
ICANN Transcription

GNSO Council

Thursday, 23 July 2020 at 12:00 UTC

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

[https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/tJQtcbirG83ToeW5QSDBfQsW461f - s0HdKrPBYmRmzASNRZAajZrASMdXoG1lvqJMqUc8BeBKJCHo](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/tJQtcbirG83ToeW5QSDBfQsW461f-s0HdKrPBYmRmzASNRZAajZrASMdXoG1lvqJMqUc8BeBKJCHo)

Zoom Recording:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/5ZRZJlrd5nJLT6fK8hHhWqV4GKLdeaa8gXUa_BZyE8PkNcVik2HBCfuFrJP2WeF?startTime=1595505634000

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – **Non-Voting** – Erika Mann

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Pam Little, Michele Neylon (apology, proxy to Greg Dibiase), Greg Dibiase

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Maxim Alzoba, Keith Drazek, Sebastien Ducos

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Tom Dale

Non-Contracted Parties House

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

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.

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Juan Manuel Rojas, Elsa Saade, Tatiana Tropina, Rafik Dammak, James Gannon, Farell Folly

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Carlton Samuels

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison

Julf (Johan) Helsingius– GNSO liaison to the GAC

Maarten Simon – ccNSO observer (absent)

GNSO appointed Board members: Becky Burr and Matthew Shears

ICANN Staff

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

Marika Konings – Senior Advisor, Special Projects

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

Andrea Glandon - Operations Support - GNSO Coordinator

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO council meeting on 23rd of July 2020. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you ever so much. Pam Little.

PAM LITTLE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maxim Alzoba.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Greg DiBiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Michele Neylon has sent an apology and given his proxy to Greg Tom Dale.

TOM DALE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Scott McCormick.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: John McElwaine.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Flip Petillion.

FLIP PETILLION: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Osvaldo Novoa. I don't see Osvaldo in the Zoom room. Elsa Saade.

ELSA SAADE: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Farell Folly.

FARELL FOLLY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Juan Manuel Rojas.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: James Gannon.

JAMES GANNON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I don't see Cheryl in the attendee list yet. Erika Mann. I see Erika connected. I know she might be having audio issues. Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here. Thanks.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Maarten Simon. I don't see Maarten in the Zoom room. We also have with us Becky Burr, GNSO-appointed board member, and from staff, we have David Olive, Steve Chan, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, Caitlin Tubergen, Ariel Liang, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Andrea Glandon, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

ERIKA MANN: Nathalie, it's me, Erika. I'm connected.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: There you go. Wonderful.

ERIKA MANN: Like you said, I have audio issues, but I'm here.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay, perfect. Thank you, Erika. So I'd like to remind you all to remember to state your name before speaking for recording purposes. A reminder also, we're on a Zoom webinar room. You've all been promoted to panelists and can activate your mics and participate in the chat. Please remember to set your chat dropdown menu to "all panelists and attendees" for all to be able to read the exchanges.

Welcome also to observers on the call who can now follow the council meeting directly. Observers do not, however, have access to their microphones or to the chat option.

As a reminder also, those who take part in the multi-stakeholder process are to comply with expected standards of behavior. Thank you very much, Keith, and it's now over to you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Nathalie. Hi all. Welcome to the GNSO council meeting of the 23rd of July 2020. I'd like to take just a quick moment to thank everybody who joined the extraordinary meeting that we held last week on the 16th of July that focused in quite some detail over the course of two hours on our work prioritization discussion and an update from ICANN staff colleagues on the prioritization tracking effort and essentially, setting the stage for the conversations that we'll have today as well. So thanks to all who joined, and particularly at difficult hours for some.

With that, I'd like to ask if there r any updates to statements of interest. If so, please speak up or raise your hand. Maxim, go ahead. Thank you.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I was appointed on interim basis to standard selection committee by registry constituencies until October, so I updated my SOI so it's current group, not past group. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Maxim. Any additional updates to statements of interest? Seeing none and hearing none, we will move to a review of the agenda. Anybody has any suggested updates to the agenda, please put your hand up, feel free to weight in.

After getting through our administrative items, we will have a review of the projects and action items list. This should go fairly quickly because the projects list was discussed in quite some detail, as I noted, in our extraordinary meeting last week on the 16th of July. But we will go through that and the action items that came from that conversation.

Then we'll move to item number three which is our consent agenda. Fortunately, there's nothing there so it'll go quickly. Item four will be a council vote on the CCWG on auction proceeds final report. This will be introduced by Rafik Dammak who is the seconder of the motion. Erika is on the call but is unable to read the text at the moment. So Rafik will introduce this, the presentation of the motion.

Item five will be a council discussion on the EPDP phase two. We'll get a status update from Rafik and also discuss proposed next steps for the priority two items that we discussed last week.

Item six will be a council discussion, this is a follow-up on the program management discussions, and in this particular case, we will focus specifically on the EPDP phase one recommendation 27 wave 1 report. Berry Cobb will introduce this and to give us an overview, but the goal here is for the council to try to have some forward movement on trying to prioritize and decide what we're going to initiate as far as additional follow-on work from the recommendation 27 wave 1 report.

Item number seven will be a council discussion, also a follow-on from our meeting last week that will discuss next steps related to the IDN operational track. Steve Chan will introduce this and give us an overview from staff.

And then item eight will be a council discussion on other items related to program management, and in this particular case, I think one of the topics we'll want to speak to specifically is the referral of the URS rules and procedures possibly to the RPM PDP working group phase one work. Berry will tee this up and then I'll likely turn to John McElwaine as the council liaison to that group for some preliminary thoughts.

And then item nine, finally, is Any Other Business. We actually have several substantive items to discuss under Any Other Business, so we've carved out approximately 20 minutes under AOB to get through the four items that you see before you on the agenda, which is the discussions ongoing about the proper

process or procedure or group to help populate the independent review process standing panel. Looking for any preliminary feedback from stakeholder groups and constituencies on that approach. There's actually a call scheduled with ICANN Org, David Olive and team on Monday to have further discussions on that, so any feedback that's available would be welcome.

We'll discuss the council's response to the public comment on enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, next steps. We'll have an update on the EPDP phase one IRT, specifically with regards to recommendation 7. This will be an update from Sebastien Ducos, the GNSO council's liaison to the EPDP phase one IRT.

And then finally, just a conversation briefly about the GNSO council liaison to the GAC. As you should have seen via e-mail, I notified council that Julf Helsingius has notified us that he intends to step down in that role. We'll have an opportunity to thank Julf for his service but also to discuss next steps with the standing selection committee.

So that is essentially our agenda for today. Would anybody like to suggest any edits, amendments or anything else? And I note in chat that Erika will be able to introduce the topic on the CCWG on auction proceeds but then Rafik will read the motion. So thank you, Erika.

Okay, I see no hands and hear no suggested edits, so let us move back to the top of the agenda here. Thank you. I will now just note the status of the minutes for the previous council meetings, as always. Minutes of the council meeting on the 24th of June 2020

were posted on the 10th of July, and minutes of our extraordinary GNSO council meeting from last week, the 16th of July, will be posted on the 30th of July 2020.

With that, let us move on. Thanks, everybody, again for joining. Very much appreciate you being here. And we will move to review of the projects and action item list. And once we get that up on the screen, I'll ask Berry to make any preliminary comments on the projects list. As I said, we did go through the projects list in quite some detail last week, so Berry, if there's anything you'd like to add specifically or call out specifically related to the projects list, please do so.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. Nothing substantive other than what I included in the e-mail that I sent out, the projects list, on Monday. Essentially, the primary items here is that we've consolidated the planning section for the summary sheet here. It's the part you see in purple. And it's really going to be pointing towards the action decision radar as well as the program management tool. And staff is looking to update or enhance the council action items page and really try to consolidate and connect the projects list, the action items as well as these program management tools into a suite, kind of like a portfolio of tools, if you will, so that we can try to enhance the connection between these and link to different items and make it into one platform.

In terms of primary changes to the substance of the projects list, essentially, as you noted on the agenda preview, there's a motion for the auction proceeds today and then we also have on the

agenda an update related to the EPDP phase two because the health of that was downgraded to “in trouble.” Other than that, that’s the only updates I have. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Berry. And as always, thanks for the work that goes on behind the scenes to be able to make sure that we’re kept up to date on all of these things. And again, thanks for all of the work that you put into preparing us and running us through the extraordinary session last week.

With that, does anybody have any questions or comments about the projects list as we have it, or the action decision radar that we’ll get into in a little bit more substance over the course of the call today? James, I see your hand, please.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Keith. I asked this at the extraordinary meeting but it was 2:00 AM so I may have missed the answer. For those of us that are interested, Berry, would it be possible to get the MPP extract from Project circulated with the standard set of documents that you send out? Just for those of us that want to kind of keep track of it in our own toolsets.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, James. Gantt chart geeks unite. So absolutely, once we find a home on the Wiki to post these, I’ll be including a monthly version of the PDF and then secondarily, I’ll start to attach the MPP file. Thank you.

JAMES GANNON: Perfect. Thank you very much.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, James. Thanks, Berry. Any other comments on the projects list? Next, we'll move to the action items list that came out of our meeting last week.

All right, thank you very much. So this is not only the action items from last week but this is our regular action items list tracking. So the first item on our action items list is the CCWG accountability Work Stream 2 next steps. This is a topic that we've discussed a couple of times in recent months at our meetings, and the plan here has always been to make sure that we have a small team assembled from the council to focus on CCWG accountability Work Stream 2 implementation and next steps.

I also have an action item to engage with the SO and AC leaders to follow up on this topic to see if there's common interest or common ground to engage together in terms of developing a joint letter or seeking further communications from ICANN regarding the process. But essentially, there's an action for the council to have a small team pulled together and we've got the list of names here before us who have volunteered to coordinate that. So I think we have an action item to schedule a separate sort of intersessional meeting of that group to be able to lay out next steps. And if anybody has comments or questions along the way here, just feel free to put up your hand in chat or speak up. The next step is the small team listed here, Juan Manuel,

James Gannon, Tatiana, Tom and myself will work with staff to identify an appropriate time to have that call.

Okay, next item is the RDS program management. I think this is actually quite long here, but we are going to be talking specifically on a couple of items here during today's council meeting on these items, including an update on EPDP phase two and EPDP phase two priority two items next steps as well as the EPDP phase one recommendation 7. And specifically, in our agenda item number six, we'll be speaking to the EPDP recommendation 27 wave 1 report.

Okay, let's move on. We have a completed item here under the report from the transfer policy scoping team. We discussed possible next steps on the transfer policy scoping team's recommendations in terms of initiating a new PDP over calling for a drafting team coming up over the coming months.

We have an action item related to the IRP, the independent review process, that's also something that we'll be discussing today in AOB that I mentioned earlier related to the appropriate process for establishing a standing panel. And we've obviously been talking about prioritization for quite a while.

And moving down the list, we have action items related to PDP 3.0 final report, so we have an action item there for the council to carry out other future action items in the resolved clauses at the appropriate time as directed in the motion.

We have an action item related to managing IDN variant TLDs. We discussed this again last week related to the initiation of a

PDP in parallel with the ccNSO's work on the IDN variant issue, and we'll be calling for a drafting team for the charter for that group in the near future.

Next item, evolution of the multi-stakeholder model of governance, also on our agenda for today, but we're looking for input for the draft response of the small team focused on the MSM evolution public comment period that's open today.

And I see that Mary has provided in chat, related to the Work Stream 2 implementation planning is continuing, including one with a planning function under Xavier. So thank you, Mary. That goes to an earlier topic. I missed that earlier. Thanks.

Okay, next item is the accountability and transparency review. GNSO council is forming a small team, including Pam Little, Tom Dale, in consultation with Cheryl Langdon-Orr, to work on a draft response to the ATRT3 final report public comment which is scheduled to close at the end of this month. So, thanks to that small team for working on that.

On IGOs, this is actually on our agenda for today—actually, I take that back. This was actually something we discussed during the meeting last week which is to discuss the timing for issuing the call for volunteers and expressions of interest for the chair for the IGO protections work track under the RPM umbrella.

And then the topic of DNS abuse, there's an action item for the council to reach out to the ccNSO at the appropriate time to discuss possible next steps on the DNS abuse issues, whether there's any parallel interest or effort likely there.

Okay, and I think that gets us to the end of the action items list, if I'm not mistaken. Any questions or comments? I know I ran through that fairly quickly. We've got quite a bit. But much of what is covered in that AI list is going to be discussed today during our call.

So let's go back to the agenda, please. Thank you very much. As noted, there are no items on our consent agenda, so we will move directly now to item four, which is the council's vote on the CCWG on new gTLD auction proceeds final report.

What I will do now is please, Erika, if you are available, to turn it over to introduce this topic and then I will hand it over to Rafik to read the motion, and then we'll have council discussion before moving to a vote. Erika.

ERIKA MANN: I'm here, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: So let me just give you a brief introduction—and I want to be super brief. So the goal was defined for the CCWG auction proceeds charter, just a quick reminder, was to develop a proposal on the mechanism and to allocate the new gTLD auction proceeds. And with this came a certain set of scopes which framed this particular topic. We started working in the beginning of

2017. We had to call the first public comment period in December in I believe it was 2018. I can't read any documents so sorry, I'm doing this out of memory. And then we decided to have a second public comment period which we finalized in December 2019.

We decided to do this because we really received valuable input and we wanted to ensure that we capture the spirit of these inputs we received. So we're trying not to neglect any of these comments.

And then we sent it out in May to the chartering organizations and we were hoping to get feedback back by, if I remember this, the end of July. We are aware this might be difficult for some of the chartering organizations, so we are looking forward probably for a much more flexible time. But hopefully not too long.

If you remember, we had originally four mechanisms we discussed. Mechanism A was an internal department inside of ICANN but independent from the ICANN structure. B was an internal department in collaboration with a second entity, and C was a charitable organization, an ICANN foundation, completely new, and fourth was an idea to outsource it to another entity.

We neglected fourth already ahead of or shortly after the first public comment period, so we didn't carry it over to the second one. And then the outcome in the second was to neglect C as well, so the remaining mechanism and which you will then see in the motion as well, our recommendation to the board, either mechanism A or B, but A was favored more strongly. And I have written it on a little paper.

So the final recommendations which we are making, the CCWG recommends that the board select either mechanism A or mechanism B for the allocation of auction proceeds taking into account a preference expressed by CCWG members for mechanism A. As part of the selection process, the ICANN board is expected to apply the criteria outlined by the CCWG. The CCWG strongly encourages the board to conduct a feasibility assessment which provides further analysis of the recommended mechanism, including cost associated with each mechanism.

So this was a topic we picked up which came in by one of the recommendation we received. It's a short assessment, so we're not requesting anything super long. And then just a reminder, so we understood the consensus, the CCWG chairs designated a level of support for the final report and recommendation as having consensus, a position where a small minority disagreed but most do agree.

And we have one minority statement which was committed by the Commercial Stakeholder Group. The CSG highlighted two issues in particular. The first was it questions the preferential statement of mechanism A and the CSG constituency, namely the IPC, specifically strongly opposes mechanism A as well.

We believe we have this in a diplomatic way captured in the recommendation to the board in the sense that we are saying, please look at the two recommendations, A and B. And since the board liaison member and we had strong connection with the board all the time during our work, we believe the board will be totally able to take such kind of decision between A and B.

So that's it. And Rafik, thank you so much for reading the motion. I just can't do it here, I'm at a gas station. It's a little bit difficult. Let me thank again [inaudible] done this in another call, staff, the board liaison, the board and Legal and Finance for all their work, and all the members of the CCWG working group. Thank you so much. Back to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

And thank you very much, Erika, for all your time and effort in your role on behalf of the GNSO in this particular CCWG. So thanks to you, thanks to all the participants and to the staff who supported this. With that, Rafik, I will hand this over to you for the introduction of motion and the resolved clauses, and then we will move to council discussion. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Erika and Keith. So I will read the result. One, the GNSO council adopts the final report and recommendation of the new gTLD auction proceeds cross-community working group. Two, the GNSO council instructs the GNSO secretariat to share the results of this motion with the chairs of the auction proceeds CCWG as soon as possible. Three, the GNSO council expresses its sincere appreciation to the auction proceeds CCWG, the GNSO-appointed members, and participants In that effort, and especially the GNSO-appointed co-chair, Erika Mann for all their hard work in achieving the delivery of the final report and recommendations.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Rafik. And with that, we will move to council discussion. Would anybody like to speak to the motion before us on the CCWG auction proceeds final report? John McElwaine. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Hey. So firstly, wanted to thank the IPC, and in particular Anne Aikman-Scalese was our member to the CCWG. Want to thank all of the members of the CCWG, especially the efforts of Erika Mann and Ching Chiao and the staff that worked on it. As Erika mentioned, the IPC strongly suggested to mechanism A as presenting, as I understand it, an extension of ICANN's power beyond its bylaws and that it presented an unreasonable risk to ICANN.

The position that the CSG put into its minority report was a preference to lead with a referral to the ICANN risk committee to evaluate that mechanism A before going forward with anything else.

There was also a question raised concerning whether consensus had actually been reached, but I think the important thing was to identify this risk. As you know, we have an awful lot of lawyers in the IPC. Our role as lawyers is to identify problems, identify risks and suggest, when appropriate, that the brakes are pumped and that we look into things a little bit more.

So there are some serious concerns, we believe, with mechanism A. We just wanted to raise that now before the vote. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you very much, John. And that's noted, and I think clearly, if there are any bylaw-related concerns with recommendations coming from the community, that that's certainly something that's worth calling out and flagging as ICANN the board and ICANN Org consider those recommendations. so I think that's well stated. Thank you. Would anybody else like to speak to either that topic or any other before we move to a vote? Now is your opportunity.

ERIKA MANN: Maybe just a short comment, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Erika, please go right ahead, and then I have James Gannon in the queue as well.

ERIKA MANN: I think John pointed out to a concern we debated many times, and I think it's important to keep in mind that all of the recommendations which we are making and the guidelines we put forward, we are always saying that whatever kind of mechanism is going to be selected—and we have said this from the beginning and we have actually many gating topics evolved which would ensure that an environment is achieved which independently from the mechanism would secure a complete independence.

Now, it's true, it's much harder if it is part of the ICANN Org and this point was discussed many times, but the majority of the members tended to support the embeddedness of the structure

and the mechanism inside ICANN. That's the reality. So if the risk committee is going to look at this again, I believe we have all the material available to review the topics we discussed to ensure there would be sufficient independence. But there is nothing that can be said against having the risk assessment evaluating and looking at this again. Thank you so much, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Erika. Okay, James, over to you.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Keith. Erika said a lot of what I was going to say, so I just want to echo what she stated as well. We have had ICANN Legal along on this journey over the past few years. I want to put another thing in, as somebody who'll be leaving council at the AGM, just a marker for the 2021 council, how the implementation of this work will be structured after the board makes its determination I think will be very important. It's something that I hope future councils will pay a great deal of attention to, and it's something that I want to make sure stays on council's radar once it goes through the board's process.

We don't have a formal IRT structure as we do in other areas, so I just want to make sure the council kind of keeps on top of this when it comes to the implementation stage, as that will be as important, if not even more important than the framework stage that we've spent a number of years coming to. So it's something I want to make sure that we keep on our radar going forward.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, James. I think that's a really important point, particularly drawing a distinction between the implementation of consensus policies through an IRT for example and the different that we have here with recommendations coming from a cross-community working group. So thank you very much for that, and I think that's an important point. Yes, Erika.

ERIKA MANN:

One other point, because we are talking about legal issues, I don't believe it's important to discuss today but I want to draw your attention to one issue which I want you all to be aware about to evaluate. So we are making one recommendation, and this is once the projects are going to be selected and somebody's objecting to a decision made from an independent evaluation team, we are saying we don't want the current review processes being applicable in this particular environment, but we recommend state-of-the-art processes which work in funding environment. So a decision, once it is taken, can't be challenged by any existing ICANN review process.

So I think this is just—go and have a look at it, and if somebody believes something else should be done, it can be still discussed during the transition phase. But I believe that's the correct process, not to carry over existing long and intensive review processes into a funding environment. It makes no sense. And we have taken this decision with common agreement. But I just want you to be aware about this. And this requires a bylaw change. But this is all in the text once you're going to be able to read it.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks very much, Erika. That's really helpful, and obviously, we're benefiting from the level of detail that you would be aware of because of your role as co-chair. So thank you for calling that out. There's obviously quite a bit of complexity and detail and nuance here that is important, but as you've noted, this is captured in the report. So thank you very much for calling that out.

Would anybody else like to speak to the issue before us, or shall we move to a vote? Okay, so Nathalie, if I could hand this over to you, I think we can do a voice vote on this one.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Keith. I'll note for the record that all voting councilors are present on the call. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say aye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sorry, I heard—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Aye, so we have an aye from—I'm looking at the open mics. Farrell, Flip and John. That's three objections.

FARRELL FOLLY: My microphone is on, but I didn't vote against.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Okay. Thank you, Farrell. So noting that we have Flip and ... This is actually pretty hard to follow. Would those objecting please speak up?

JOHN MCELWAINE: I voted no—or aye.

FLIP PETILLION: Same for me.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much both. Any further objections? Hearing none, John and Flip, would you care to share the reasons for objecting?

JOHN MCELWAINE: The reasons for objecting were explained in my statements during the discussion relating to the minority report and the IPC's strong objections to mechanism A. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, John. And Flip?

FLIP PETILLION: I copy John. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much. Would all those in favor of the motion say aye?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Aye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Greg DiBiase, proxy for Michele Neylon, please say aye.

GREG DIBIASE: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Greg. With no abstention, two objections, the motion passes. Thank you very much, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Nathalie. And again, thanks to all who contributed. Thanks to Erika who, as the GNSO co-chair, for all of

the time and work, and obviously, as always, for the staff support to bring this CCWG to a conclusion. Obviously, the GNSO is just one of the chartering members of the CCWG, so we've done our duty now and it's up to the others to conclude their work as well. So thank you very much, and let's move on.

Next item on our agenda is item number five, which is a council discussion on the EPDP phase two work. We'll have a status update from Rafik. Obviously, that group is in the final stages of its work and is expected to deliver a final report to council by the end of this month. I know that there's intense work going on this week within that group, and I just wanted to make sure that we had an opportunity to hear from Rafik. And then we will discuss the council's consideration for next steps on the priority two items that we've identified. So Rafik, if I could hand this over to you now. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. So yes, I will start first with a status update for the EPDP phase two. So after Janis leaving, our first action was to share a version of the final report for review by the EPDP team members, and we asked them to input in a Google doc in three different categories to help us in terms of resolving the concerns and issues. So the category one is the "cannot live with" items, and the category two is what they would like to see change but they are not, let's say, die in a ditch for it. So that's to make that difference. And the last category is just non-substantive or minor edits.

We had to extend the deadline for getting the deadline by request from some of them, and that is impacting us in terms of the timeline. So when we got the input, the staff and I worked how to present that and for the approach in how to deal with those items, and we scheduled in the beginning two calls this week, but we had to extend and we have another call just after the council meeting.

So we went through the category one trying to resolve either with a proposal or getting input, and it is to push really all the EPDP team members to focus on how we find compromise and not rehash the previous deliberation or arguments.

So we are progressing on that. Still, we'll try to finish for today the category one and also try to cover some of the category two items as much as possible, and if time permits. And for the rest, we will ask the team members and those who expressed a concern to try to work online with those who have an opposite view.

We are trying this because with our timeline, we are supposed to present a final report today and that I make the consensus level designation, but just we tried to accommodate as much as possible. so we will share the final report and the consensus designation tomorrow.

With that, we will be putting that report for review and asking the EPDP team to review the consensus designation and share their thought, and following the process, trying to go the several iteration to finalize that. So we are working hard to deliver by next week Friday. There are still challenges, because in some items, like the team members are still arguing sometimes on some

topics, but we're doing our best. So I want to thank the staff for the help on that front.

So this is the current status, and I think as you heard, for the project list update in terms of the health, so it's between "at risk" and "troubled." But we are still keeping the direction, and we are clear also with the team members about the deadline because there's still some concern that people say that's an artificial deadline. But we were clear that's what the GNSO council asked, in particular after the approval of the confirmation of the [PCR.]

So that's basically what's going on. As you can see, we are close to one of the most important milestones, but the risk is still there and I hope that at the end, all groups support the final report. We now, it's, for this EPDP it's two years and I think even regardless of not getting all what they wanted and so on, the product, it's something that should be acceptable to all.

So this is for the EPDP phase two. So I can go now to an update, what we are doing in the small team for priority two next steps. So we have a call and we shared ... We had there a first or new draft based on the previous framework and also the comment we heard from the council in June meeting. So now we are really trying to elaborate or giving more details and also setting kind of the objectives of those next steps, like for example ensure efficient use of people's time and resources, ensure that due consideration is given to the topic that many consider important, and ensuring—and it was made clear that, confirming to GNSO PDP manual and bylaws requirement, and also the oversight of the GNSO council will be essential.

So what we have now is that we have an approach for legal versus natural and feasibility of unique contacts, and that's by ... is to reconvene the EPDP team after some date. That's one of the open question or topic, is to agree on the date when we should reconvene the EPDP team. And that is the ... there is either—it depends on if we have to wait for the final report approval or just the reception of the final report. So that's still open.

Also, we tried to clarify what the EPDP team should consider for the two topics and to give guidance, and also, one of the important things is to set a target date on a specific date by when the EPDP team need to—I mean the chair of the EPDP team and GNSO council to report back to the GNSO council on the status of deliberation, and so based on that report, we shall include the progress made and expected likelihood of the consensus recommendation. With that, GNSO council will decide on next steps based on that report.

For the accuracy, the suggestion here is to have a scoping team, and so we worked on what should be considered in terms of for the deliberation of the scoping team, and also adding some of the elements from the recommendation 27 wave 1. So I think one of the questions here that's still remaining is about when the council should consider the initiation of the scoping team. so this is still an open question. And also, about the chair and the council liaison for the accuracy track. So I hope I captured the different items. But I think—and probably if members of the small team, they can add anything I missed. So this is the update from me. So we are still trying to finalize the draft and we should share soon it with the council for review and consideration. That's it for me.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Rafik, and thank you for your time and effort and contribution, stepping in as the chair of the EPDP phase two group following the departure of Janis. I just wanted to acknowledge the hard work that's going on within the EPDP team and also thank you for your efforts to try to bring this to a conclusion, and of course, thanks to the work that staff is doing. I know you're in crunch time at the moment, and that there's a lot of work going on and has been for quite some time. But just want to acknowledge that the group is still continuing to work to bring this to a conclusion and to a final report, including consensus recommendations for the council's consideration.

Also, acknowledging the small team's work related to a framework for dealing with the priority two items, and thank you for giving us some level of detail in terms of the proposed path forward on some of those issues, including legal versus natural, the unique identifier, as well as the separate track on data accuracy.

So with that, I'd like to open this up for council discussion. I do want to note that obviously, the substantive work of EPDP phase two is still ongoing within the group, but there's an opportunity now for councilors to discuss this from a procedural perspective or anything else.

So, would anybody like to get in queue on the update that Rafik has just provided? I see hands from John McElwaine and Greg DiBiase, and then Philippe. John, go ahead.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks. I was taking some notes there from Rafik's update. I think he said the question is when should the council consider forming a scoping team concerning data accuracy. And I just wanted to get a little bit more clarity on that. That is my question; when should we? So, what factors are we looking at? What is delaying it? Is it the current workload? Just kind of seeing where it might slot in or what additional information we need as a council to make a decision about when that would be tackled. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, John. And Rafik, if you'd like to weigh in at any point here, feel free. I think what we have right now is the proposed framework document that was developed by the small team within council to look at this issue? So I think this is our opportunity to consider all of that.

I think certainly, all of these issues are going to be evaluated based on the other work prioritization items and everything else that you noted. So I think the answer is it's still an open question at this point and its certainly worth the council's discussion about priority and timing. I think we probably need to wait for, at a minimum, the delivery of the final report which is expected by the end of this month. And then the question is, do we assess whether there's consensus for the final report? Do we end up with consensus policy recommendations? And is that potentially the trigger for the follow-on work for the priority two items, or something else? And I think that's something that we need to discuss and consider.

So Rafik, would you like to respond on behalf of the small team, or shall we move to the queue?

RAFIK DAMMAK: I think we can move to the queue because I see they are all from the small team.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Rafik. So Greg, we'll go to you, then Philippe, then Marie.

GREG DIBIASE: I just wanted to touch upon the open issues Rafik mentioned was we're going to address these priority two items after the SSAD report has been delivered to council. From my perspective, it seems like it would make sense that we also vote on the report before moving on to what is essentially phase three, just as we voted on the phase one report. I've heard some suggestions that this could introduce delay, but it doesn't seem like this would be substantial delay, and even if there was a delay, I kind of feel like this hardworking team deserves a short break.

So I just kind of wanted to raise that and kind of understand what the rationale would be for not voting on the report once it's delivered.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Greg. Why don't we get through the queue and then we'll get back to any comments or questions? So Philippe, over to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Nothing to add to what Rafik has just said. That's a comprehensive description of where we are I think within the small team. Just a small comment. One of the things that I'm struggling with is very much on the procedural part. That's the phasing and possibly the dependencies between the three tracks that we're dealing with that's the scoping team on the WHOIS accuracy part, the reconvening of the EPDP and the approval—whilst this third party is not within the remit of the small team, but we have to consider the approval—hopefully—of the phase two final report.

Bearing in mind that final, according to the GNSO working procedures, is final. And that's meant to mean closure of the EPDP, although we had to fiddle with the phase one, phase two of the EPDPs already. But that's the sort of things that I'm struggling with and I think we'd personally like it to fit within the GNSO working procedures. So that's food for thought for the next steps within our small team. But again, Rafik's characterization of where we are was perfect. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Philippe. We'll go to Marie and then I'll respond with some comments to I think everybody. So Marie, go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks very much, Keith. Obviously, starting by thanking Rafik for the huge amount of hours he's put in on this, and Marika and all of the rest of the team.

Two issues that I think are being dealt with and must be now dealt with separately, the first being the remaining items, the second being accuracy.

On the remaining items, I appreciate what Greg is saying and I understand what he's saying about when this new Work Track is started. I'm using Work Track as a shorthand, Keith, because I agree with Philippe, none of us are quite sure where this procedurally fits in.

My concern is that we need to maintain the momentum, we need to maintain the expertise. I'm extremely pleased that this is going to happen, that if it's going to be, as you know because you've all read Rafik's briefing document, if it's going to be the team as is or if it's going to have to be one or two substitutions, totally understandably, of course, and I know from speaking with the people that I've been talking to, in particular the BC reps, that start date of September is feasible because it gives the mat least August off.

My dual concerns about pushing this even further into the long grass, I'm not just losing the momentum, the expertise, the will, if you'd like, it's also that we are approaching all the preparation for ICANN not Hamburg. I'm afraid I can't remember what number it is. It is going to get tied up, it is going to get lost in other things. And I think that maintaining the momentum, maintaining the connections between the people is extremely important if we're ever going to get through this.

Now, accuracy of course a different subject, but the same timeline concerns. I'm very worried that if we say we will set up a scoping

group at some point, it will get tied up in the next ICANN public meeting and then it'll be the Christmas vacation and then there'll be all manner of other issues. I would very much like us to be able to establish that scoping team as soon as we can realistically. I'm not taking tomorrow, but as soon as we can.

And also a comment that I've made to the small team about both of these two work tracks, whatever they may be called, is that I think we should also recognize and try to bring in the relevant concerns/expertise of our colleagues in the other ACs who have been so involved in this process and have made very substantive and useful comments. Because we're doing this for the entire community, because we want to get it right. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Marie. I've got a couple more folks in queue and then I do want to try to weigh in and respond with some preliminary thoughts. But let's go ahead to Tatiana. And Maxim, I saw your hand up. If you'd like to speak, you're more than welcome to. But Tatiana, go ahead.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Keith. Actually, I think Maxim was before me, but never mind. I wanted to address the issue of the starting point and preserving the same team members. While I very much appreciate the concerns and hopes raised by Marie on behalf of BC, I see how intense—I'm just an alternate on this team, and I see how intense this work is. And honestly, having just August off

and just pushing people to reconvene again, I'm not even sure that we can retain the same volunteers if we continue like this.

So I just wanted to say, not trying to write these concerns off or concerns about losing momentum and everything. But I also think that we have to first get this work done, EPDP phase two report, and see how everyone feels about restarting as soon as possible, and listen to the concerns of the stakeholder groups and those who are actually on the team as well, because I understand that as a GNSO we might want to start this Work Track, whatever the name is now, as soon as possible, but I also think that we might just not be able to start if people do not join because there is not enough time to have off, or there is not enough time to have a break and everybody is just burned out. So I believe that we have to be every careful about this. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Tatiana. Maxim, you're next, and then Rafik.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I'd like to underline that keeping the momentum for sake of keeping the momentum has no value. In situation where people are exhausted and all items were discussed in full, and the same question's discussed again and again, I'm not sure that instead of properly doing the process, we need to try to start it again and maybe to lose the leftovers of people who decided to join the process. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Maxim. Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith, and thanks all for the comments. With regards to the two priority of that track, if we can call it, the two items, I think maybe it's important to have in mind that we need to ensure the condition and the factors of success for that period of time to get something delivered. So we are not precluding what can be the result of that discussion, but I think our role is to ensure the success and to have more insurance that we get a result.

So for that, the [role of even] the small team, we're trying to put more guidance and detail, and I hope that will help the council in terms of this decision about the next step. But what's more important is also to create a new dynamic in the way that we are expecting the groups to come up with maybe a new proposal, that we move on from some of the deliberation. And if we want that, I think having some time will be helpful to everyone.

So I think we the council as process manager, we need to focus on the condition that will enable that track to be successful. So a small, even short time, a few days, few weeks, will be really helpful. And I'm speaking here my experience now in two years in the EPDP. Those things can really have a great influence. I understand the eagerness to go and try to cover, but that short period that [inaudible] to allow more time for reflection and preparation will be really helpful to have an outcome that can satisfy all parties. It's just I want to have this in mind. I understand the interest and the concerns, but I think our role is how we can respond to that while also to ensure the condition for success.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Rafik. Very helpful comments and input, particularly from your vantage point. I think the key here is for the council to try to set up circumstances or an environment that will lead to a successful outcome. And if there's a need to have a bit of a break to help ensure that that's something that we should consider, but also recognizing that there is strong interest and a sense of urgency, so not something that would be put off for long, but perhaps giving the group an opportunity to take a breath after some very intense work over the last couple of years I think is certainly worthy of consideration.

James, I'm going to give you the last word here and then we're going to need to move on. I will circle back and make some observations in a moment, but James, go right ahead.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Keith. I'll keep it rather brief. I'm going to be slightly less diplomatic than Rafik. The reality is that over the last few years on the EPDP, we have burned members of the community out to the extent that they have left ICANN, and that is an existential threat to the GNSO's ability to continue to operate and deliver policy. At this point, once we have the final report delivered of the EPDP, the exceptional nature ceases, and we need to treat the remaining items as we would by slipping them into our program management processes. I cannot support us continuing to have the same level of push and risking burnout of even more community members.

We have a program management responsibility here. we have processes, we have tools to help us with that. And the remaining items, we need to put into that process and allow that process to run as it is supposed to and as is our responsibility to manage. This needs to become a “business as usual” item rather than maintaining the exceptional nature for another year or two. That will existentially threaten our ability to retain community members to do policy development.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, James. Just to sort of wrap up on this topic, obviously, the issues that we’re discussing here, particularly the ones that are being suggested for continuation of the EPDP team for a period of time, are within the charter as I understand it, so it’s not going to necessarily require a revision of the charter, but it could require some additional focus on developing a workplan.

And so I think that we need to make sure that we’re approaching this in a careful way, but in a way that also acknowledges and recognizes the importance of these issues. They, as we’ve discussed previously, are not on the critical path for delivery of the recommendations on the SSAD, but they are still within charter, within scope for the EPDP team. Yes, the issues have been discussed quite extensively over time, but I think to Marie’s point in chat, there is some new input related to the legal versus natural report and that there’s an opportunity I think to close out the work in that regard.

So I think we need to take this one offline in terms of a decision. I think we need to rely on the recommendations and the work of the

small team in putting together the framework document in terms of next steps.

So I appreciate everybody's input on this one. I think next steps are obviously to look forward to the delivery of the EPDP phase two final report. We will obviously need to have council consideration and discussion of that and schedule a vote, assuming we receive consensus policy recommendations for consideration, and that once we get to that point, I think we'll be in a better position to understand timing for the next steps, because that will obviously impact the timelines but also the level of participation from the members of the EPDP team. And frankly, I wouldn't be surprised if we see some transitioning of members on the EPDP team from various parts of the community. Rafik, I'll give you the last word on this one, and then we need to move on on the agenda. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith, and thanks everyone for the comment. I just want to say one thing. I think the whole work we are doing in the small team and this discussion at the council meeting regarding the priority two items, next steps is to make it clear that we are listening, we are taking into account the concerns, and so we are responding to that following the process and our procedure, and also what the charter says. So I think it's just to make the message clear that we are working on that, and that will be also communicated to the EPDP team just to alleviate any concerns from the groups that expressed interest on those topics. So that's it.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Rafik. It's a really good point. And thank you for underscoring it that we as a council in our previous conversations have made a commitment to not ignore, not put off these issues and to make sure they're dealt with and we are committed to doing that. I think the question is at this stage exactly how and when, and making sure that we have, as Rafik mentioned eloquently earlier, make sure we have a workplan in place that ensures maximum chance of success.

So thanks, everybody, for the good discussion on this. We're not finished with it, but we do need to move on today. So let's move on now to the council discussion. This is item six on our agenda. And I'm going to hand this one over to Berry to introduce and then we'll discuss further. Thank you.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. This one will be just a quick update, so we'll be able to give back some time for the 15-minute allocation. We talked about this during last week's extraordinary meeting about how we're going to handle and categorize and time out how a lot of the impacts as a result of the EPDP phase one, how the community, how staff can absorb and accomplish this work.

So just a brief update. Since that last session, we've had a couple of meetings with our GDD colleagues and ultimately we'll be providing a substantive update at the August council meeting. From our extraordinary meeting, the first step here was really to try to attach each of these wave 1 items to its respective program

to understand more so about duration and possible timing and trying to look at an initial scheduling of how all of these might be addressed.

What we're working on now, and as noted, will be discussed in the August meeting is that we're essentially developing a matrix of the seven policies that were impacted, and it's still in early draft form, but essentially, this matrix will be kind of a four-column summary report that essentially column one will be the consensus policy impacted and a summary statement of that impact or what needs to be accomplished, and then the remaining three columns will be kind of a division of how ..

The first one is if there are true policy implications and to understand the amount of effort that would be involved and/or timing by which it could be accomplished. The third column would be what we're informally labeling as kind of a band-aid, is that if the timing of these policy changes is far enough out that perhaps there needs to be some kind of interim attachment to the RDS policy and its policy effective date, mostly to avoid confusion or conflicts when the RDS policy is deployed. That includes some things like terminology updates, but we need to analyze that if these certain topics that do have policy impacts can't be addressed for a while, we need to make sure that we can bridge that gap up until they can be addressed.

And then the final column is essentially the low impact items, which are just pure terminology updates, and the initial thinking here is that we can try to bundle those together or essentially kind of take care of the low-hanging fruit in one kind of package for essentially addressing these, as I mentioned, likely through

redlines, review by the IRT, put out for public comment and post the updated changes.

The intent, though, of any of this impact as it relates to implementation of the RDS policy or these terminology updates is to ensure that they're detached from the critical path of the phase one IRT for them completing their work. But of course, we do have some dependencies as we approach the policy effective date for the work coming out of the implementation.

So that's pretty much it of the update, and we'll have a lot more in the August meeting. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you very much, Berry. That's really helpful in terms of an update and next steps. I like the way that you've been considering breaking it down, and particularly the opportunity to maybe consider some low-impact changes in a bucketed fashion or basically to batch them in a way where council could make its decisions or make decisions on some of the changes in a way that we could move things forward and not have individual work tracks or individual votes for example on a range of issues. So, thanks for that, and we certainly look forward to being able to get into the details of that before and during our August meeting.

Just a follow-up question, Berry. Do you expect that you'll have the document available in advance of the council meeting, or will it be sort of an introduction at the council meeting in August? Go ahead, Berry.

BERRY COBB: It's our desire to have it by the documents and motions deadline. I'm still working with the GDD colleagues, but perhaps we might invite one or two of them to kind of co-present about the approach, again, because there are some bandwidth considerations. But absolutely, we would be hopeful that we can get signoff from the council about that approach so that we can get busy on these. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Excellent. Thanks, Berry. So the hope is that we'll have some direction from council by the August meeting. So thank you very much for that. And we certainly welcome colleagues from GDD staff to join as well.

Okay, any questions or comments for Berry or on this topic before we move on? All right, seeing no hands, let's move on to item number seven, and with this, I'll hand it over to Steve. Steve, thank you.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks very much, Keith. This continues our theme of program management items coming out of the extraordinary meeting last week. So the IDNs as part of the gTLD program track, and the council will likely recall that they convened scoping team on IDN issues and received a report from that team back in January, I want to say.

As part of that final report from the scoping team, they recommended two tracks of work. So this is about only one of

those tracks, the operational track, which is focused on the updates to the IDN implementation guidelines 4.0.

The council will likely recall that they requested the board delay a board on adopting those guidelines. There were concerns about the changes made to the guidelines. And because contracted parties are required to adhere to those guidelines, there were concerns about the substance of the changes as well as the process by which they are updated.

So this operational track, at least as we understand it, is dependent on GDD and contracted parties primarily to collaborate and work together to address any issues within the guidelines themselves. So there's unlikely to be heavy lift from the council's side. But nevertheless, it seems like a blessing from the council to initiate this work is sensible, which will allow the interested parties, which has I mention is likely the contracted parties, to work on the operational elements and updating the IDN implementation guideline 4.0 set.

In informal discussions that we've had with our GDD colleagues in talking about the wave 1 report, we've also talked to them about this item as well, and they've indicated that they are prepared to support the work. So again, it's really a blessing needed from the council to just get this work started if the council believes it's timely for that to begin.

In informal discussions with Berry on the sidelines about I guess taking action on this item, I think something that we'll learn from here is that likely this probably made more sense as maybe a consent agenda item if the council wants to take this action. Just

to note that a formal action was taken to initiate this work. So I think maybe a lesson learned for future items like this.

So that's the background on this particular element. Again, this is primarily about the operational track and I guess the council blessing that work to begin in GDD and contracted parties. There's the other element that the council talked about briefly during the extraordinary meeting and that's related to the policy track. I believe it was mentioned that the charter drafting team could maybe be convened as early as August.

So just as a sneak preview, I'm going to turn it over to Ariel as staff has done a little bit of background and analysis on this item in advance of actually formally convening the charter drafting team. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks very much, Steve. Just to provide the council a very brief update on the policy track effort, so per action item, staff is exploring the PDP 3.0 revised charter template in drafting charter for preparation for the policy track work, and at this moment, we already made some progress on that draft charter, but of course, the council will have opportunity to weigh in on the substance and when we formally organize this charter drafting team, we will have something to start with. So that's what staff is doing in the background to prepare for that.

And at this moment, we're also working with GDD, especially Sarmad who's expert in IDN work, to refine some of the charter questions. And the way we develop that is by looking at the staff

paper on the IDN variant TLD management recommendations and try to convert these recommendations into appropriate questions that can be addressed in a charter. So we're working closely together with Sarmad to confirm these questions and of course, that's just one component of the charter. There are other things, especially to reflect the PDP 3.0 improvement. So we're working in the background to provide some text for the future drafting team to look at.

And one other thing I want to mention, in terms of the operational track, in essence it has a very important advisory role in terms of identifying what is the portion in the implementation guidelines that's purely implementation, what portion may have policy implications. So the part that has policy implications, that should also feed into the policy track for the future working group to look at. So that's a quick sneak peek, and hopefully when we convene the charter drafting team, the draft that staff developed can be shared and the council can look at that into detail.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Ariel, and thank you, Steve. Yeah, I think it's important to note—and just to remind everybody that there's been a tremendous amount of work already done in this area, both on the side of ICANN Org as well as the scoping team that delivered its recommendations to council earlier this year.

So I think we're in a good position here. We've discussed this now for many months. I think we're in a good position for the council in the August meeting. I think as Steve has suggested that we have on a consent agenda basically the indication for ICANN Org and

contracted parties to move forward on the operational track and also at the same time initiate the call for volunteers for the charter drafting team for the policy work that would be under the remit of the GNSO council and the GNSO.

So I think I just want to note that there's been a lot of work done here. Thanks to staff for all the support that they've provided to the group already. Rafik, I see your hand. Go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. Thanks also to Steve and Ariel for the update. I have no issue with the next steps, I just have a question with regards to the operational track. I understand that that track will consist of or composed of people from the contracted parties and ICANN Org with expertise on IDN, but I was wondering if it's possible to have observer on that track. I could not find details in the report, but just wondering if it was envisioned, discussed, and if not, can we have that opportunity? Just observer. I think it's good to have people get a better understanding about the operational side and also understanding the challenges because that also can help in terms of any policy issues regarding IDN.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Rafik. It's a good question. I'm going to hand it back to Steve actually to answer the question of whether that was discussed or whether that's been envisioned. I don't know myself personally. And then I see Philippe has his hand up as well. So Steve, is there anything you'd like to add?

STEVE CHAN: Sure. Thanks, Keith. And Ariel might want to jump in too. So the topic did indeed come up about having those beyond just the contracted parties to be able to participate in that collaborative effort, and I think where the group settled is that primarily, it is an operational and contractual negotiation, I suppose. But nevertheless, I think the group supported the concept of observers, and I don't think that the GDD folks would object to allowing observers to follow along to the collaborative effort.

I don't want to answer for them, but I would imagine that because a scoping team had already talked about the concept of observers, although it's not captured as Rafik mentioned in the report, I don't imagine that they would actually object to that being allowed. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Steve. Philippe, over to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Keith. Thanks, Ariel and Steve. A candid question [on the] policy track. Would you—it's probably a question for Ariel—remind us of how much this might be ... I'm looking for the word, but dependent or related to our friends at ccNSO PDP 4 for which there's an ongoing call for participants, or whether that's totally unrelated? Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks so much, Philippe. So, as some of you may already know that ccNSO has launched ccPDP 4, and they have envisioned

there are two subteams. One of the subteams is going to focus on IDN variant TLD management issues, and that's the main focus, actually, for the future GNSO policy track work, IDN.

So there are some overlaps, and when staff did a quick glance at their issue report for ccPDP 4, we didn't notice many concrete charter questions or proposals or things they're going to kind of discuss in detail regarding the variant TLD management. So I need to touch base with our colleagues in ccNSO and double check to what degree they're going to talk about in that particular subteam.

And then when we look at the variant TLD management staff paper, there are some areas that GNSO and ccNSO need to coordinate in terms of exploring some kind of management issues related to variants. But it's not a lot. There are several questions, but not a lot of them. But we can get back to you with more details after we touch base with our colleagues and also chat with GDD, and hopefully we can provide a more accurate answer to your question. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Ariel. Thank you, Philippe, for the question. Any other discussion on this before we move on? So I think just to summarize, the expectation is that we will have, on the August GNSO council meeting on the consent agenda an indication that the GNSO council supports GDD staff and contracted parties engaging on the operational track. I think we can note the discussions we had today related to observers. And then also, we will have basically a decision point to call for members of a

drafting team to charter the policy track, the PDP work that will take place related to IDN variants.

And with that, I think we need to move on in terms of time, so let's move to item number eight on the agenda. Berry, go ahead. Thank you.

BERRY COBB: Hi Keith. Just going ahead and preempting you to talk about this item eight.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, go ahead, thanks.

BERRY COBB: Okay. So we did discuss this particular topic, although it's not highlighted specifically here on the agenda, and this is still in relation to the recommendation 27 wave 1 report from phase one, and specifically, this particular topic is around the items identified in that report that were listed as high and medium impact, which is the URS procedure as well as the URS rules.

Staff did a cursory analysis, and in regards to the URS procedure items, there were nine that were listed there from the wave one report, two of which are—most of these are terminology updates, and two appear to have been addressed by the working group draft recommendations that they're considering now. There were two that were identified as not yet addressed but likely could be considered as implementation guidance as part of their final

report, and then one item was not yet addressed which could produce a little bit of policy deliberations at the group.

So in short, from the URS procedure perspective, it seems like the bulk of that could be addressed by the existing RPM working group and likely most of it in terms of keeping track to full resolution is that they be incorporated into the final report, mostly as implementation guidance highlighting those terminology changes and so on and so forth.

And essentially, the same kind of analysis was produced for the URS rules as well. the bulk of these are terminology updates, and as noted that as part of the final report, that they could produce a redline and incorporate it as implementation guidance.

Two items of the eight were already addressed by the working group and then the last item was basically understood that it could be better addressed by the IRT.

So again, the overall approach here is that all of these particular items across the two work products, the procedures and rules, likely could be incorporated into the final report. A few of the items will likely require some deliberation by the working group, but by and large, appears to be a lower level lift for the RPM working group, and I think that there's less risk or very reduced risk that it would impact their critical path towards delivering the final report.

So ultimately, I think what would be helpful here for the council today, and as Steve mentioned in the previous topic about laying down a marker around some of these decisions, hopefully today we can consider that the action here is that the council agrees that

the RPM liaison as well as the policy staff supporting the RPM working group take this initial analysis to the working group leadership, have them review the summary analysis and to take action on those within the working group. And if for any reason the working group leadership there, as well as the liaison, thinks that they can't be addressed, then they would report back to the council.

So in terms of kind of a marker for the formal decision here is really for the council to agree to this without objection that these next steps can be taken. And then should there be any objection to this work being passed on to the working group leadership, then it's still on our radar to figure out how it's going to be addressed because a few of these did seem to have some policy implication.

And then the last thing I'll say about this is if none of this can't be incorporated into the working group final report, then this is one of those items that I'll still have identified in that matrix that I talked about two agenda items ago, but again, if the current working group can't handle this and we follow the track or conclusion of these items when it likely will transition to a future IRT, then this particular package of work will need to be bulked into the other items that have been identified in the wave one report that we'll discuss about in August.

So I hope that was somewhat clear, and we don't necessarily have a presentable product that talks about the analysis of some of these URS procedures and updates other than to say that we don't believe that this is going to be a heavy lift for the working group to address. So if you do have any questions, I'm happy to

answer them, or I may rely on Mary or Ariel or Julie, if you do have any more detail questions. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Berry. John McElwaine, I will turn to you here momentarily, but I just want to sort of, I think, summarize what we heard. I think we have some EPDP phase one recommendation 27 issues identified that will impact URS, and the question before us is, is the current RPM PDP working group focusing today on URS-related issues, the appropriate or the best vehicle to consider and to address these required changes or updates, or is it better considered through another path? A separate group, or is it considered, as Berry said, among some of the other items we've identified?

So John, I think the question for you and for the RPM PDP leadership is whether this is an appropriate thing for us as the GNSO council to refer to the RPM group that's currently underway, and is there risk by our referring this of impacting negatively the timelines or the ability for the RPM PDP group to deliver its phase one final report? So John, if I could hand it over to you for any initial reaction, but I think the proposed next step is for you as the council liaison to the group to take it to the RPM PDP co-chairs for some initial feedback for us as the council. So John, if I could hand it over to you. Thanks.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Yeah. Thanks, Keith. My initial thought is, and from hearing the description that Berry provided is that, provided that the work is

primarily definitional, updating definitions, then it should be handled within the RPM working group.

I know that Mary Wong has let me know that RPM staff are prepared to table mapping to the terms that need to be changed in the URS, and we have it on our agenda for a call scheduled for Monday morning east coast time with the RPM working group leadership. So again, my initial reaction is I think we can handle it, but we need to make sure that it is primarily definitional or some easy policy type issues. I think that if it got into some more controversial issues, it would probably significantly delay things, but that's not what I'm hearing right now. I think after we take a look at that table, mapping to the terms, we'll have a lot better idea. So I hope to have something to report back early next week. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, John. Very helpful, and I think that gets us to a point where we'll look forward to getting feedback from you then to help guide the council's decision on next steps on this one. So Berry, thank you very much for teeing this up. I see Marie has her hand up. Marie, go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thank you. It's a very short comment, and it's not specific to RPM, Keith. First, Berry, thank you so much for that meeting last week. It was really easy to follow and really informative. So Finance Committee, thank you for all the work, but also for the explanation.

I'm wondering, on a more general level with the terminology issues, if this could be put into its own little bucket. If the terminology updates required by wave one could be, for want of a better word, a rolling agenda item so that when staff have the bandwidth—and I know how hard you guys work, so I'm not saying do this tomorrow, please, but it could be a rolling, okay, we've got a window, we can look at what terminology needs to be updated—for anything, not just for RPMs—put together a redline and then I think the terminology issues should be able to be signed off really quickly. They're not contentious. And then we can see where the actual work needs to be concentrated rather than having to keep coming back to a terminology amendment which really should be able to be dealt with relatively quickly. So it could lower the stress levels and make it clearer to see where we still need to go. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Marie. Yeah, very helpful comments. I see Berry has his up, I assume to respond. So Berry, over to you.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. Thank you, Marie. Very good question. And perhaps I'm not clear, but I do hope to make more clear in August. And of course, we're still polishing the wax on this whole toolset about program management, so we're learning as we go and it's an iterative process.

But with regards to handling what I would consider kind of the bulk of what was identified in the wave 1 report, and those items that

are the low hanging fruit, these terminology updates and/or, as I kind of alluded to informally, these band-aid kinds of things that may need to be considered, the ultimate decisions around those are really not for the council. It'll be mostly work done by GDD staff in coordination with the EPDP IRT, because it is the RDS policy and the implementation of that that is causing these impacts.

So in terms of viewing redlines on the impacted consensus policy, there really is no decision for the council to make other than to agree with the overall approach. And I'll note that this is—like several things that have occurred over the last couple of years—somewhat unprecedented. We've never had such a change in consensus policy that reverberated through other consensus policies.

Now, where the true decisions that need to be made for the council are these items where we don't think we can create this "band-aid" within the IRT and/or those items that do require consensus policy or PDP-type deliberations. And that's where the bulk of the analysis is, we're going to be spending time, because that does directly impact from our program management perspective, on finding a home by which they can be discussed and deliberated, understanding when they can be deliberated, and then understanding how long it would take to deliberate. And when we get a better picture there, then we need to ask ourselves, can we live that long without addressing some of those types of items? So I hope that helps. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Berry. It does. And I see Marie's acknowledged also in chat. So thank you very much. All right, we need to move on and we're running a little bit behind, and we've got four items in AOB that are substantive. So let's get right to it. 9.1 is a council discussion or update on the conversation around populating the independent review process standing panel. I'm just wondering if there's any feedback at this point from stakeholder groups or constituencies on this approach. And I see James has his hand up. So James, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Keith. We discussed this within the NCSG, and we just want to reconfirm our understanding that this is to populate the search panel, for want of a better phrase, and not to populate the IRP standing panel itself. And on that basis, we're happy to go ahead with it.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, James. I think the question that was posed to the SO and AC leaders and that has been forwarded to the SG and C leaders is whether—and I'll ask if anybody from staff wants to weigh in on this, Mary, you may have some input as well—is that the question is, should the existing IRP IOT—implementation oversight team—be the body to identify the members of the standing panel?

And I believe that's sort of one of the questions before us, and if not the IRP IOT, then how should we consider it from a community perspective?

JAMES GANNON: If I can respond, the wording that went out was very confusing, to be very frank. We read through it a number of times and we still weren't 100% clear. That's why I want to make it clear what we are supporting.

So if it is that, that the IOT is to be the body that helps select the standing panel members, the NCSG agrees with that.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, James. Mary, is there any additional input that you'd like to provide here? Thank you very much.

MARY WONG: Thanks, Keith, James, and everybody. Just really quickly, that that is just one of the options, that either it could be the IRP IOT—and there have been some concerns expressed by some groups about them, how that group was formed and constituted. Another option is to have a small representative community group that may or may not include members of the IRP IOT, the composition to be decided by the community.

As Keith said, there's a meeting coming up on Monday with all the community chairs and ICANN Org, and hopefully, we can have that discussion so that the community can have a sense of what it prefers. The last point I'll make, Keith, is that ICANN Org wants to be very clear that given the bylaws, there is an important role for the community structures in constituting and selecting the IRP standing panel, and that is certainly not something that ICANN Org wants to take a path on without clear direction from the community. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Mary. That's very helpful. So I've got Maxim in queue and then if anybody else would like to speak to this. Oh, I see James and then Flip as well. So Maxim first.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I have a stupid question. Why don't we use standing selection committee of GNSO council? Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Maxim. Are you referring to the actual selection of standing panelists, or to discuss the issue more broadly? I think part of the challenge here is the identification and appointment of members to the standing panel will be broader than just the GNSO. It's going to be a group that will have an impact across the community in terms of IRPs. So if you'd like to clarify, go ahead, and then we'll go to James and Flip.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Selection is just a formal process, because when qualifications are known and the recommendations, what persons should know, should not know, which affiliations are forbidden, etc., it's just a formal selection process. And as I understand, selection committee used to approve persons outside of GNSO. So it's not a big deal from my point of view. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Maxim. James, let's go to you next, and then to Flip.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. So I'll respectfully disagree with Maxim. Thanks for the update, Mary, that's very valuable so I can give more detailed feedback. We would strongly support using the IOT members for that function, the reason being the selection of these panelists is a very complex and very—it requires a specific level of knowledge and experience with the structure and form and procedures of the IRP itself to ensure that we get a good and valuable set of members for that standing panel.

Swapping it out or onboarding new people into that detail is going to take a long time, and I think we would much prefer that we use the existing experience base that is already being brought into the IOT to utilize that. And I haven't consulted with my other counselors, but I don't think we would support using the SSC for that.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, James. Flip, you're next.

FLIP PETILION: Thank you, Keith. I would very much like to second what Mary has summarized. That was a very good and accurate summary. And I would like to add that—and I'm part of that IRP IOT—this is not a formal PDP, it is actually a group of people, some supposed to be experts, others to be more experts, I don't know. But it is

clear, as Mary has said, that the intention is that this group is thinking of issues, problems, is examining what was done in the past, is examining suggestions for improving the IRPs and it is my understanding that it is not to that IRP IOT to take any kind of decision. It may be asked for its expertise, views, but it is clearly to the community to organize itself with a view to making the selection of the members of the panel. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Flip, very much, and also, I see that there's been an input from Becky as well as Mary in the chat as well, and that the bylaws say that SOs and ACs nominate a slate of proposed panel members that the board would approve, and Mary's noted that to the extent that the community agreement is that a community group should be constituted, it's up to the GNSO how it wishes to appoint a representative to that group, which could be done through the SSC. That's an obviously internal discussion for us.

So I think this is an important topic, this is an important context. There will be a meeting on Monday and I think what we'll do is report out notes of the discussion on Monday to the council group shortly. And Becky is noting also that the IRP IOT does not have current authority for panel nominations and technically the board and Org select members in consultation with the SOs and ACs. So I think we've got some additional work to be done here.

In the interest of time, let's move on now to item 9.2, which is council response to the public comment on enhancing effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model. We have some

proposed next steps. And so if I could hand this over to—Pam, is this one that you're helping to lead? I apologize.

PAM LITTLE:

No problem, Keith. Just very briefly, actually, it's Rafik, and I was working with Rafik and staff. We have circulated a draft to the list, so please take a look at the draft, see whether you have any feedback or comments or suggested edits, and that's where we are right now. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Pam, and thanks to Rafik as well. Okay, so just to reinforce, we've got some next steps proposed, and that's available for everybody's review. So please provide feedback to the small team. Okay, next item on the agenda, 9.3, update on the EPDP phase one IRT regarding recommendation 7. Sebastien, I'll hand it over to you for any update in terms of your engagement with the IRT on EPDP phase one recommendation 7. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. So today, I will not give any updates on the substance, but I can say that we're very close to coming up to an agreement. We had several rounds of—or I had, sorry, several rounds of discussions with the different parties. I liaised also with the GNSO ExCom to make sure that I was keeping within the boundaries.

Yesterday, we had yet again another discussion in an IRT call and I presented my findings to the group. I think that we are in agreement. I was just asked by the group to put these findings in

writing to be shared with the group for their full agreement, and I'm in the process of doing this. I will have that finished today and shared with the group today. So I hope to have a written response to the GNSO out before our next meeting. Way before our next meeting, probably, over the course of the next week. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. Any questions, any comments or follow-up for Sebastien? Okay, I don't see any hands, so thank you for your efforts there, and we look forward to your further updates next week or in the near future. Thank you.

Okay, last item on our agenda under AOB is to note, as I said at the beginning of the call and notified everybody by e-mail, that Julf Helsingius has notified council leadership and now the council that he's going to be stepping down as our council liaison to the GAC, and I just want to take this opportunity to sincerely thank Julf for his efforts over the last almost three years. It's a very important, and as I noted in my e-mail, visible role, and Julf has performed the role and responsibilities very well and we really do appreciate all of the effort and time and commitment that he's made in that regard.

So I think the next steps are just to note that we will be initiating a standing selection committee process to identify a replacement for Julf, and everybody should keep an eye out for that. Julf, would you like to say anything at this point?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Not really, except thank you for those kind words, and just pointing out that I will still be here until ICANN 69 at least.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes. Thank you very much, Julf. And that's much appreciated as well. So, with that, we are nearing the top of the hour. I'd like to see if there's Any Other Business, any other points to be discussed. I should also thank—just a note and thank that Becky and Matthew, our GNSO appointed board members, joined our call today and I just want to thank them for spending the time with us today on this call, and we look forward to continuing to do that. Any Other Business before we wrap up?

All right, thankse, everybody. With that, we will conclude this meeting, and look forward to speaking again during our August GNSO council meeting. Thank you all.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining today's call. [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you all. Goodbye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks all. Bye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: You may now disconnect your lines, and have a great rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]