to pull the temporary policy trigger there is a requirement for the council to respond pretty much immediately. So that's why it's important for the council to consider what's in front of us now putting aside all our different views on GDPR and what it is and what it isn't. The reality is for the council at the moment the board decides to trigger the temporary policy it becomes a very urgent issue for us because there is a 12-month timeframe in which to complete a policy process associated with that temporary policy. So I just wanted to make that point Heather that I'm a bit concerned that we're not hearing from too many people. But I think it's important to understand that, you know, for the council there's an immediate issue here if the board decides to go down the temporary policy route and that's what the RDS Leadership Team has hopefully laid out for us here in terms of possible options to fulfill that so that's all I wanted to say. Thanks Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Donna. I think that's very, very helpful. Stephanie over to you.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much, Stephanie Perrin, just rather a question. One of the points and there was that it would be too hard to change the, well let's call them parameters for lack of a better word, of the existing PDP. And I'm wondering if that – why that has to be so because my gut tells me that I would rather have the existing PDP that is put in, goodness knows how much work, at least two years and understands well for those of us that have paid attention we understand the issues as well as we can manage and therefore to lose that by say coming up with a (unintelligible) team that would be a shame.

If we could simply lead the people who don't appear to have any skin in the game behind or who are not willing to do the work and read the documents, not to be annoyingly repetitive about that, maybe we can actually make some progress. Personally I'm pretty uncomfortable with the board imposing an interim policy that it cooks up and then having us attempt to change it. That's just my own view. So again to reiterate the question why is it so hard to reconfigure the one we've got with the existing charter?

Heather Forrest: Yes thanks Stephanie. And I'll note that a number of the points that you've raised here and a few more besides are in the analysis that' been put together in the document in the WebEx screen that compares the different options, one of those being repurposing thing the existing PDP. And indeed that discussion of the existing PDP and the status of that PDP and how it relates to what happens next is something that likewise the council will need to decide because we do have a PDP that is open and live but albeit on a break at the moment waiting to see what, you know, what we want to do in this space.

So quite a few decisions for council to take. And I suppose the question from leadership well I encourage Donna and Rafik to speak as well about my intention to speak for all three of us. But I, you know, my understanding and the thinking is that, you know, we probably need to decide on how we want to take this forward mechanically.

The work to date has largely been done by the RDS PDP Leadership Team. They've given very generously of their time and effort in producing this document and helped us to produce that – a briefing note that went around to council from the call. But in terms of the actual action on any of these things we need to think about a plan about how we do that. Donna your hand's up please?

Donna Austin: Thanks Heather, Donna Austin. So Stephanie to your point I think if we can understand that I think there's a few important principles here. One is that

there's a 12-month timeframe on this. So whatever path we, you know, as council decides that we need to go down to do what we have to do we had a very strict time frame which is 12 months. So when need to find the most appropriate way to make the objectives of what we have to do.

And, you know, given the conversations that we had in January about some of the challenges with the PDPs I think we need to keep those things in the back of our might as well. So when we think about this does it make - and bearing in mind that we really don't know what they ask is going to be yet because we might have some idea because of, you know, what the cookbook currently looks like. So we might have some vague idea but we really don't know yet what the ask is going to be and what the parameters of the ask are going to be. But if we can think about it in terms of is a smaller task force going to work better or, you know, the RDS PDP is a large PDP now, it hasn't moved at considerable speed we might say so are we bye, you know, re-chartering that effort are we going to face the same problems?

So they're kind of at a principal level what we need to think about I think is council because we're, we know that with all the PDPs that we have at the moment there are some challenges in, you know, moving forward at the appropriate speed. So if I think about our PMs could we have done that in 12 months, sub pro could we have done that in 12 months? If that was the ask how would we do that, What would be the appropriate way to do it?

So I think that's what the RDS Leadership Team has put together for us. And they've gone through some of those – some of that thinking themselves. But now from a council level we need to, you know, have a look at what they've suggested or recommended and see whether that gels with us. But I think, you know, we really do need to be creative about this primarily because of the really short window we have to do anything about this. So, you know, I guess, you know, going into this if we could just be a little bit open-minded and understand what the task is and how best to fulfill that. Thanks Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Donna very much. So we have three hands in the queue. I'd like to cut it there not because I, you know, really want to cut this discussion but we have invited guests for a few of the remaining agenda items. I'll suggest we're already over time and we're scheduled really to end this one at quarter past. I suggest we go to half past on this which gives us eight minutes and so that got the hands. There you go and Michele your hand was up first followed by Erika.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Heather. Yes just a quick one here. I mean I don't want to go down into kind of the weeds on which particular way of dealing with this is the best but I mean looking at the three options that are being presented there with their pros and cons I was on the EWG with Susan and other people for about 18 months and then after that I foolishly put myself onto the RDS PDP and ended up as one of the co-chairs. I say foolishly because obviously I really do need to develop hobbies and a social life.

The idea that we could somehow repurpose the existing PDP I think is simply - is just simply not realistic for a multitude of reasons and not least of which is that the group in its current form is far too big. And not only is it too big it's also made up of quite – there's quite a few people within that group who have little or no experience or willingness to work within the parameters of the ICANN PDPs or pretty much any PDP and seem to think that by yelling and screaming about whatever particular view that they hold that that's somehow helpful which really isn't.

They're not interested in moving the ball forward in solving anything. They're far happier stalling things and just not moving things forward at all. If we look back at the conversations we had in Los Angeles back in January and again in San Juan we were looking at ways to kind of reboot, redo, rethink how we handled PDPs where we have this kind of contentiousness and this kind of lack of progress and movement.

I mean this is the, one of the perfect examples of that kind of issue. So any potential replacement for this be that under a new PDP or a new PDP would need to be a group that it was smaller and more manageable and made up of people and support from the various different stakeholder groups and constituencies and all that but with a very different mindset and approach to things because otherwise we will be having the same conversation in 12 months' time and if you want to look at it in terms of failure or success it would be a massive failure. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Michele. Erika?

Erika Mann: Yes this is Erika. I would like I wanted to say something similar like Michele. Let me add one other point which I believe makes it the 12 month period quite complicated because we don't know what the temporary measures are going, our recommendations are going to be. We have some ideas but we don't know. But whatever it is going to be you – we have to keep in mind that for European operators or for foreign operators you - who are handling European data the 25th May deadline is – it's going to be a hard deadline. So it's the – when the law comes to force there is no wiggle room a month or two months or whatever nothing, zip, zero, which means at times if somebody a competitor wants to challenge somebody to find they can go to the national DPA and can issue a complaint and it can trigger an investigation.

So whatever we're going to do and whatever the board is recommending I think the council will have to respond in two ways. So one has to be an immediate response with regard to the deadline and whatever is recommended and then the second one is related to those items which can be handled in 12 months. So a 12 month deadline alone I don't believe is going to work.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Erika. And that's very helpfully turned our attention to the question of council and what it is that we need to do. I wonder if, you know, of course the case that no I'm – no 15 minute agenda item was ever going to do this

justice. This was meant to serve as a sort of start of the discussion and an update on the, you know, the calls and the documents that we've reported on to this point.

I wonder if the way forward here is to do a call for volunteers, a small group that wants to put their heads together and think further on this and take this discussion forward. It's not a nice thing to have to cut to such an important discussion off at this stage. But I think we do need to do that because we have guests joining us for our next agenda items.

So Donna, Rafik your thoughts on just make sure I haven't said something silly here, your thoughts on perhaps putting together a small group of interested folks so that we can, you know, we're sure to continue this discussion and can capture that? Any objections to that?

Donna Austin: Heather I have no objection. I think it might also be timely to do a follow-up with the board and just, you know, see if there's any change in their timing or their thinking as well. You know, if we have to go down this path it would be good to know sooner rather than later so any heads up from the board I think at this point will be really helpful.

Heather Forrest: Yes Donna I think that's a good idea to capture that in the action items. And Rafik just checking, any objections from you for a small group?

Rafik Dammak: I don't think objection here be cognizant the current context we have to be ready and to explore the different options so we can have a common understanding when action is needed so I think we should go with that.

Heather Forrest: Great, all right so that also ensures that we can continue these conversations, plenty of volunteers appearing in the chat. We'll keep record of that, if I can ask staff to keep a record and we'll reach out to you after the call. So with that can I turn us back in the WebEx screen to our agenda? We're now looking at Item 8 which is a discussion of updates to the

consensus policy implementation framework. And for that I believe we have Karen on the line. Karen Lentz are you with us?

Karen Lentz: Yes I am. Hello Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Karen very much. So Karen very kindly volunteered to give us an introduction to this topic and has prepared some slides for us which you'll see in the WebEx screen. And with that Karen I turn it over to you. Thanks.

Karen Lentz: Thank you very much Heather and thank you for the invitation to join you, discuss this for a little bit of time today. I'm actually going to hand the slide presentation over to my colleague Brian Aitchison who has done a lot of the work on developing the updates to the framework. And for those who don't recall the consensus with policy implementation framework was something created by the non-PDP Policy and Implementation Working Group in conjunction with staff. And the name was to help document the procedures the staff uses once we have a completed set of policy recommendations from the GNSO and how we go about implementing that with the help of an IRT. So now that we've been working with that for a few years we've identified a few areas that we think can be flushed out more as well as just sort of updated to keep up with the time. So I'm going to let Brian take you through those briefly. Thanks.

Brian Aitchison: Hi. Thanks Karen. Can you hear me okay everyone? Heather?

Heather Forrest: All good Brian. Thanks very much.

Brian Aitchison: Great okay. So yes as Karen mentioned this Consensus Policy Implementation Framework or CIPFs as we call it contains a mandate within it for us to sort of continually review the process and incorporate best practices based on experiences with using the framework and the implementation. So we've spent quite a bit of time over this past year formulating a redline document for the GNSO to review. But we've sent sort

of two sets of proposals to you both implementation related. And I wanted to spend this time kind of clarifying what those proposals are, how they all relate to each other because I think it can probably get kind of confusing especially considering your workload.

So one relates, one set of proposals relates to the overall CIPF process, and the other relates specifically to the support and review stage of the CIPF which we're calling the Post Implementation Consensus Policy Review Framework or PICPRF for short, so there's another acronym for your lexicon.

We sent you a redline version of the original CIPF process that contains our proposed amendments. And all the amendments should be very clear in red lines. We've also added in comments our rationale for adding these changes. Along with this redline document we've sent you a GDD engagement in PDPs document. And that detailed well one of the things we found was we didn't really have a set of guidelines for how we would engage in the PDP if we should, when we should, how we should all while being mindful of it being a community driven process. On this first set of proposals we'd simply like you to review it, give it sort of your sanity check, provide us any feedback questions -- that kind of thing. Can we move to the next slide please? I don't think I have control here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Brian this is Nathalie. All participants can (unintelligible) on the slide decks so you just need to mention what number slide you're on and then we'll be able to move at our own pace.

Brian Aitchison: Okay. Sure sorry. Number two, Slide Number 2. There's only two slides. So the second set of proposals we sent you focus on this post implementation consensus policy review framework or PICPRF. Its focuses solely on the support and review stage of the consensus policy implementation framework. And why are we doing this, because the (CPIPF) contains directives to review implemented consensus policies but really doesn't provide any details on how to carry that out. So this is our attempt to sort of flush out a process for how

to do it. Included in the sort of PICPRF package I suppose that we sent the GNSO is a process flow, well flowchart basically for you to review and alongside it comes a survey with a set of questions to sort of provide you a way to add additional input on how we should be doing this. I think that's all I'm going to say about this for now. I hope this makes sense. I know we've kind of thrown a few things at you but I wanted to clarify that. Our ask of you is essentially just to review the CIPF redline and amendment document, the GDD engagement document and give us your feedback and also to review the policy, the consensus policy review framework and fill in the accompanying survey. We're sort of hoping to get some sort of finalized products by Panama but of course that's dependent on your workload. And I know you all have a lot to do but that's our sort of tentative goal for now. With that I will stop talking and leave it open to any questions you may have.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much Brian for that helpful update and for your two very clear slides and indeed for the documents that we've circulated on the council list including that redline. I don't have any hands up at the moment. Brian I'm going to – oh I do. Donna go for it.

Donna Austin: Sorry Heather. Thanks Brian, Donna Austin from the Registry Stakeholder Group. I just want to be clear when you say what you're looking for from us. Is this a council ask? Is this an SJC ask? I'm just trying to understand what, you know, who this is targeted at whether you're going to – are you just talking to the council? Are you talking to other SPs and Cs as well?

Brian Aitchison: No this is just – am I still on?

Heather Forrest: Brian you are. Back to you.

Brian Aitchison: Okay, great. Okay no that's all Donna. I hope that answers your question. I think it was pretty straightforward but if there's any others let me know.

Donna Austin: Brian…

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: …I suspect we lost your answer. We had a sound of running water and that - unfortunately we didn't hear a word you said. So could you - I'm so sorry to make you do that. Could you repeat yourself?

Brian Aitchison: No it was pretty straightforward Donna. It's really just for the council. We haven't solicited any other feedback from any other SOs or ACs?

Karen Lentz: And this is Karen. To add to what Brian said certainly, you know, our aim is to have the council view on whether anything that we've proposed is contrary to the framework that's been, you know, came up through the working group. And certainly to the extent that the councilors want to disseminate and share that within their stakeholder groups for any feedback that's welcomed also. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: (Unintelligible).

Brian Aitchison: (Unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much. I'm – so we don't have any other hands up. May I ask Karen and Brian in terms of timeline and when you'd like us, you know, ideally to come back on this knowing that we're all a bit manic at the moment it - what would be your ideal timeframe?

Brian Aitchison: Well I'll probably let Karen give you an answer on that. We thought Panama would be a good sort of milestone but that's, you know, two months away now so that might be too fast. Our timeline isn't the same as yours so we sort of would leave it to you in a way. Karen does that sound about right?

Karen Lentz: Sure. So we've actually had the - and you're probably have had them both for slightly different amounts of times. We sent the deadlines on the first portion

on GDD engagement and updates to the framework a few months ago. So you've had that a little longer than the policy review framework which is more recent understanding though that you may not, you know, that essentially we're asking you right now to look at both of those.

But I – our original thought for the engagement piece of it anyway was to want – was to be able to have an updated framework for that within the first half of this year of 2018 so that's the Panama target. For this we've opened a survey tool that helps you, you know, provide input on the questions that we've posed. There are I think five or six just within the proposed flow. There's some open questions as to, you know, what the best approach would be or the views on that. And so I think we've asked for initially a month for people to put feedback in that tool. We would likely then do some work to potentially update the framework and then follow-up with next steps there so I hope that helps.

Heather Forrest: Hey thanks Karen and Brian for your action on that. And I think the redlines are indeed very helpful. You know, my review of them suggests that they go to roles of who does what and this sort of thing and I think they're important clarifications. So we'll take those, put some focus on them and update you as soon as humanly possible if that works for you.

Brian Aitchison: That sounds great…

Karen Lentz: That's great.

Brian Aitchison: …Heather. We appreciate it.

Heather Forrest: Wonderful. And thanks very much Karen and Brian for joining us. I very much appreciate your willingness to do that and do so at the behest of a last minute invitation as well so super kind of you. Thank you very much.

Brian Aitchison: Happy to, thank you.

Karen Lentz: Thank you.

Heather Forrest: All right that takes us back to our agenda. We're running a bit behind time but we have admittedly done fairly well with a very full agenda. We're on to Item 9 now which you'll find at the top of Page 3 which is our discussion of the review of the inter-registrar transfer policy. Caitlin Tubergen from staff very kindly put together some summary slides of what is proposed here. Those slides were linked to the wiki. You'll see them here in the box.

I'll bring to your attention in particular Slide 2 which I think is very, very helpful that the original proposal was for a report to be delivered by the 1stof May. But the report is let's say triggered by a request from council to prepare that report. So there's two questions before us really. One is do we pull the trigger on asking for this analysis to be undertaken, and two what do we want the analysis to entail on IRTP? And you'll see the four proposed points on Slide Number 2 relating to it, let's say various aspects of the IRTP effort.

So question for council than is - well let's say at the start I don't think that the 1st of May is realistic. If we were to start this effort now obviously we wouldn't have a turnaround by the 1st of May but it - that then maybe behooves us to think about what we want to do in terms of whether we want to initiate this activity.

So any thoughts, questions on what council should do here on whether or not we request this analysis to be undertaken? Don't see any hands. Oh, good I do see hands. Darcy followed by Michele. Darcy?

Darcy Southwell: Thanks Heather, Darcy Southwell for the record. I guess mine's really a process question first because I'm a little confused when they talk about convening a panel to collect and analyze data. But are they also making recommendations about what's supposed to come next because I kind of read the second bullet point to read as if they're making decisions that are not

just collecting and maybe analyzing data but also deciding what we need to do next? Am I misunderstanding?

Heather Forrest: Darcy thanks for the question. I don't have an answer to the question but what I would suggest that we do is we can record that as a question and even perhaps more usefully record it as what we would like the scope of this thing to be as opposed to a, you know, as opposed to just sending the question. I think that might be the easiest approach. Does that make sense to you Darcy?

Darcy Southwell: Yes that would be excellent.

Heather Forrest: Okay cool. So we'll come back to you to clarify what the wording should be on that. Michele please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Heather. Sorry, I'm losing my voice. I think also as well in terms of timing anything involving IRTP is going to be impacted by how GDPR is handled, so issues, problems everything else that might be occurring now will probably be quite different what - and once things are changed in the GDPR world. So it's good to bear mind I think.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Michele. Pam?

Pam Little: Can you hear me?

Heather Forrest: We can Pam. Go ahead.

Pam Little: Pam Little speaking from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I agree with what Michele just mentioned about timing of this particular review because of the impact of GDPR or potential impact. The same applies to the RDS Whois 2 review but we are proceeding with that review although the Whois is going to be changed significantly. So I'm not sure whether that is the basis of the potential GDPR impact.

Is the basis to postpone this particular review, the IRTP post implementation review? But beside that point what I was confused is about this status report. I thought that report was proposed by ICANN staff back in February in a letter to the council in which was supposed to be or intended at least that was my understanding as a prelude to the actual review. The letter if I recall correctly was saying staff would prepare this report will contain these elements and then the council can look at it and decide what to do. So it was on that basis or the discussions were around that but now we are – we seem to be saying no, we should do this – the staff status report.

So I am totally confused. And there were some email exchanges on the council's mailing list about some element, the proxy privacy piece that is now referred to the PPSAI IRT team. So to me that is really not relevant because we all know that was the case throughout the last two years or so.

So my point is why can't we proceed with the staff report as proposed? If 1st of May is not doable and not feasible then that's a separate issue, just tell us we can't leave the 5th of May 2018 timeline as indicated in that letter. And also as discussed in San Juan in March during that discussion I didn't get any impression or indication that the status report wasn't going ahead so that's my concern. That's all for me thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Pam. Marika your hand's up. We'll give you the last word on this.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks Heather. This is Marika and I hope I can bring some clarification I think both to the question that Darcy asked and as well as Pam's comment because basically I think if you look at the recommendation as it's up on the screen that was developed at the time when there was no framework in place for conducting reviews.

And this closely links of course to the item that Brian just address that, you know, we're now working on having a framework in place to have a kind of,

you know, predictable approach to dealing with reviews. And as Pam noted, you know, the first step in that is a staff initiated or drafted report that would kind of outline, you know, the original policy recommendations, whether they try to achieve, you know, some of the metrics around that data collected with a potentially a couple of recommendations on what possible next steps would be which then would be handed back to the GNSO Council to make a determination for what if anything should happen next. At least from a staff perspective I think, you know, we're still, you know, preparing to do that.

You know, and I do have to say that the original date of 1st of May will probably not be able to make that. They will need some additional time as, you know, we were waiting for some council feedback as well on the proposed approach that took a bit of time. But we're doing our best to gather all the information as soon as we can but of course we want to make sure as well that it's a robust report and gives you enough information to then decide what should happen next.

And, you know, to Michele's point, you know, definitely GDPR will be one of the issues that will get flagged because at least, you know, from what the current set of interim model looks like it will have a direct impact on the policy as such as a, you know, relies on certain elements in Whois. So I hope that clarifies I think the different points that were made. You know, unless there is a serious concern from the council to having staff prepare this report and sharing it with you so that on that basis you can then make a determination if how and when you want to proceed, you know, we would go ahead and get that to you as soon as we can.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Marika. So I think there were some comments here that we need to follow-up on in terms of clarifying the scope of, you know, if we do want to go ahead with this. What I suggest we do is let's follow up with Darcy, Michele and Pam for clarification of these points let's say on what the status report should include and then the timeline. We'll have a look at that as council on the list. And, you know, if we see that language polished up and we're

comfortable with it then we'll action that from there. I'm conscious that if we try and action it today we won't have the full sense of what is that we're actioning. So with that in mind I'm – I will pose that as a way forward unless anyone objects to that.

Pam I see your hand is up but I'm wondering if it's an old hand? All right I suspect Pam's is an old hand. Okay then let's follow-up with that on the list perfect. Let's follow-up with that on the list and Michele and Darcy and Pam we'll follow-up with you to work on that language. That takes us to you Darcy. And for Item 10 which is an update in your capacity as PPSAI IRT liaison.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks Heather Darcy, Southwell. So I sent an update to the council list I think on April 2. I outlined a couple of key things there, one being that there's just some generally some unresolved language in the proposed accreditation agreement. No progress has been made on that. It really looks like that lack of consensus is going to remain in the public comments documents that go out. We'll show both options.

The second issue really is about the fees that ICANN is proposing. They charge for application fees to the accreditation program as well as the ongoing annual fee for keeping your accreditation. There was a presentation made in Puerto Rico. The same presentation was made at Tuesday, this past Tuesday's meeting. Without any further detail members, many of the members are asking for details to help understand what the fees are based on.

That was, I understand that should be delivered by the end of next week. This pushes the public comment period out to probably late May. That's all that's really new. I don't know if anyone has specific questions about what's going on? I think the bottom line I would say is that depending on the fee issue since we don't have the details I don't know where that's going to end up but the proposed documents that are going to go out for public comment are just

going to have this rather great discrepancy that they expect public comment to somehow resolve.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Darcy very much. And you have hand up for Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, no, just to add to - this is Michele for the record and all that. The issue around the fees is something that has been raised by multiple members of the IRT going back several months. We have repeatedly requested an explanation, a rationale and a breakdown of the fees. And so far we have received, I'm trying to think of a diplomatic way of putting this, let's just say I'll go with very little.

The challenge here is that in some respects this entire thing could actually be rendered mute depending on how Whois is handled in relation to GDPR. But the way that this entire thing is being handled in terms of getting responses on what we would have thought were quite simple questions has been very, very frustrating.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Michele. And thanks very much Darcy. So Darcy I assume that what we're doing now is, you know, a good time let's say to advertise the public comment period that will open. And I suppose it would be timely to have an update from you after that's over. Does that make sense?

Darcy Southwell: Yes I think that does make sense.

Heather Forrest: Great. Well thank you very much Darcy for your update. That then takes us to the final substantive item on our agenda which is an update on the joint timelines of RPM, PDP and sub pro. And I'm - any other business. And for those I will turn to Donna. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Heather, Donna Austin I was typing something in chat. I've got a question about the last item. So Item 11 which is the joint timeline of the all rights protection mechanisms in all gTLDs in the new Subsequent

Procedures PDP Working Group folks might recall that in San Juan we had a discussion with the leaders of the phase 2 PDPs about some concerns about the timelines being incompatible. And Paul as the liaison of the RPM PDP and Keith and I as the joint liaisons for the subsequent procedures PDP were asked to get together and see if we could, you know, take the issue apart and potentially come forward to the council or the working groups with a recommendation for how to move forward.

Paul, Keith and I had an initial conversation about this last week. We agreed that we need to do some scoping on the issue and understand the requirements. And that's about as far as we've got at this point in time. So Keith and Paul did you have anything you wanted to add to that?

Keith Drazek: Thanks Donna. This is Keith. I'll just say yes thanks for the update. I think that's great. And Donna and I have reached out to (Jeff) and Cheryl of the Subsequent Procedures Group. and I think, you know, just establishing, you know, good lines of communication between the two groups and to make sure that everybody's expectations are managed is a really important thing at this stage whether it's interrelation or interdependency between a couple of groups. So I have nothing more to add to that. Thanks for the update Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Keith. Paul I don't know if you're still on the line whether you can speak or not?

Paul McGrady: Yes thanks Donna. This is Paul. I am having to wrap up the WebEx portion but yes we – so essentially we're at kick off stage on this but there are a couple of things that we are trying to be mindful of which is first of all syncing up the timelines between these two PDPs, making sure that there are no contingencies on the RPM side that would slow down implementation on the subsequent procedures side in the event subsequent procedure PDP is done first.

When you look at the timeframes it's really interesting to me the different folks looking at the same timeframes come up with different views on whether or not these two PDPs will resolve themselves in a, you know, a corresponding timeframe that allows both to move forward. There is just so you know some talk on the RPM PDP of pushing the URS over into phase 2 rather than in Phase 1 just to ensure that the RPM PDP doesn't interfere with the subsequent procedures timeline. I'll have more information on that probably in our next call.

So we are looking sort of at all the moving pieces there and looking at how to empower the co-chairs to make sure that they, you know, while they're listening to everybody and giving everybody a voice that they're not allowing, you know, repeat issues that have been discussed and settled to, you know, come back up again and things like that that would grind the time frames to a halt.

So there's a lot of work to be done. I'm three days behind Donna and Keith just because I took a three day holiday to Iceland which I don't regret. But I'm going to try to get - catch back up with them and reach out to the RPM co-chairs in the next couple of days just so that next time we come back for me we'll be a little further along on pace on this. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks very much Paul. Does anybody have any questions in relation to this? Okay great so I think we'll move forward to Item 12 on the agenda which is just an update on ICANN 62 planning. Oh it's actually under any other business. Nathalie do we have a slide to put up for this? This will be very quick folks.

So bearing in mind that we're still six weeks out to Panama but there's, some planning has been done so far with regard to the block schedule what you will see on the screen in the orange is agreement from the SO, AC Planning Team about high interest, topics so cross community topics so far. So there's

still a few vacancies there. So there's some further discussion that the SO AC leaders have to do to fill those last lots.

Just also would like to highlight for the council in particular that we are taking a slightly different approach to council or GNSO working sessions. So we've pulled back a little bit on the amount of time that we've put on the schedule for those sessions and we're a little bit – it's not in one single (unintelligible) so look at understand (unintelligible).

Thank you. Just so that you understand what the – at the moment what the planning we're doing in terms of your availability for different sessions. One thing we are looking into is as a result of the call that we had with the Leadership Team had with Goran a couple of weeks ago they would like the council to undertake the strategic outlook planning exercise. So we're trying to find a way to fit that into our schedule as well. It may actually have to be as part of an after-hours session but we're trying to be creative about that. So that's just a very quick update Heather. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Donna. That's very helpful and I think very important to emphasize that this is a work in progress. As Donna has noted there are discussions still to be had at the end of next week amongst the amongst the SO AC leaders in finalizing the cross community topics and we're never quite sure what pieces will move in those discussions. We hope to have these things I mean I guess it's a double edge sword. You hope to have them locked down as early as possible so we can go about our own scheduling but at the same time it's hard to know what cross community topics we want that far in advance.

So this is where we are. The secretariat staff is in the process of reaching out to the various SGs and Cs so that the leadership of those groups would be in discussion with the secretary in terms of their own planning and how we go about that. But that's where we are. Any questions on ICANN 62?

No I see no hands up. That takes us then to the end of our agenda. Any final remarks, comments, questions for our April meeting?

Now we've done a tremendous effort in an enormous agenda today. Some of the items rather more difficult than others emotionally or intellectually so, you know, great effort by everyone. Thank you very, very much. With that let's say final call for interventions? It doesn't look like we have any, just checking, triple checking hands up I don't see any, marvelous. With that I'll call the meeting to a close. Thank you very much everyone for your input today and to be continued. Thanks very much.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for joining everybody. This concludes today's call. You may now disconnect your lines. Goodbye.

END