EN

ICANN Transcription

GNSO Council

Thursday, 19 September 2019 at 2100 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://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/PuXU1OR7Ev87q-sfarOwQiLmlnkoVtxR3BmGuRJgb7luVZXKoY_fP6uf5f-GM3RQ

Zoom Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/hL9AI0WzQvfY1UaNZs0CSUIIEkqtCCgzIEDagsk7RPZSfFxAxE9_4ooNnhZVTwoI?startTime=1568926885000

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

List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): **– Non-Voting** – Erika Mann (absent, apology sent)

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Pam Little, Michele Neylon, Darcy Southwell (apology sent, proxy to Michele Neylon)

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

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Carlos Raul Gutierrez

Non-Contracted Parties House

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

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

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Syed Ismail Shah

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison

Julf (Johan) Helsingius– GNSO liaison to the GAC

Maarten Simon – ccNSO observer

Guest speaker: ICANN Org: Karen Lentz

ICANN Staff

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

Marika Konings – Vice President, Policy Development Support – GNSO

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

Julie Hedlund – Policy Director

Steve Chan – Policy Director

Berry Cobb – Policy Consultant

Emily Barabas – Policy Manager

Ariel Liang – Policy Support Specialist

Caitlin Tubergen – Policy Senior Manager

Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Operations (apologies)

Andrea Glandon - Operations Support - GNSO Coordinator

Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator

EN

TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting, taking place on the 19th of September, 2019. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it out? Thank you. Pam Little?
PAM LITTLE:	Here.
TERRI AGNEW:	Rubens Kuhl?
RUBENS KUHL:	Here.
TERRI AGNEW:	Maxim Alzoba?
MAXIM ALZOBA:	Here.
TERRI AGNEW:	Keith Drazek?
KEITH DRAZEK:	Here.

TERRI AGNEW: We do have listed apologies from Darcy Southwell, as she's traveling. She may try to join for a short portion of the meeting, but just in case, her proxy will go to Michele Neylon if every needed. Michele Neylon?

MICHELE NEYLON: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Carlos Gutierrez?

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Marie Pattullo?

MARIE PATTULLO: Here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Scott McCormick?

I don't see where Scott has joined as of yet, but we'll go ahead and see if we can get him on. Paul McGrady?

Paul, I do believe you joined earlier. If you could just check both your mutes.

I do see where Paul is connected. We'll go ahead and check his audio here in a moment. Paul, I did unmute you on the Zoom side. I don't know if you want to try to check it on your side again one more time before I move on.

All right. We'll go ahead and move on. Rafik Dammak?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Elsa Saade?

ELSA SAADE: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Arsene Tungali?

ARSENE TUNGALI: I'm here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Just as a side note, Arsene is just on audio only. Flip Petillion?

FLIP PETILLION: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Philippe Fouquart?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Osvaldo Novoa has sent his apologies. Just in case, his proxy goes to Philippe Fouquart. Tatiana Tropina?

TATIANA TROPINA: I'm here. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Martin Silva Valent also sends his apologies, proxy to Elsa Saade. Ayden Federline also sends his apology, proxy to Tatiana Tropina.

                       I do believe Syed is on the telephone side only. Syed, if you could just test your mute.

                       All right. We'll go ahead and check on Syed's audio. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Here, Terri. By the way, I'm hearing Syed on the telephone connection.

TERRI AGNEW: Perfect.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just not on the Zoom.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, okay. We'll go ahead and test that out. Thank you very much. Erika Mann sends her apologies. Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Maarten Simon?

MAARTEN SIMON: Yes, I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. I do believe Scott McCormick has joined as well. Scott, do you want to go ahead and just acknowledge that you've joined?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Yeah. I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. We will have guest speakers of Karen Lentz from ICANN org join us a little bit later. From staff, we have Marika Koninigs, Steve Chan, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Caitlin Tubergen, Ariel Liang, Emily Barabas, Barry Cobb, Mike Brennan for technical support, Andrea Glandon, and myself, Terri Agnew.

We also have listed apologies from Nathalie Peregrine. May I please remind everyone to state your name before speaking for recording purposes?

Thank you, everyone. With this, I'll turn it back over to our Chair, Keith Drazek. Please begin.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Terri. And thanks for taking over the kickoff administrative duties. Hi, everybody. This is Keith Drazek. Welcome to the 19th of September 2019 GNSO Council call. I'm going to take one moment here and ask everybody to unmute your lines. We're going to wish Nathalie a happy birthday. She is on a plane right now getting ready to go celebrate her 40th birthday. I think it would be nice for her to hear all of us with her a happy birthday when she returns and listen to the recording. So on the count of three, we're going to say, "Happy Birthday, Nathalie!" One, two, three!

EVERYBODY:	Happy birthday, Nathalie!

KEITH DRAZEK:	Excellent. Thanks, everybody. All right, let's get to business. Let me ask if there are any updates to statements of interest that anybody would like to provide.
	Tatiana, please. Over to you.

TATIANA TROPINA:	Thank you very much. I have a big update to my statement of interest. In the last week, I changed the country and the job. So I'm not living in Germany anymore and I'm not working for the Max Planck Institute anymore. I took a position as an assistant professor of cybersecurity governance at Leiden University in The Hague. So I'm now living in Holland and working for Leiden University as an assistant professor. I'm still non-commercial. I'm still from the European region, but yeah, I've had a big change.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Congratulations.

KEITH DRAZEK:	Yes, indeed. Thank you, Tatiana. Congratulations. That's very exciting news. I'm glad that you're still able to continue with us on council, even despite the change. Thank you so much.
	Any other statements of interests? Any updates?

All right. Thank you, all. Let's move on then. We will do a brief review of the agenda. If there's anything anybody would like to add, please let me know. We have several substantive items to go over today. We will have a council discussion on the ICANN Board's referrals of the CCT-RT recommendations, those that were referred to the council and also to the GNSO PDP working groups. We will then have a council discussion on the IRTP policy status report and council's next steps related to the IRTP and transfer policy.

Item #6 on the agenda will be a council discussion on the draft amendment to the RPM PDP charter to integrate Recommendation 5 from the IGO/INGO curative rights final report. This is a small group that's come together and produced a recommended amendment to the RPM PDP charter to factor in the IGO protections issue. So we'll have a conversation about that.

Item #7 on our agenda is a discussion about ICANN org's request for clarification about data accuracy in Phase 2 of the EPDP and also specifically the ARS. This is a topic that we've had on our agenda for several months following receipt of the letter from Goran that teed up the question. We'll talk about that today.

Item #8 will be a council discussion on the EPDP Phase 1 Recommendation 27 and the impact of GDPR and the Phase 1 recommendations on other existing policies and procedures. That's where Karen Lentz from ICANN org will join us.

Item 9 on our council agenda is an update from our council PDP 3.0 small group. Item #10 is a council discussion on the draft

response to Verisign's request to defer enforcement of the thick WHOIS transition policy. There is a letter that is out and has been out on the list for, I think, ten days now that is a draft response there. When we get to that section, I will hand off the discussion, if there's any discussion to be had, to Pam and Rafik to manage that discussion, since Verisign is also my employer.

Item #11 on the council discussion is a draft response to questions on the IRP-IOT. That's the Independent Review Process Oversight Team. Finally, we'll get to Any Other Business, where there's a draft council letter to the ICANN Board about the NCAP and any possible dependencies between it and the new gTLD subsequent procedures and then just a reminder that we're going to have a possible e-mail vote on the approval of members and liaisons to the CSC.

So you can see we have quite a full agenda. Lots of substance to discuss. We don't currently have any votes. We have no votes scheduled for today and there's nothing on our consent agenda. So I think we'll be able to pick up some time there. I'm going to basically make the decision that we're going to defer the review of projects list and action items list to the end of the call so we can be sure to get through all of the substantive items that are there before us.

Again, there's some things here that we've had outstanding for quite some time. I think there's important work that we need to do during this call, following this call, and during our next call leading into ICANN 66 in Montreal, which is just around the corner.

EN

So let's get right down to business. Well, let me pause and see if there are any questions, any updates, or proposed amendments to the agenda.

I see no hands. I'll just remind everybody that I did send out a summary e-mail yesterday. I hope everybody has had a chance to review it. If you haven't, please look for it. It might help prepare all of us to have the conversations we're going to have here today.

So no changes to the agenda. Item 1.4 is just a note that the minutes of the previous council meetings have been posted. The minutes of the council meeting from the 18th of July were posted on the 2nd of August, and the minutes from the meeting on the 22nd of August were posted on the 6th of September.

With that, let us move directly to Item #4, which is the council discussion on the ICANN Board's referrals of the CCT-RT recommendations. I'll tee this up and then I'm going to hand it over to Pam. Essentially what we have here is that the ICANN Board, as know, going back to the workshop that took place prior to the Kobe meeting, referred a whole series of recommendations that came from the CCT-RT to various parts of the community. Some were referred to ICANN org. Some were referred to the GNSO Council. Some were referred to some of the PDP working groups, including SubPro.

I think what we essentially have before us is an obligation to address the Board's referrals of the items that went to council and then to also discuss how we intend to work with our PDP working groups to make sure these are all responded to and addressed.

So we've had a small team of councilors working on this. The first proposed draft was circulated on the 23rd of July. A second draft was circulated on the 30th of August. The latest version is going to be put up on the screen shortly. So we need to discuss our next steps on this. Coming out of this meeting, we need to, I think, be close to approving or ready to approve the direct response.

If there's any concerns or questions or further work that needs to be put into it, now's the time to consider and discuss that. We can continue the discussions on the list. Then we'll need to figure out how to engage with the PDP working group leaders.

As the setup, Pam, let me hand this over to you. If we can put the proposed response up on the screen. Thank you.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Keith. Can you hear me okay?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Sure can.

PAM LITTLE: Thanks. Hi, everybody. I hope you can see on the screen now: this is a proposed initial response from the GNSO Council to the Board, if you like. The small team consists of myself, Carlos, and Michele. I'm not sure whether you all have had a chance – I certainly hope so – to review our proposed council response.

There are five recommendations here that you can see. We tried to set out in a table format what those recommendations are, the

recommendation number, the description of the recommendation, and whether the recommendation was passed to or directed to other groups other than GNSO in a particular column. You can see that Recommendation 10, for example, as only passed through to the GSNO.

We also set out what we think the small group as a proposed GNSO Council response, if you like … Then we also tried to set out the rationale – why we proposed such a response.

I will just very briefly walk you through those five recommendations that are passed through to the GNSO. The first one is #10, which is that the CCT Review Team recommended that the GNSO initiate a new policy to create a consistent privacy baseline across all registries. You can see our response here. We feel it really is not appropriate for the council to initiate such a new PDP at this time. You can see our rationale. We feel this is probably overtaken by events such as GDPR and the EPDP.

Oddly, the recommendation says, "For clarification, this recommendation does not relate to issues involving WHOIS or registration directory services data." We feel that is only the part that really is within ICANN's remit or GNSO's remit. If it's about the general privacy protection or practices of registries around the globe, that is certainly up to each registry to ascertain what the applicable laws and regulations are that they are subject to. So, on that basis, our recommendation or the small team's recommendation of the GNSO response is to not initiate such a PDP.

We can move onto the next one. It's about abuse. The small team's recommendation as a GNSO response to this, as you can see, was directed to a number of parties, including the ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholder Group, the Registrar Stakeholder Group, the GNSO, and SubPro. We feel the recommendation really has two aspects to it. One is about the DAAR project or the Domain Abuse Activity Reporting initiative that is being managed by ICANN's CTO's office. And it's about the recommendations about further study and reporting of the data. We feel then that such aspects or the recommendation should be directed to ICANN's Office of the Chief Technology Officer.

The second point of that recommendation is about enforcement if the data identified bad actors. Again, we feel that this part of the recommendation probably should be directed to ICANN's Contractual Compliance.

However, in the rationale, you can see the added text, which was really added because these recommendations that were passed through to us actually came to us around the last ICANN meeting. Subsequently, there has been a lot of conversation discussion going on within the ICANN community about abuse. So the added text on the rationale really is trying to recognize that this is an important topic within the ICANN community. The council really wants to acknowledge that there is ongoing community dialogue and efforts in trying to understand the nature of abuse and also to see what's within the ICANN remit that can address those abuses and the possible mitigation measures.

So we hope that the rationale add would add some sort of clarity or thinking of why we feel the current recommendation from the

CCT Review Team really at the moment should be directed to ICANN org. But then there is ongoing community efforts or discussion on this important topic.

The next recommendation is about the interoperability of the URS and the UDRP. The small team feels that this one really should be directed to the RPM Working Group, but we are also sensitive to the fact that the RPM Working Group is in their last mile, if you like, trying to wrap up their Phase 1 work. So we feel that maybe the best time to raise this with the RPM Working Group is when they finish their Phase 1 work and before they go into Phase 2.

The next CCT Review Team recommendation is 28. Recommendation 28 basically is recommending some sort of a cost and benefit analysis of the TMCH. From my own research and information provided by staff, it appears that there is no such cost and benefit analysis done during the RPM Working Group's Phase 1, although there were some studies done on TMCH by the Analysis Group. But the report from the Analysis Group clearly says that was our of their scope. In other words, that wasn't done. There wasn't such a cost and benefit analysis done. So the small team feels we should probably refer this recommendation to the RPM Working Group and then seek their feedback.

The next one or the last one that passed through to the GNSO was Recommendation 29: set objective metrics for application from the global south. I think you can probably tell from the Board reaction to the set of recommendations from the CCT Review Team that there's difficulty with the definition of the global south or that there isn't such a clear definition. So some of those

recommendations that reference the global south seem to be a bit difficult, a bit vague.

So for this one the small team feels is probably best to refer this recommendation to the SubPro Working Group. We feel this is within the scope of the SubPro.

With that, I would probably just pause there and see whether there are any questions or comments or suggested changes to the proposed council response to those recommendations. Also, I would like you to probably consider whether we should submit these council responses to the ICANN Board now or wait until we seek feedback from other working groups. Personally, I feel it would be best if we can submit those responses now, just to keep the momentum going. Otherwise, with the SubPro and PDP Working Group, if we have to wait for their feedback, it could be a couple months or even longer down the track. I just feel we should probably wrap this up and then keep this on everyone's radar. At least this will be the first phase of our response. Once we coordinate with the other groups, like SubPro and RPM, then we can send a second [tranche] of our response to the ICANN Board.

So I'll pause there and open up the floor. Thank you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Pam, and thanks to the small team for the work that you have all put into this in preparing something for council's consideration. You're getting a bunch of plus-ones in support in terms of the timing and your suggestion to wrap this up and send it as soon as we reasonably can and then follow up

separately with the PDP Working Group leaders. If anybody feels differently, feel free to speak up or put your hand up.

So far, Pam, I think your suggestion of trying to get this piece wrapped up and delivered is getting support. This has been hanging out there for a little while in terms of multiple drafts. So I just wanted to thank you all for the work that you've done. It's probably time to draw a line under this one.

Noting that we had a previous draft on the 23rd of July and a second draft (this draft) was circulated on the 30 of August, I feel like we ought to be in place where we're able to wrap this up fairly quickly. But I'm going to open this up for any discussion.

Any hands? Anybody who'd like to get in on this, please put up your hand. I know there's stuff going on in chat as well.

Pam, go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Keith. If there are no further comments or questions, may I suggest that we may put it out there for another week after this meeting. If there are any suggested edits, then folks can send their suggestion to the list. If we hear nothing within the next week or so, then we can clean this up, tidy it up, and send it to the Board. How does that sound?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Pam. And thanks for the suggestion. I think that makes a lot of sense. I'm sure some folks would like the opportunity to take

one more look at this after your good summary. So let's do that. Let's say that any further comments or edits are needed by Wednesday of next week. Well, let's call it Thursday of next week so it's a week from today. Then we will plan on sending by Thursday COB or on Friday.

Pam, thank you very much. I think that's a great summary. Thank you for dealing with that so precisely. Thanks for leading the small team work on this one.

Let's move on. The next item on the agenda – actually, Paul, I don't want to put you on the spot here, but I know you've got some time constraints at the top of the hour. I'm thinking about giving Pam a break because she's going to speak to the next item (#5) on IRTP. We perhaps ought to flip to Item 6 now, which is the small team's draft amendments on the RPM charter with regard to the IGO protections issue. Paul, would it be okay if I put you on the spot here, or at least you and the small team, to move to #6?

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Keith. Can you hear me?

KEITH DRAZEK: I can.

PAUL MCGRADY: Great. Thank you. I had some trouble earlier with the phone connection. Thanks, Keith. Thanks for allowing me to moved up.

I'm getting ready to switch away from my desk and on my way to O'Hara for a meeting out of the country. So I appreciate it.

We have before us up for discussion, not a vote, draft amendments related to the RPM charter to integrate some proposed changes. They have disappeared from me on my screen, however. I don't know if they're coming back or … let's see here. Maybe I can go out to the link or the [inaudible].

KEITH DRAZEK: There you go. You should have it back up on the screen now.

PAUL MCGRADY: All right. Let's see … there they are. So we … maybe I'll work off the one that's in the Zoom. So it's meant to be an [addendum] charter to deal with the issues on the NGO/IGO [immunity] questions related to the UDRP. The idea here is that we would have a streamlined process. It would be under PDP 3.0 principles to the extent that we have those tacked down. We would invite Work Track 5. We would invite various folks from the GAC, from IGOs, to participate in the process. We would enforce the ICANN expected standards of behavior. Importantly, it would be similar to Work Track 5, not only in the terms of reference, or SubPro but also in the sense that the remit of the group would be very narrow.

As you guys might remember from the final recommendations of the IGO/NGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms, we voted yes to the first four and then essentially voted no to one of the last remaining issues because it was a change to the UDRP

EN

that really didn't solve the problem. In fact, it arguably made it worse.

The problem is that we really haven't yet solved the problem that we were asked to solve, namely that, when an IGO prevails in the UDRP or URS, the losing registrant fails in court and the IGO then is put into a pickle where the IGO can either submit to jurisdiction or can claim their usual immunity. If they claim their immunity, then the idea would be that the UDRP or [URS] decision would be set aside. Essentially what that means is that there really is no UDRP mechanisms for IGOs in that circumstance because all a loser needs to do is file a complaint and wait for the prior decision to be vacated.

So we need to take a look at that. In the process of that, the small group, which consisted of Maarten and me – Elsa came in and out of it by e-mail for a while – discussed putting together a very narrow scope group to address this particular issue.

What we're proposing, what it boils down to, is there'll be this work track that does not belong to Phase 1. It doesn't really belong to Phase 2 either. Phase 1 is wrapping up its work and we don't want to give them anything more to do that will slow them down. Phase 2 really hasn't kicked off yet. This particular IGO work track will look specifically at this one particular issue. You guys have read the proposal, which went to the lists quite a while ago. We talked about pushing this into Phase 2 but the Phase 2, I think, will not kick off until Phase 1 is done. So we don't want to put it off while we're waiting for Phase 1 to wrap up. Yes, it involved the URS. The URS was meant to be dealt with in Phase 1, but how it really shook up in Phase 1 is that the URS is being looked at in certain

EN

aspects, but some of the operational and substantive aspects are being looked at in Phase 2, along with the UDRP, because they're so similar.

So I think it's odd that this would not be part of Phase 1. The UDRP is not being considered in Phase 1, so I think it would be awkward to be there. Phase 2? Yes, it might fall nicely there, but there's a timing issue because, on Phase 2 wrapping up, assuming it stays in the same track as Phase 1 did, it could be three years or four years from now or longer. Hopefully not, but it could be. There's a need for speed here.

So that is the issue and what we're trying to do. Sorry to sound so fuzzy. It's a fuzzy issue. We need to discuss if this the way forward. Do we want to establish this independent work track to deal with this issue? If so, what would that look like? We're proposing, as I said, a PDP 3.0 approach where each constituency or stakeholder group appoints people with the appropriate background and we move forward.

In terms of the membership, we'd like for them to have a basic understanding of the issues (international IP law and arbitration and that kind of thing). Maxim proposed in an e-mail that, instead of that, some of the contracted parties could appoint people with knowledge of implementation issues. I don't really see there being any technical issues that are meant to be implemented, but if Maxim sees them or can anticipate them and he wants to include a change like that, that doesn't bother me too much. There's some discussion about that going on on the list. It would be narrow in who gets appointed. We've got some other things in here that are standard stuff [inaudible].

So what's being proposed is that the Registry Stakeholder gets to appoint up to two. Registrar: up to two. Commercial Stakeholder Group: four. Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group: up to four. And then two members from each interested SOs and ACs. So ALAC could appoint two. GAC: two. On and on. And then two folks appointed by IGOs. The idea is it would be a relatively small team but it'd be an expert team. The goal is for us to move quickly.

So that is long-winded. I think that's probably it, unless there's something else staff wants me to address on that. But that's the idea. So we have deliverables. You can see they meant to be fairly standard but fast with a quick timeline. By that point, Phase 2 should be underway. So that appears to be the method for them to be approved.

So how do we go from here, Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Paul. Thanks very much for the summary, the overview, and for all of the work that you and others have put into this. I think my initial reaction upon reading this is that I appreciate the fact that the small team considered the PDP 3.0 approach and reforms and possible implementation. The narrow scope I think is important. It includes the interested parties, including specifically the IGOs, because that was one of the problems with the previous PDP: there was a lack of participation from them. The proposed structure is not going to impact the other work of the RPM PDP Working Group, including not slowing down the current progress on Phase 1. The timeline as outlined is achievable and is intended to be wrapped up in fairly short order so it doesn't drag on.

So, on those five points, I think it sounds like we're, from my perspective, very much on the right track. I'm sure that folks will have some adjustments or edits that we'd like to make. That's the purpose of having this discussion.

With that, let me turn it over to Elsa and then to Tatiana. Go ahead, Elsa.

ELSA SAADE: Thanks, Keith and Paul, for the elaborate brief. I can see that a lot of work has been put into this. But I'm not going to go into substance just yet. I want to note that I'd like to not be considered part of the small team, especially given I could not really engage in the development of the addendum charter. I do have detailed comments, which I've been promising for a while. I will follow-up with an e-mail concerning statements that I think should not be in the charter from the GNSO Council perspective, like issues relating to substance. But I'll delve into these further later.

There's one statement I believe is problematic procedurally that I thought I should highlight for everyone's attention on this call. Just for your reference, the statement is at the very end of Section 3. It says, I quote, "The GNSO Council recognizes that, while it wishes for the IGO work track to develop recommendations that are generally consistent with Recommendations 1 through 4 from the IGO/INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP final report, it is possible that the final recommendations may supersede or affect the scope of those four previous recommendations."

I'd like to note that, procedurally, any recommendation that is passed by the GNSO Council, as far as I know, is final. Right? Recommendations 1 through 4 are final. The only recommendation that will be reviewed is Recommendation 5. That should be the only recommendation that can still be deliberated upon. Please correct me if I'm wrong. I thought I'd highlight this because I feel like this could open up a Pandora's Box that we don't want to open up as a council.

Again, thank you so much for the work that you put into this, Paul, Marie, and Maarten. I'll definitely be sending more comments soon. I thought this is important to highlight. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Elsa. Maybe I'll respond at least with my view on this one, and that is I think that, as we all know, while we have delivered our recommendations on 1 through 4 to the Board, the Board has not yet taken action. In Marrakech, if I'm remembering my meetings correctly, we had a conversation with the GAC and the IGOs and basically had further discussions on this topic broadly (the IGO protections issue) and this concept of setting up a small team, a small group, to further tackle the issue as it relates to UDRP and generally.

So, while, yes, procedurally we have Recommendations 1 through 4 that are currently with the Board, I think the Board has taken the approach or is taking the approach of a wait-and-see to determine how we charter this group, what the participants look like, and whether there's an opportunity for the topic of IGO protections to

EN

be addressed more holistically or with an outcome that isn't as negative as Recommendation 5 was.

I'm going to stop there before I get too far ahead of myself. I see Tatiana is in the queue also. Marie, if there's anything you would like to contribute to this discussion, you're always welcome to join. Tatiana and then Maxim.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Keith. Thank you very much, Elsa. First of all, thank to Paul and Maarten and Marie who worked on this document. Keith, thank you very much for your intervention because, as Elsa said, I'm not very comfortable with this part of the recommendations. I'm very much not in love with this document because of this part. [Your] intervention made me even more worried. I do not think that the fact that the Board hasn't approved those four recommendation yet actually provides us with a possibility to open these wounds for negotiating them. I think that, by putting this word in this paragraph of Section 3, we are making ourselves even more vulnerable to opportunity that they're not going to be approved or they are going to be renegotiated. Anything can happen, right, in this life and the whole GNSO process. I'm just wondering.

It wasn't an easy process to agree on those recommendations. There was a lot of pressure on us. It wasn't an easy process for us to vote on these. Then we're just giving it up. We're giving it away so easily, and I do not see any reason why we are doing so. And I do not see any reason why we are basically [playing the state] and saying, "Hey, you can negotiate those four." Why are we having

them at all? What would the rationale for the Board to approve them at all?

If you can provide me with this rationale with your thoughts, I would be happy to hear. But for now, I'm very much against this paragraph. I think that we have to put that 1 to 4 [up for] approval by the Board are not renegotiable. Otherwise, this process can take ages and maybe there would be no conclusion at all. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Tatiana. I think perhaps the language here is an acknowledgement that existing policy recommendations can only be replaced by new policy recommendations. I think that's true of any PDP. We're going to be facing some of that with some other policies and impacts. But I understand your point, and I think this is something that we'll need to discuss a bit further before we finalize this.

I have Maxim and then Paul. Maxim, please?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, my suggestion, which was sent by e-mail almost right before the meeting, was about ensuring that whatever the small group comes to [inaudible] is operationally and technically feasible and actually doable. They require qualifications that actually prevent the contracted party house from [operation] because you don't have mainly international lawyers doing DNS operations, the DNS technical part.

My suggestion is to keep the [inaudible] some representatives of maybe a single representative of the contracted party house, even if it's only to the technical and operational party without [inaudible] anything for the legal part. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Maxim. Thank for the clarification. We can certainly continue that conversation here or on the list. Thanks for sending your note earlier.

Paul, I'm going to hand it over to you now.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. I wanted to respond to the issue raised by Elsa and Tatiana. Keith has already addressed this, but, as we all know, no policy is safe to future policy. So I don't think that we can necessarily dig in and say that Recommendations 1 through 4 can't be changed. The reason why this paragraph is in here was really was the heads up because what we didn't want to happen was that we impanel this work track and they make a tweak to Recommendation 2, for example, and then everybody goes, "Oh, my gosh! How did that happen?"

So the idea was just to warn people that it could happen. It wasn't meant to signal that anybody gunning for Recommendations 1 through 4 were to encourage the work track to do it. So, if it's the heads up itself that's causing the consternation, then I think everybody is appropriately been given a heads up. And I think the language then becomes vestigial and we don't need to keep it.

If, however, it really is a desire to make Recommendations 1 through 4 policy forever, I don't know how to do that under the bylaws we have now.

So I guess we have to decide if it's really the language that's the problem and everybody feels appropriately warned that this could happen. Or do we want to make 1 through 4 sacrosanct? If it's the latter, then we've got a bigger issue to deal with. If it's the former, then great. We're done. I hope that's helpful. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Paul. I think clearly we have some more work to do on this paragraph or parts of this paragraph. To your point, as long as people recognize that, as is true with all policies, as you noted, that a new policy that's recommended and supported by the GNSO Council and approved by the Board would and always will overtake a previous policy … So that's just the reality, but if there's concern about calling it out and making it so explicit in this document and the proposed charter of the group, then I think we need to consider next steps on that one.

Tatiana, please?

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Paul, for your explanation. Let me be clear here. I'm not calling for Recommendations 1 to 4 to be carved in stone. I believe that it is not possible in the bylaws. We all know that, if the new recommendations are passed by the consensus policy making process, they will change Recommendations 1 through 4, and we do not have to write it in the charter or in the

documents to enable this because, if it's procedurally possible, it will happen anyway.

But I believe what is happening here looks like plain encouragement. It looks like incitement. This is something different. I do not believe that, if we will keep these, we will carve the policies in stone. No. But clearly this paragraph screams at me encouragement to change those recommendations. I do not believe that, with all the hassle we've had already with this PDP, it's actually necessary, especially if you say that it is still very much possible under the GNSO procedures. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Tatiana. I think that's well-said. So we clearly have some more work to do on this. I think Paul indicated that, as long as everybody understands the process and the procedure and what might come, then perhaps the paragraph is unnecessary.

But let's take this offline. In the interest of time, let's make sure that we take this offline, Paul. I think you're still holding the pen for the small group on this. Let's continue to work. If others have concerns or issues or suggested edits around the representation portion or any of the other bits, let's please focus in the next week or two, now that we've received this and we've had the opportunity to kick it around a little and Paul has given us a good summary. Please, please, please take the time to read this, to consider it, to socialize it with your groups. Within the next couple of weeks, let's try to come up with a next draft that we will be able to then consider and ideally vote on at an upcoming meeting, either in the October meeting or in Montreal.

I would very much to be able to take the next step as we come up with perhaps the next draft of this to start socializing it with the GAC and the IGOs and the other groups who will be potentially invited to participate so we can demonstrate that we are moving forward on the commitments that we've made in our previous motion related to Recommendation5 and also the conversations that we've had recently with the GAC and the IGOs.

So let me draw a line under this one. Again, please, everybody, look at this and come back to us with your comments in the next week or so.

All right. Let's move on. Thank you, Paul. Thank you, small team. We're going to go back to Item #5 now, which is a council discussion on the IRTP policy status report and next steps for the council on the transfer policy. Pam, I'm going to hand this one back to you. Thank you.

PAM LITTLE: Hi, everyone. Thanks a lot, Keith. Marika is sharing the agenda item. This one has been with us for some time now. As you may recall, this review of the transfer policy got kick-started with the staff's prepared status report, which went through a couple iterations. The council received a final version a few months back.

The next steps for us as a council is to decide how we're going to conduct this review of this transfer policy. This is separate from EPDP Recommendation 27, under which the council and ICANN org probably need to review a whole bunch of impacted existing policies. This is one of them. But we already kickstarted the

process of reviewing transfer policy even before the EPDP recommendation arose.

Here we have been looking at this staff-prepared status report for some time, and the council leadership, given that the transfer policy mostly impacts registrars, also took the step of consulting, if you like, or seeking feedback from the Registrar Stakeholder Group as to whether the Registrar Stakeholder Group has any preference or suggested approach as to how Council should conduct this review in terms of next steps.

Obviously, that will concern, say, the scope of the review and the composition of the review team or working group and maybe also the timing of the review. The feedback we've got from the Registrar Stakeholder Group basically consists of this.

In terms of scope, it is the Registrars Stakeholder Group's preference or suggestion that the scope is a more holistic approach, rather than just limited to the issues identified in the status report. In terms of format or structure, the Registrar Stakeholder Group feels probably something like a PDP as a structure. But, in terms of composition, maybe some sort of representative model, similar to that of EPDP for the registration data, would be more appropriate, given that this is, again, a topic that may not attract great, broad interest from the general community as a whole, it's probably likely registrars and possibly registries and maybe certain groups that would be representing registrant interests as well.

So that's where we are at the moment. So I think, as a council, what we need to decide is, is this suggested approach from the

Registrar Stakeholder Group acceptable and appropriate for the council to consider or to adopt? If so, I guess this is also a question of timing. I am very sensitive to the fact that we have quite a lot on our plate (the GNSO community as a whole), not to mention EPDP Recommendation 27, where we need to review the impacted policy that is likely going to involve a huge amount of work. Then we also have a number of major PDPs that are likely going to come before the council soon. So it's bandwidth question that would decide how we prioritize or how we time these reviews/next steps.

So that's the summary of where we are, Keith. I would open to a brief discussion. We don't have to decide anything, but in terms of next steps, I was thinking something similar to what we have done with the IDN issue, which may also be open for council to consider: to have a small drafting team within the GNSO, maybe not only limited to council members to maybe draft some sort of a scoping paper for the council to consider.

I'll pause there and hand it back to you, Keith. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Pam. Thanks for the overview. Marika, I think there was a staff paper that is one of the links there in the agenda. Can you just put that up briefly so folks can have a quick look at it so that you recognize it when you go to read it later?

I think what we have here is some possibly suggestions of possible approaches that we ought to consider as we consider the next steps on the transfer policy. For those who have been around

ICANN for a while, you'll remember that the transfer policy had multiple parts, multiple work tracks and working groups, and it was a very complex and very heavy lift. I think the suggestion here that we're considering is how can we review, revisit, and perhaps reconsider the transfer policy in a more efficient way and in a way that doesn't drag us all down into years and years of work.

So I think Pam's suggestion of the use of an expert group of interested parties to come up with a starting point or a proposal, considering it from a holistic and perhaps a green field approach, rather than trying to fix this to what already exists. So I think that's certainly worth considering. I think it's consistent with our PDP 3.0 work and our desire for the council and our PDPs and our groups to be more efficient and effective. So I'm certainly open to considering this.

Michele, I see your hand. Go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Keith. I do agree with pretty much everything [you] and Pam said. However, it would be remiss if I didn't flag what the registrars considered to be an urgent issue, which is the issue where [inaudible] [facing with regards to] …

KEITH DRAZEK: Michele, I'm sorry to interrupt, but you're breaking up.

MICHELE NEYLON: [inaudible] to the FOAs, which are the [inaudible].

KEITH DRAZEK: You were cutting out there for a little bit. I heard you were saying there's an urgent issue around the FOAs (Forms of Authorization), correct?

MICHELE NEYLON: Yes. So I think, for a lot of the registrars, this is causing a lot of stress and headaches. So, while I totally agree that doing a comprehensive, short review [inaudible]. That makes a lot of sense. Even though that might be faster than other PDPs breaking out the FOA issue potentially is some [inaudible]. I think there's a lot of urgency around, if not to resolve it completely, but if only to be able to get some level of clarification or forbearance because Compliance is causing headaches for a lot of registrars around this issue [inaudible].

KEITH DRAZEK: Great. Thanks, Michele. I appreciate that. Your phone was cutting out, but I think we captured that, that essentially we've got an urgent issue around the FOA requirements. Compliance is still making this an issue and it's something that needs to be addressed urgently, even if we're going to continue to consider a more fulsome review of a broader transfer policy.

Pam, go ahead.

EN

PAM LITTLE: Hey. Thank you, Keith. I just want to add to what Michele said about the FOA issue. That FOA issue can be prioritized as part of the review. But before we actually do the review, yes, ideally some sort of Compliance forbearance on the part of ICANN org … But that is something the Registrar Stakeholder Group is still in the process of considering how best to approach that or seek council's assistance to achieve that.

Again, I feel we may be the first [inaudible] to put out a call for volunteers to this small drafting team to come up with the scoping and similar approach to what we have done with the IDN issues. Otherwise, we just have this on our plate and on our agenda. So I think we've got to start it some way. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Pam. I think that's a good suggestion. Would anybody like to get in on this topic?

I don't see any hands. Just to wrap up on this one in terms of next steps, we have an obligation to take the IRTP [calls to] status report and figure out what to do next. I think there's, as we've discussed, the possibility of a full-blown PDP. There's a possibility of coming up with a small expert group like we have in the IDN variants issue to try to at least set a baseline for possible next steps. There's the issue of the FOA (Form of Authorization) that is an issue right now because of the GDPR and the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations and temp spec.

So there's a range of issues here circling around the transfer policy. The key, and I think the challenge for us, as the council is,

as I said at the outset, is trying to figure out a path forward that gives us a maximum opportunity to be effective – the buzzwords that you here me use a lot – to try to figure out with this transfer policy in a way that doesn't take years and doesn't bog everybody down in terrible minutiae.

I'll leave it at that. Pam, thank for continuing to shepherd this one. If anybody would like to contribute further to the discussion or be part of the small team or contribute to that, please contact Pam.

Thanks, everybody. Let's move on then to Item #7, jumping forward, which is a council discussion on ICANN's request for clarification on data accuracy and Phase 2 of the EPDP and related to the WHOIS ARS or the Accuracy Reporting System.

As I noted and as I've described, we received a letter from ICANN From Goran on June 21$_{st}$ – so this one has been hanging out there for quite a while – that basically asked for the GNSO Council's views on the discussion of the subject of data accuracy as it relates to gTLD registration data and related services, such as the WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System.

We've had a small team of councilors working to try to draft a substantive response, but there's still some disagreement within the group, within that small team, of how exactly to respond.

Unfortunately, Darcy was unable to join the call today. Marie, I know you're on. I'm trying to remember who the other contributor was. I think it might be Flip. So I don't know. Marie, if there's something that you'd like to speak to here, I would invite you to do so. I think the question here before us is, in the EPDP Phase 1

report, there was some references and footnotes, I think, to the possible future consideration of data accuracy. The question, I think, that has been posed to the council by Goran is, is that something that the EPDP Phase 2 is supposed to be looking at? Is that something that the council is looking at? Is that an implementation matter? I think that there's a range of ways that we could respond to this. I think there's some concern that … Well, at the end of the day, the council has to decide how we're going to handle this and where this discussion is appropriately taking place.

I'm not sure if we have – Marika, do we have the draft or the Google Document on this one that we could put up? If not, we could just speak to it.

Marie, could I ask you if you've got any views or concerns or comments on this one that you'd like to share with the group?

MARIE PATTULLO: Sure, Keith. Can you hear me okay?

KEITH DRAZEK: I sure can. Go right ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you so much. Marika, you're right. we do have a Google Document, but it actually hasn't been circulated. I've got it in front of me, though.

First up, a huge thanks to Caitlin, who set up the Google Doc for us. We're really grateful. What we've done is to draft a short response to Goran. Flip will correct me if he thinks I'm wrong, but I think Flip and I are in agreement, more or less. Darcy had some issues. We started with saying that which we all know, which is that the Council is aware that ICANN needs further guidance on how data accuracy will be considered.

We then said that – again, factually – the Phase 2 team has solicited legal analysis on the accuracy requirements and is in the process of posing additional questions to council before concluding its analysis on accuracy [or accuracy including] the ARS.

Now, to this point, all three of us were together. We diverged in what I'm going to say next in that what Flip and I suggested is that we should say to ICANN that, if they've got any issues they want to discuss about ARS, bring them to the EPDP and, in the meantime, keep publishing the ARS reports, which of course are, again, an already agreed-to policy.

We also thought it would be useful for all of us going forward to know if ICANN itself is looking at an update for ARS in cases where ICANN itself is asserting its own purposes for processing data. Now, the reason we're looking for that is because, if there is work already going on in ICANN, it would be really handy and useful and good for council to know that so we can align, so that we can go in the same direction. We all need a lawful solution here. So we're all on the same team.

Another query we had is that we're not quite sure why the RDS Review Team final report hasn't been published because there's a lot, as you know, in that that's really useful (their recommendations on accuracy). So we though, if we can get clarity on when that's going to be published, again that can inform, it can feed in, and it can be taken account of in what is clearly very important work.

Now, with all of what I just said, Darcy – I'm not speaking for Darcy. Please don't think that. I'm just reading out her comments from the Google Doc. She thinks that we should not ask any of that or say any of that but wait for the legal analysis on data accuracy requirements.

So that is the state of the Google Doc. Flip, do you want to add anything to that?

FLIP PETILLION: Hello. Thank you. I think you summarized it well.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Marie, and thanks, Flip. Again, I'm sorry Darcy is not here to discuss this topic.

Rafik, I see your hand. Since you are obviously close to the workings of the EPDP as our liaison, I'm certainly interested in your views on this one. I should note that there was some reference to the ARS or the WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System as being a policy. It's actually not a policy, and I don't think it came from a policy. It might have come from a review team

EN

recommendation or something like that. Anyway, just to be clear, it's actually not the result of a policy. Rafik, over to you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Keith. Thanks to the team for this draft. I think there was some previous comment that we made in previous calls regarding what was now reiterated, that the ARS is not a consensus policy. I think the same is for data accuracy because, at the end, the ARS is the tool. I do believe we need really to have that in mind. The current letter is not moving in that direction.

Again, also we made the comment that we need to be cautious and careful about the work load we will put on the EPDP. The EPDP cannot be the place we will try to fix RDS and WHOIS issues at. So we need really, as the policy manager here, to see how we can handle that more carefully and what we are going to do, [like] we see in the other agenda for existing policy or any problems that the previous RDS Working Group was supposed to fix. So we need to be careful and think about that.

Hearing Marie mentioning the RDS Review Team, I'm surprised here because, even if it's published, we need to have in mind that it needs to be approved first by the Board in order for us to act on it. So we cannot, in this situation, try to use something that didn't go through the full process to use it as an input. I understand the rationale, but I don't think it's appropriate for us to do so.

So we need to be careful about the scoping and about the work load. Let's not try to add more work than what we can handle.

EN

KEITH DRAZEK:	Thanks, Rafik. Pam, you're next, and then I'll put myself in queue. Marie or Flip, feel free to jump back in on this one.
	Go ahead, Pam.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Keith. Marie, I just posted in the chat the link to the RDS WHOIS 2 Review Team's final report. So that's out there. I believe it was published on the third of September.

The other thing about this accuracy issue is, as you probably know, there was a memo of legal advice from Byrd & Byrd about the question of data accuracy. However, I understand the EPDP 2 is in the process in formulating some further clarifying questions in response in a legal memo as to what certain comments or opinions [means].

So I feel that the community or different groups have a different understanding of what accuracy actually means. [Is accuracy obligation] on the part of the data controller or the rights of the data subject? I thought, from the Byrd & Byrd memo, it seemed clear that that's a matter for the data controller, ICANN org, to decide. So I feel we are a bit diverse on how to respond to Goran's request for clarification. I also think we should respect the EPDP's work. They are in the process of seeking further clarification on the accuracy issue.

In terms of the comments related to ARS, I think that is very clear. It seemed to be a misunderstanding on the part of our colleagues that is an existing policy. In fact, it is not. It is just a tool ICANN

developed to further their compliance work on the WHOIS accuracy obligations under the RAA contract.

So I'm not sure whether the current content or draft of this letter is really appropriate at this point. Maybe we just go back to Goran to say, as I just said, the EPDP is still working on certain clarifying questions to go to the outside legal counsel. So we will probably just put this in a holding pattern for a while. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Pam. Let me jump in here. Obviously, we need to have further discussion on this particular point. I'm going to encourage us to do that on the list or in the small group or if others would like to contribute. But we do need to draft a response, and I guess it could take a couple of different forms. It could be a response indicating that the council is watching this and that the EPDP team is considering the work that Pam described. We could go back to ICANN org and to Goran and ask some clarifying questions about the references to ARS or to the topic more generally. So I'm thinking of this in terms of that it's not clear and we don't have full agreement on whether to … Well, let me stop and back up for a second.

I think the council telling ICANN org to communicate directly with the PDP Working Group might be a bit, I don't know, problematic in my view. I'm not sure that we should necessarily be saying, "Go ask the EPDP this." I think the question has been asked of council. Then I think we need to be prepared to provide our guidance in terms of the scoping issue and whether this is in scope or out of scope or all of that. So perhaps there are some

clarifying questions that we could pose back to ICANN that would help us make a more informed decision. Just throwing that out there. If anybody would like to react to that, feel free. I know there's some conversation going on in chat.

Marika, if there's anything that you'd like to weigh in on here that relates to the EPDP or the topic more broadly, you're certainly welcome to do so. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Keith. Instead of maybe typing more, I can speak to it as well. I think, as you all noted, the accuracy has been identified as a Phase 2 item. But I also want to point out that's currently solely based on, I think, a one-line footnote from the Phase 1 report that noted something like, "Accuracy in the context of GDPR is to be further considered, including ARS." It doesn't provide any specific guidance on what kind of questions are expected to be considered. Is the group expected to consider whether any of those aspects should become consensus polices? Is there any specific guidance that's expected to be given to ICANN org? So, in that respect, there's very little that the EPDP team at the moment has to go on.

I do note that the group hasn't spent a whole lot of time on it yet as it is identified as a Priority 2 item, but the initial conversations that the group had in trying to scope the issue were very similar to, I think, some of the comments that have been made on the council today and the different viewpoints on what should be done in that regard and where it belongs.

I have indeed some suggestions for follow-up questions in relation to accuracy, but again, those have not been agreed to yet. I also want to note there are, of course, other legal questions that are being dealt with within a limited budget that the group at some point will need to prioritize what goes back to Byrd & Byrd.

So I hope that provides a little bit of context. As I said, it is a Priority 2 item so it's not likely to be dealt with in the very near future. But it is on the list, and obviously any guidance that the council may be able to provide probably will help the EPDP's task in dealing with the topic.

KEITH DRAZEK: Great. Thanks very much, Marika. That's really helpful and I appreciate the context there. It is being discussed in chat. Pam has just said, "So we can just Goran know that's still a work in progress." I think at some point we do need to respond and just procedurally get a response to org. So I think there's further work that we need to do on this one. So let's take this again to the small group – I'm sorry, Elsa. Go ahead. You have the last word on this because we need to move on.

ELSA SAADE: I just had a clarifying question. Thank you, Keith. In the footnote, it doesn't necessarily say that EPDP Phase 2 will be dealing with accuracy, right? I just want to clarify that with Marika. Thanks.

MARIKA KONINGS: I can respond to that. That's correct. The footnote basically says it's expected to be considered further. I have admit here that, when staff did its initial assessment of going through the Phase 1 report and taking out all those topics that were specifically identified as needing to be considered in Phase 2, we actually didn't pick up on this one because our read was as well that that was maybe dealt with in some other way, as it didn't specifically call out Phase 2. But a number of EPDP team members then pointed to this as a topic that was missing, and we added it to the list of items. I don't think there were any objections at that point to having that also included as an item to be further considered.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Marika, and thanks, Elsa, for the question. We need to move on. I don't want to cut that conversation short, but we're ten minutes behind at this point. So we will take this one further to the list and to the small team, and we'll try to come up with another draft for consideration. But this is one that we need to try to move along here pretty quickly.

Let's move on then to Item #8, which is the council discussion on the EPDP Phase 1 Recommendation 27. This is the assessment of impacts from GDPR and Phase 1 recommendations on other existing policies and procedures. You'll probably all remember – we're welcoming Karen Lentz to this discussion, but I'm going to tee it up first – that Recommendation 27 listed out and called for a review of policies and procedures – we also have considered contractual provisions – that are impacted by GDPR, EPDP Phase 1 recommendations, the temporary specification, etc.

We held a plenary session or a high-interest topic cross-community session in Marrakech on this specific topic, and the council leadership – myself, Pam, and Rafik – probably two or three months ago – I'm not remembering the dates specifically – had a meeting with Karen and discussed the approach that we're going to see here. This work plan has been circulated to the council list. This has been out there for quite some time. We wanted to make sure that Karen had the opportunity to join us and to give an overview of the work plan so we're all aware of the fairly significant amount of work that is yet to come for us as council and for the community on these topics.

Let me be clear. Some of this is going to be the responsibility of council. Some of this is going to be the responsibility of the Implementation Review Team from Phase 1 (the IRT), and some of it will be the responsibility of ICANN org as it relates to updating contracts and contractual compliance matters that are not specific to policy. So there's quite a range here of some moving parts. We just wanted to try to capture this and to have an opportunity for a quick chat.

Karen, if I could hand this over to you. I would probably need to try to finish this up in about ten minutes. Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ: Sure. Thank you, Keith. Can you hear me okay?

KEITH DRAZEK: I sure can. Thanks.

EN

KAREN LENTZ: Okay. I will walk you quickly through the workplan highlights. We can go to the next slide. The link is there. As Keith noted, this ha been shared with the council in August.

So we'll go to the next slide. This was Recommendation 27 from the EPDP Phase 1 team, noting that, as part of the implementation process of their recommendations, they foresee updates to existing policies and procedures because of the impact of the recommendation that they were making. The recommendation does call out certain ones that they identified and believed were impacted and also allows for the addition of others if those are identified as other areas that are being impacted.

This activity is a little bit unique in terms of taking a new set of policy recommendations and going through systematically and identifying where those new policy recommendations impact things that are already in place.

Can we go to the next slide? Thank you. In terms of organizing the work, we are thinking about it in really three parts. The first is obviously to identify what the impacted areas are. We expect that these will be on a few different levels. For example, the recommendation notes that, in some cases, there is mention of an admin contact or a technical contact. So there would be identifying areas of language changes to existing policy and procedure.

There are also cases where the recommendations may have an impact on a process. That would need to be looked and figured out how to address. Then we think in some cases there will be

questions about whether a particular policy or procedure is consistent with the new recommendations or indeed whether it needs to exist in that form under the new policy environment. So we anticipate that the impacts will be a variety of different types, but the goal of the inventory is so that all of those are in one place, captured and documented.

The second part is to review and validate what is there. This is something we expect in terms of developing the inventory, which is in process now at ICANN org. The review piece would be to share the inventory with the IRT, the Phase 1 Implementation Review Team that has been formed as in progress, for a couple of reasons, one being to have an opportunity to add anything that maybe wasn't identified in the inventory that is another area of impact and secondly to validate the proper path that each of those items would take.

When you get to the third part, you'll notice it's called triage. There are a few different paths that an area or an item might take. For everything that is consensus policy and is looking at an update or change to an existing policy, that would be in the bucket that is delivered into the GNSO for action and consideration there. We think there are other items that will concern an implementation piece or a procedure that can be adjusted outside of the policy process. Then there may be impacts to existing contract language, which would be a different path. The objective overall is to make sure that the identification is transparent and that there's a proper path for each of the items that are identified.

Next slide. This is a little bit of a recap of that work in terms of who is doing what. As I mentioned, ICANN has started the inventory

piece in terms of performing a detailed review of the existing policies and procedures to identify impacts. We would expect to share that [with you for] any follow-up as needed and also to make sure that areas that are not going through a GNSO process do go through a transparent process to show how those updates are going to occur.

Secondly, as I mentioned, we envision sharing this inventory as a first step with the Phase 1 IRT for any inputs that they may have in terms of the content or the buckets as far as what belongs in the policy bucket versus other buckets.

Finally, we have the GNSO Council on here. We expect that, ultimately, there will be a bucket of items and identified impacts that will be delivered to you. The council can obviously discuss and consider what kind of actions to take with that input. Also, we expect that the council will be involved in communicating and sharing this with the broader GNSO stakeholder community, noting as well that, with the Phase 2 work that's in progress, we think we'll be very interested in making sure they're aware of the progress and status of this work.

Next slide. This is the last slide. This is the timeline. We have envisioned delivering this inventory and having it go through the community process in waves, right now two. This is allowing us to make sure that we're accounting for all the policies and procedures that have key touch points on registration data. Some of them were already identified in the recommendation itself. There are others that we've identified as being a key area of impact. We're trying to get as many things as we can into Wave 1. This is something that we're planning on delivering to the IRT

before ICANN 66 – so at the end of October – and then subsequently to the GNSO Council before the end of the year.

The Wave 2 would be – again, this is analysis that we can do in parallel with some of the other periods, but it allows us to do a clean up and include anything we may have missed or look at some of the other areas that were identified as having a heavy impact. The goal is to have the mostly highly impacted areas to be in Wave 1 so that those could start.

That is the overview of the work plan. I will hand it back to you, Keith, for any questions or discussion.

KEITH DRAZEK: Great. Thanks very much, Karen. Thanks for all the work that you've been putting into this. Just to note that, on the current schedule, everybody, you'll note that the final date there is the week of the 24th of February, 2020. There's a reason for that, and that is because the temporary specification – you may remember, you may not remember, but coming out of the Phase 1 EPDP recommendations, there was this bridging period where contracted parties could either accept the new consensus policy or continue operating under the temporary specification. But as of the 29th of February 2020, that was at least the date that was laid our initially proposed to the transition full to the new consensus policy. There's clearly a tremendous amount of work to be done on this project. That date of the 29th of February 2020 is, I think, frankly unlikely to be met. But we're trying. I think ICANN org and we as council need to be focusing on this to try to at least map out the plan for addressing these issues, understanding where we

might need to initiate a new PDP, where there are other things we could do that perhaps are not a full-blown PDP to address these impacts and where there are inconsistencies or incompatibilities with old policy versus the new policy.

Anyway, I just wanted to provide a little bit more context there as to the urgency and the amount of work that's going to have to be undertaken. This will go very directly to the discussions that we have as Council at our strategic planning session around prioritization or how much we can reasonably do in defined period with the resources that we have, both community resources and staff resources.

Anyway, I just wanted to make note of that. Let me open it up for any questions – questions for Karen, questions for me or the council leadership. As I said, we coordinated on the early thinking of this project plan, so we're happy to take any questions at this point.

Any hands? Anyone?

No? I don't see any hands, so Karen – Maxim, I see your hand. Go right ahead. Thank you.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I have a question for Karen. Karen, do you think that the guidebook or so-called AGB is something we should be looked into for compatibility with GDPR? Or do you think it's something that should be taken into account after SubPro and the RPM PDPs finish their work? Thanks.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Maxim. It's a good question. It's a little hard to predict in terms of what may happen when. But I think, in terms of priority, we're looking at things that affect the contracted parties and what they need to support under the new policy and what kind of systems and procedures are affected.

The new gTLD policy is a result of the GNSO consensus process, so I think it's certainly worth looking at. I do think that the timing might lend itself to occur in a more in-depth way when we have Subsequent Procedures' recommendations. But I think it's something we can look at in terms of what we're examining right now.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Karen, and thanks, Maxim, for the question. I think, to Karen's point, the subsequent procedures and the Applicant Guidebook is forward-looking. It's the next round of new gTLDs. Much of the work that is being done here relates to policies that have been incorporated into contracts that have obligations and compliance requirements. So it's about identifying, for example, where an old policy is no longer legal or covered under the new EPDP Phase 1 recommendations. But contracted parties are still contractually obligated because the contracts haven't been updated. Therefore, Compliance is still obligated to work on those. I think the FOA for the transfer issue is a good example.

Anyway, I think that's the context that we also need to recognize. I'm talking specifically about the prioritization – what's most

important, what is urgent, what is incompatible? – rather than where we need to be looking for inconsistencies in something that's yet to come. So that's just my initial reaction.

We need to move on. Well, there's a question in chat from Rubens about whether this effort should cover the WHO ARS (Accuracy Reporting System). Maxim has given it a plus-one. That's probably something we can take offline and have as part of that previous conversation.

Karen, thank you very much. Thanks for all the work that you're putting into this. We look forward to receiving the analysis for the GNSO. We'll probably have you back if you're wiling to come. Thanks.

KAREN LENTZ: Of course. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay, everybody. Let's move on then in the interest of time. We are now at Item #9, which is an update from our PDP 3.0 small group. With this, I'm going to hand it over to Rafik, I believe. Rafik and Pam will help shepherd this conversation under Item #9. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Keith. We have the slides. Okay. Waiting. Okay. Next slide, please. For today as an update, we'll try to highlight the workplan we have now. It's an updated workplan on a weekly

basis. It's also about the engagement with the community and the council.

Let's go to the next slide, please. This is a reminder about how we categorize or split the different items into packages. We have five packages. We are aiming to send to the council [in] a few. We already sent the first one prior to the previous council meeting. I think, if I'm not mistaken, we are close to the deadline to get the input for this one.

The second package we are aiming to send to the council is #2. You can see 3, 4, and 5. I'm not going through the detailed improvement items, but you can see here the 14 and how we categorized them. We tried to put those who are having some dependency or some relation or under the same theme together in order to avoid any overlap and to ensure some consistency between them.

Let's move to the next slide. Here are the target dates we have for the package delivery. I've said Package #1 was submitted already. We're aiming to send Package #2 next week and two in October. On the final one, #5, since we will still have a lot of work to do – for example, we made a request for a proposal for vendors and so on – that's why that will happen just after the ICANN meeting in Montreal.

Let's move to the next slide. You can see the timeline in terms of the target date to submit the package and try to do it prior to the council meeting in order to allow all councilors to review the improvements and to share their input in time. We also said [we'd have] the deadline by when we should receive the inputs in order

to allow the team to work on that and make any amendments or change in the improvement.

We are also aiming to have a session in ICANN 66 and use the council session for seeking feedback for completed improvement and to engage with Brian Cute if the time permits. Also we'll have our own working session there, but that will depend on how much work still needs to be done and what we need to do as activities post-ICANN 65.

Please move to the next slide. This is really a short summary of our weekly plan. In fact, we have a much more detailed version in a Google Doc that we are using for organizing our calls and managing the deadline and the target dates for sending the packages. As you can see here, this gives you an idea of by when we will send and by when we should get – we are waiting for the feedback for the council. I think that it's probably important to have in mind. It will help us to get input in a timely manner in order for us to review them and to be able to respond or take action. I understand the workload for the council, but it'd really help us to get feedback in a timely manner.

Please move to the next slide. That was showed before. It's our kind of high-level summary of our plan and the dates we are putting for us to manage our work. But here is about the public comment for the next steps to improve the effectiveness of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. The deadline for submitting comments is the 14th of October.

 If you check the content of not the report but the workplan, you can see that the PDP 3.0 recommendations are mentioned in

several parts and are referred to in several parts. So it makes sense for the small team to draft the GNSO Council report, since the team is close to this recommendation and we are working on them. What we can do is to provide a [factual] overview of the PDP 3.0 implementation status and refer to the implementation related to the issues identified in the report.

We are also thinking that we should engage with Brian Cute to invite him for dialogue with the small team, just to introduce more or to explain the work we are doing. We are aiming to organize that during ICANN 66, ideally during the GNSO working session. So it should not be just the PDP 3.0 team. So I think that will be helpful and we can organize that. But this is just a suggestion or proposal for now. Otherwise, we can have just a meeting between Brian and the small team after ICANN 66.

The next slide, please. So that was for how we are engaging with the Brian Cute initiative, but here it's more like how we will do the consultation with the GNSO Council and the community at large. As I said, we are sending the packages and we are putting the target date by when we should get input or feedback from the council. We'll continue to do that during ICANN 66. Probably we will work with the council leadership team when we discuss the agenda and allocate the time for that.

But also we are thinking about post-ICANN 66 and either organizing a special purpose webinar, as we did before, last year, for the PDP 3.0 recommendation or to have an extraordinary council meeting. The idea here or the rationale is that it will help also for incoming councilors to catch up and to be involved. They

will have to handle the implementation. We are aiming for late November. We will see when we can organize that.

For the community, now we are really counting on the councilors to share the completed improvements with their corresponding [NCSG] and to solicit feedback and to share that with the council or with the PDP 3.0 small team. We will, I think, continue that post-ICANN 66. So we really count on you to share your thoughts and also to liaise with your own groups to get all feedback and input that can be helpful for us.

Let's go to the next slide. Sorry for taking much more time than expected. So—

KEITH DRAZEK: Rafik, I'm sorry to interrupt, but I think we probably need to wrap up and move on. We've got a few more items. This has been a great summary, and it's clear that you've guys have been doing amazing work and that there's a lot going on in multiple tracks, including, importantly, the drafting of comments in response to the Brian Cute evolution of the multi-stakeholder model effort. So I just wanted to note that for everyone.

Is there any final comment that you have? I apologize for jumping in.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Oh, okay. It's just short one. As I said, we will continue post-ICANN 66, including the consultation and incorporating all feedback. But we also need, in relation to several improvements,

to revise the PDP Working Group's shorter template and to work on the consistency and the dependency between related improvement and also to try to experiment and to have this dry run of some selected improvement. Also we will work on the report to summarize the work that was done and also to suggest or to recommend action for several items in the parking lot that we find out within the team.

That's it for my side. I'm sorry for the time.

KEITH DRAZEK: No problem, Rafik. Thank you so much for all the work you've put into it. It's an excellent summary. It's my fault for allowing the agenda to run over a bit. Thank you for the update.

Are there any questions for Rafik at this point? Thanks to the small team for all the work that's been done on this around PDP 3.0. It really is a tremendous amount of work and very important as we head into the strategic planning session in January.

I don't see any hands, so let's—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Keith? Cheryl here.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes, Cheryl? Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. There seems to be a delay in when hands go up and when you're seeing it today. Just to draw your attention, or more specifically the small team's attention, I did pop a question that can be dealt with as a question with notice into chat. So, if that could be captured and addressed at a later date, it would be appreciated. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Yeah, I apologize. There is apparently a delay. The question that Cheryl has proposed is when and how any interaction or seeking of feedback on PDP 3.0 might happen outside the GNSO with other interested parts of the community, such as ALAC. There's a little bit more there, but that's essentially the question that we'll take offline.

Let's move onto the next item, which is Item #10, the council discussion on the draft council response. I'll tee this up and then hand it off to Pam and Rafik. On the 29th of July, Verisign wrote to ICANN, requesting an extension on the current implementation for thick WHOIS. The ICANN Board then subsequently wrote to the GNSO Council, asking us for our views as council on whether we believe the request should be granted. The Board requested a quick response shortly following or immediately following this meeting. The council leadership team drafted a response that was circulated on the 6th of September, which notes the expected policy work on the thick WHOIS transition and EPDP but also notes that the request for a deferral was from one contracted party and is not a matter of policy development.

So this is an opportunity for us to kick around any questions or comments on this. I will hand this over to Pam and Rafik. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Keith. I think I've been handed this one. I hope that everyone had a chance to review the letter. I think the important part is the last paragraph. Since this request for the deferral of compliance enforcement is from an ICANN contracted party, we believe that the council view is that the matter is not within the purview of the GNSO Council and it's the responsibility of ICANN org to make the determination. I think we explained that the council leadership team worked on this.

We are looking for input and comments here. I want to remind you that we are supposed to respond back to the Board as soon as possible. I think they made it clear that they are expecting that we will do this in fact by today's meeting.

Yes, Pam? Please go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Rafik. Thank you for drawing to our attention the last paragraph and the distinction we're trying to draw here between a case like this one where the deferral request is actually from an ICANN-contracted party versus possibly a request from a stakeholder group where there might be a question of whether the policy is silent or whether the policy is unclear or involving different interpretations of policy. So we feel this is really not a case like that. It's jut a request from a single ICANN contracted

party – i.e., Verisign. Therefore, it really should be a matter between ICANN and that contracted party. Therefore, we do not believe the council should be the one who is making the call here. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:　　　　Thanks, Pam. I don't see anyone in the queue or any questions or comments in the Zoom chat. I think we didn't see any reaction also on the mailing list. I believe, with the time constraint and if there is no strong objection, we can send the letter. But before that, let's see if Pam wanted to add further comment. Pam, please go ahead.

PAM LITTLE:　　　　　I just want to add, Rafik, that the thick WHOIS transition policy will be one of those to be reviewed within the scope that Karen just gave us the briefing on. So it's going to be pending this review as well. That's all I wanted to say. I'll hand it back to you. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:　　　　Thanks, Pam, for highlighting that. As I said, if we have no objection and everyone is happy with this letter, then I guess the action is to send as soon as possible.

That's it. Over to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:　　　　All right. Thanks very much, Rafik. Thanks, Pam. Thanks, everybody. Moving on to Item #11 on the agenda, it's a council

discussion about draft responses to questions that were posed on the IRP oversight team. This is the Inependent Review Process oversight team. There was a small team that was pulled together to come up with some suggested responses. I would like to know hand this over to our small team. I don't recall who has the lead on this one. I apologize.

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you, Keith. Flip here.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you so much.

FLIP PETILLION: I think I can summarize, in view of the time. Actually, we've been asked to answer some key questions that were posed. We've got several inputs from different people, different supporting organizations.0

                       There were four key questions. One of the questions was the qualification question for members of a standing panel. The question would be how to search for the qualifications that would help find the right people to be part of the standing panel. I think the answers were quite straightforward and were covering the topics like independency, neutrality, expertise and experience in international law, in international arbitration, and an understanding of both common law and civil law. Actually, these were points that came back in the different comments that were sent in by the different people who answered the questions.

Another one was about identifying a slate of well-qualified panelists. The question was, how would that be done? Would that be done internally? Would that be done with the help of external organizations? Not everybody but some have made the suggestion to actually call upon institutions that are there and institutions with which ICANN has been working with in the past. Of course, the very first one that one would think of is the ICDR, which is the international division of AAA New York, which is currently handling the independent review processes at the request of ICANN and at the initiative of a party that wants to initiate IRP proceedings.

Other institutions of course are the ones that ICANN has been working with in the past or is still working with – for example, ICC is Paris, which is an institution of high repute, and WIPO. Somebody suggested a permanent court of arbitration. I think we may even drop that one because ICANN doesn't really have a relationship with it and it may be questionable to actually burden the permanent court with these kind of issues.

The point would be that the institutions could come back to work with the ICANN organization and allow the SOs and the ACs to examine the input and help make decisions on who actually is best-suited to be part of the lists of panelists of the standing panel.

That could then be part of the Board approval, of course, with the input of the SOs and ACs (Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees). Then the question was how to handle future selections. Should there be a regular review of how the process worked, how well people performed, the effectiveness of the first slating, etc. It's actually quite straightforward if you ask me.

So with the help of Julie Hedlund, Elsa and I have prepared a draft that is a proposed small text, actually – it's not longer than two pages – that could be the answer that the council is sending in response to the questions that were posed by the ICANN organization.

Thank you very much, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much.

FLIP PETILLION: I see Elsa has a question.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes. Elsa, go right ahead.

ELSA SAADE: Hey, Keith. Thanks, Flip. First of all, I really want to thank Julie Hedlund for all the help that she provided during the drafting of this. I would encourage that the councilors actually read the draft because I feel like the wording is quite important there.

I just want to note that I sent an e-mail to the list as well about certain things that we found: I wouldn't say disagreements because they were not that huge but discrepancies between us (Flip and I). So I would really encourage that councilors would look at it again and put in their comments. I just want to make sure to note that, in my opinion, it's really important that we put our trust in

the SOs and ACs to have the expertise instead of relying on external parties that have [inaudible] for us but also of course keep external expertise within reach as long as there's no conflict of interest.

So I just thought that I'd put it out there. I really encourage everyone to look at the draft that Flip and I, with the help of Julie, developed. I look forward to any comments. I'm sure Flip does, too. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Flip and Elsa, for the work on this. I just will note – I know we're short on time – that this IRP standing panel is a very, very important development coming out of the IANA transition and the ICANN accountability work and the new ICANN bylaws. The establishment of this standing panel, the selection of the members, and the processes that Flip and Elsa have described here are critically important at this stage. The IOT (Implementation Oversight Team) is currently working on this. They're seeking input. This is our opportunity to try to ensure that the processes that they have and eventually have in place to establish this standing panel of the IRP are done well and done properly.

So I thank you, Flip and Elsa, for your work and also for your comments today. At the end of the day, the IRP is the ultimate accountability mechanism. It's the accountability mechanism of last resort. Having good qualified panelists who understand the DNS and understand ICANN and understand the multi-stakeholder model is critically important. So thank you for that.

Any comments, any questions, at this point on the IRP standing panel and the questions for the IOT?

Okay. Thank you. I don't see any hands. There's some traffic in chat. We are moving then to AOB. Pam, I see you've asked for an addition to AOB, so let's just go ahead and jump right to that. Please go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Hey, Keith. Thank you. I just want to mention the ICANN Board's invitation to provide feedback on the Board's proposed public interest framework. There were two webinars held on this topic this week. There is a draft proposed framework out there. I believe this would have, potentially, impact on how PDP recommendations are made and how to justify or provide rationale for those recommendations and how council considers PDP recommendations and how the Board considers to adopt or not to adopt GNSO-approved recommendations. So I personally feel this is something that council should provide feedback on. We should probably form a small team of volunteers to draft the comment. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Pam. I completely agree with you on this one. I recall, in our last discussions about our response to the Board on EPDP Phase 1 recommendations – this is a topic that Elsa raised also – discussions of public interest or global public interests or public interest framework. So I agree completely. This is one the council should take on board and pull together a small team to

develop some suggested responses or input. So thank you, Pam, for flagging that.

We also have two other items on the AOB agenda. We're almost finished here. 12.1 is just to note there's a draft GNSO Council letter to the ICANN Board. I believe it was circulated ten days ago or more. This is the request, finally – we've had this on the action item list for quite a while – for clarification from the ICANN Board about its views on potential dependencies between the Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) and the work of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP.

Pam, Rafik, and I worked on the initial draft. We received some additional input from Jeff as Cheryl as the SubPro leadership that we did incorporate. We incorporated all of the suggestions, if I recall. The draft has now been out there for quite a while. This is actually a topic that's under active discussion right now within the Subsequent Procedures PDP.

Essentially, I'll just summarize by saying it's asking the Board to elaborate on comments that it made in the resolution drafted on NCAP back in Kobe, I believe, where it said there may be dependencies. So what we've asked is for a clarification on what there views of those dependencies are. And are they on policy? Are they on implementation? Is it on the development of the guidebook? Is it on the launch of the application window? It is on delegation? There's a range of possibly dependency. We're trying to clarify on behalf of the Subsequent Procedures Group if those dependencies from the Board's perspective are related to the policy development.

So this is something I think we need to get out. It's been out there for quite a while. Unless there's any objection to sending this letter that has the support of Jeff and Cheryl from the Subsequent Procedures Group, I think this is something that we need to get out. If anybody has any comments or concerns, please flag them for us. Otherwise, we'll plan on sending that COB tomorrow.

Finally, the last item is just to note that one of the individuals who is appointed to the Customer Standing Committee has had to resign, so I think the Registry Stakeholder Group has been going through a process of trying to identify a replacement candidate. So there's likely a need to be an e-mail vote of the council to approve the replacement of the member and the slate of members for the 2019 CSC. So just to note that there.

Finally, I believe, just a note again. I sent an e-mail to the list yesterday. Council leadership, working with staff, has begun our planning for the strategic planning session that will be in Los Angeles in January. I just want to flag that we're expecting the Friday, the last day of the SPS, to be a full working day that will culminate in a meeting with the Board and then some drinks with the Board. So, as you're making your travel plans, please ensure that you're day through the day on Friday. Friday night is an approved hotel day. So let's just make sure that we're there a as a Council to engage with the Board on what is essentially the first day of their workshop.

With that, is there any other business before we wrap up?

Michele, go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Keith. Just on this travel thing, I believe ICANN Travel would already have been in touch with most of us about booking flights and all of that. I don't know if that impacts people's ability on the Friday for the full day.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Michele. I guess what I'm saying here is we need to, as we're making our plans and as you're making your plans, try to be there for the Friday. So I guess, if there are reservations that have already been made, then we need to start identifying that.

Flip, go ahead.

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you, Keith. Actually, on that point, I asked a question today to Travel Support regarding reservations of the rooms. I've been informed that we would be informed a week before the meeting of the reservations of our rooms. I would ask if somebody can actually advance that. That would be much appreciated.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Flip. We'll take that on and follow up with staff and travel support.

Thanks, everybody. I don't see any other hands. I apologize for going ten minutes over. We are finished for the day. We'll conclude the meeting now and stop the recording. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]