

**Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference  
20 July 2012 at 11:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 20 July 2012 at 11:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20120720-en.mp3>

on page

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul>

**List of attendees:**

<https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/GNSO+Council+Meeting-+20+July+2012>

NCA – Non Voting - Carlos Dionisio Aguirre

**Contracted Parties House** Registrar Stakeholder Group: Stéphane van Gelder, Mason Cole, Yoav Keren – absent

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jeff Neuman, Jonathan Robinson, Ching Chiao, Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

**Non-Contracted Parties House** Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Zahid Jamil John Berard, David Taylor, Brian Winterfeldt, Osvaldo Novoa, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen - absent, proxy to Osvaldo Novoa

Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Mary Wong, Joy Liddicoat, Wendy Seltzer, Mary Wong, Wolfgang Kleinwächter, Rafik Dammak – absent, Bill Drake – absent,

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Lanre Ajayi

**GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers** Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison  
Han Chuan Lee – ccNSO Observer

**ICANN Staff**

David Olive- VP Policy Development,  
Margie Milam - Senior Policy Counselor  
Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director,

Julie Hedlund - Policy Director  
Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director  
Brian Peck - Senior Policy Director  
Berry Cobb – Policy consultant  
Alexander Kulik – Systems Engineer  
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

**Guest:**

Mikey O'Connor – Fake Renewal Working Group

Woman: ...at the moment. Thank you.

Woman: Okay thank you. The recording has been started.

(Stéphane): Thank you very much. Welcome everyone to this council call on July the 20, 2012. And we have apologies from Wolf. He will be absent on this call.

Jeff Neuman will only be able to be with us for the first 30 minutes. So and that's why we're trying to start as soon as we can.

And Mason Cole will not have Internet access. So Mason if you're on the line and you need to ask questions please just speak up so that I know that you need to be counted in the queue.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Stéphane): Glen can I ask you to do a role call please?

Glen De Saint Géry: Certainly (Stéphane) I will do that. Jeff Neuman?

Jeff Neuman: Here.

Glen De Saint Géry: Ching Chiao?

Ching Chiao: Here.

Glen De Saint Géry: Jonathan Robinson?

Jonathan Robinson: Present.

Glen De Saint Géry: Mason Cole?

Mason Cole: Here.

Glen De Saint Géry: (Yoav Keren) is not yet on the line. (Thomas Rickert)?

Thomas Rickert: Present.

Glen De Saint Géry: Zahid Jamil?

Zahid Jamil: Present.

Glen De Saint Géry: John Berard is not yet on the line.

John Berard: No (unintelligible) online. I've - I'm here, been here for a while.

Glen De Saint Géry: Thank you (John). Brian Winterfeldt, I do not see him on the call yet. David Taylor? (Asweldo Nova)?

Oswaldo Novoa: Present.

Glen De Saint Géry: Bill Drake?

Joy Liddicoat: I have apologies from Bill Drake. This is (Joy).

Glen De Saint Géry: Okay thank you very much (Joy). Wendy Seltzer?

Wendy Seltzer: Yes (unintelligible).

Glen De Saint Géry: Mary Wong? Not on the call yet. Rafik Dammak we have apologies from too. (Joy Liddicoat)?

(Joy Liddicoat): Yes.

Glen De Saint Géry: Wolfgang Kleinwachter? Not on the call yet. (Lanraya Jae)?

Lanre Ajayi: (Unintelligible).

Glen De Saint Géry: Carlos Aguirre?

Carlos Aguirre: Present.

Glen De Saint Géry: Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenberg: Present.

Glen De Saint Géry: Han Chuan Lee? And Han Chuan Lee's on this call. I know he must be on mute.

And for staff we have David Olive, Margie Milam, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Berry Cobb, (Brian Peck), (Alex Kulik) from our technical staff, (Natalie Peregrine) and myself Glen De Saint Géry.

I see that Mary Wong has just joined us as well. Thank you (Stéphane), over to you. So we have a quorum in both the contracted parties and the non-contracted parties' house. Thank you.

(Stéphane): Thanks Glen. And just for the record I will note that I am also present. And come to any statement of interest updates?

Glen De Saint Géry: (Unintelligible)?

(Stéphane): Hearing no updates, any calls to review or amend the agenda please?

Thomas Rickert: Would it make sense to discuss the defensive registration subject and the IOC debate while Jeff is on the call? This is (Thomas) sorry. Jeff would you like that?

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff. That's fine. I mean I can listen to the recording but if you guys want to do that that'd be great.

(Stéphane): So that would mean moving Item 6. And what was the other item you asked for (Thomas)?

Thomas Rickert: Yes I think the defensive registration briefing paper and the IOC discussion sort of are interlinked.

(Stéphane): Okay. So we can move Item 6 back towards Item 8 that - the next item after the consent agenda if that helps.

And so we'll do...

Man: Yes but assuming (Brian Peck)'s around, is (Brian) available to give the update?

Brian Peck: Yes I am.

(Stéphane): Okay. Any further requests to review or amend? Okay...

Glen De Saint Géry: (Stéphane) it's Glen. (Stéphane) it's Glen. Sorry Wolfgang Kleinwachter and Brian Winterfeldt and Rob Hogarth have joined the call since.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Sorry for being late. This is Wolfgang.

(Stéphane): So on the minutes of the previous meeting, the minutes were sent to the council list today. They are scheduled to be approved on July the 30th if no specific comments are made.

And we will - the minutes...

Man: Hello, can anyone hear me? I can't hear anybody now.

((Crosstalk))

(Stéphane): (Unintelligible) setup on the list? Who was that speaking? Was that you (David)? Hello? Are we having a problem with the line?

Man: You're still here.

(Stéphane): Okay well that's good enough. So I heard someone way that they were not coming through. But we'll try and work through that.

I will draw your attention as usual to our pending projects list where you have a link on the agenda and ask if there are any questions on that list please?

Hearing no questions I'll move on to Item 2 which is our usual consent agenda. The - and I will note that the SCI has now put forward -- I'm sure we've all seen it -- a procedure for the consent agenda. So thanks to the SCI for doing that work.

I believe that procedure is currently out for public comment. And we have no consent agenda item for today's agenda.

So we will move straight into..

Wendy Seltzer: I'm sorry this is Wendy and I object.

(Stéphane): To what?

Wendy Seltzer: Just for the sake of it. Sorry.

(Stéphane): All right, that was a joke then I guess. So we'll move on to Item 6 as per (Thomas)'s request. And we will go straight in for this item on defensive registrations at the second level.

And item for which we've asked (Brian Peck) from ICANN staff to provide an update for us. (Brian), sorry for the schedule change. Are you able to give that update now please?

Brian Peck: Sure of course, thank you.

Okay I will - good morning, good afternoon. I don't know if it's good evening for anyone but just give you a brief update. I think we have about ten minutes on this agenda, so hopefully we'll leave most of that for discussion among the council.

But as you know, Kurt Pritz sent a letter on behalf of ICANN staff introducing this briefing paper on defensive registration back on June 4.

And I'm sorry I don't have control of the slides. The next slide please?

This briefing paper basically was driven by a - in response - well basically came from a motion from the new gTLD committee of the board back on April 12.

It was in response to a letter from the Department of Commerce Assistant Secretary Larry Strickland as well as several right holders concerns that had been expressed with prior to the launch of the new gTLD applications early this year.

In results - and in response to those particular events ICANN did conduct a public comment period (unintelligible) need for defensive registration applications and how these (needs) might be addressed.

Although the public comment specifically requested for commentators to address this issue focusing on the first round or first top level, excuse me of new TLD applications actually most of the comments submitted focus on protections at the second level.

So the result of that public comment period as well as subsequent discussions in Costa Rica and sensing the - this, you know, the public discussion on this issue focusing on the need or the perceived need for defensive registrations at the second level of new TLDs is that the board gTLD committee requested or required staff to provide a briefing update on this issue for to facilitate discussion in the community.

It was submitted to the GNSO Council basically to facilitate this discussion on two things. One is whether there's further policy discussions are warranted to address this perceived need and if so, you know, what is - could be done to address the perceived need.

And as part of that is whether there should be any additional protections on second level registrations? Okay next slide please?

The briefing paper basically provides a summary comments on these particular areas. It identifies the primary concern which is whether the need or the risk of defensive registration from (consistent) level of the TODs is much higher than at the top level.

And the two main reasons for that for this perceived risk is that the current (unintelligible) life protection are either insufficient and/or ineffective for rights protection and that the cost of monitoring or enforcing rights is unreasonably high given that you're going to be facing perhaps at least 500 new gTLDs

The key question that comes from the community is are additional protections necessary at the second level? The paper then goes through a summary of the existing second level protections as well as a summary of the suggested measures in the public comment forum that came out of that discussion to address the perceived needs for defensive registration.

The paper recommends, you know, it suggests that the council consider utilizing one of its approaches or available processes such as requesting initial report or conducting a policy discussion to address this issue and as to whether, you know, either some sort of manner should be moved forward to either address the perceived need and/or to consider whether additional or second level protections are necessary.

It's the intent - if the intent is to encourage the community discussion the paper raises the possibility that perhaps especially if such changes are necessary before the designation of new TLDs that an STI type of mechanism might be usable.

If the GNSO result of this discussion is that community conversation should continue but formal consideration be merited, then perhaps an initial report PDP can also be (requested).

The paper does note that there are some other ongoing existing either (missed) reports such as the I - you know, International Organization issue report.

You know, that final report of course is schedule towards the end of August. The paper's also aware of, you know, the existing PDP that likely will be called, you know, 18 months after the designation of the CODs on whether, you know, existing RPMs are indeed adequate or whether further protections might be necessary.

Okay that's a brief outline of the briefing paper, the background of what drove it for its publication and what it contains.

If - unless anyone has any questions perhaps then it'd be best to open up for discussion. Thank you.

(Stéphane): Thank you (Brian). Thank you very much for that information outline. And just a reminder, we are in this agenda item attempting to ascertain what our next steps might be.

So I'd like to ask counselors to focus our discussions towards that aim if possible. Zahid? You have your hand up Zahid.

Let's go to (Jonathan) then and go back to Zahid. (Jonathan)?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Stéphane). I have a couple of simple questions. I apologize. There may be some background noise at the moment so hopefully it stays away.

The first thing I noticed (Brian) is that there's reference in your presentation to the concept of defensive applications.

I'm not sure that we've seen that term before. And I just think that one of the issues that perhaps caused the confusion we shouldn't mix up.

When there was all the input on the public comment period and there was significant reference to second level part of that may be simply as a result of confusion on the terminology.

Because the - it was introduced, the concept of defensive registrations in talking about new TLDs being created at the top level.

After that the response to the comments were naturally - when defensive registrations has historically meant at the second level.

So it's helpful if you've clarified that by the use of the term defensive applications. But our view of those comments coming in must be tempered by the use of the confusing terminology previously.

There's one other point of clarification I think we should be sure to make sure we focus on here. And that is that we're focusing I believe on the current round of new gTLD applications, and additional protections for this round.

But again when we talk about this we should be clear are we focusing on this round, future rounds or both? So I think those are just two comments (Stéphane) in and around clarifying the way in which we discuss this.

But I hear you that we want to focus on what specific the council takes going forward.

(Stéphane): Thanks Jonathan and yes, just to pick that up, from - and you see that page on the Adobe now. But just for the benefit of people who aren't

on Adobe, some suggested possibilities for the council to take action on this is whether we request an issue report as a prelude to a possible PDP or a mechanism that is quite - is an STI type mechanism.

For those of you who recall that was the Special Trademark Issues Group that was put together to deal with rights protection mechanisms within the new gTLD program. So those are two possibilities that are (unintelligible) out there by staff.

And it would be I think very helpful for us to try and narrow down what as a council we might like to do.

So let's continue the conversations. Zahid I believe you're now off mute.

Zahid Jamil: Yes I am. Thank you (Stéphane). Two points, one on to (Brian), we in the BC had suggested that the trademark clearinghouse watch notice or claim notice should be extended beyond the existing 31 day or 30 days as it exists right now with the understanding that if you can do it for the 30 days after launch you could possibly also do it beyond the 30 days. And it would make sense to extend that.

We haven't seen that on the sort of the very strengthening existing RPMs on Page 4 of the briefing paper. And so some of our members were disappointed.

And I was wondering whether staff had considered that aspect or that comment from the DC or not? That was my - that is my question.

And by way of sort of moving forward I think some kind of approach where the GNSO basically tries and addresses this maybe in an STI format or some others may be helpful.

But I also see that there is a suggestion for a public comment period which the staff briefing paper makes. So maybe we could have that public comment period and then follow that up with maybe the STI sort of thing. Yes, that's all I had today. Thanks.

(Stéphane): Thanks Zahid. (Brian) can I just turn to you for answers to Zahid's question if possible?

Brian Peck: Sure (no) and thank you Zahid for bringing that up. We did - I mean we - in this paper we kind of took a broader overview of some of the comments, you know, some of the broader general areas if you will, categorizing some of the comments in terms of suggestions that were raised in the last (level) comment period.

But we are aware of the particular BC proposal that you mentioned. And again, the purpose of the paper was trying to draw in, you know, kind of a broader overview of some of the directions or general responses to as I say, possible ways to address existing RPMs to improve them if you will that was drawn from the public comment period.

(Stéphane): Thanks (Brian). Just to make it clear there is a comment period planned for this paper?

Brian Peck: No there is - not that we're aware of. I mean there is - there has been plan that's - well no. The simple answer's no.

(Stéphane): And there's a suggestion that we have a comment period is that correct, that staff made? Or is it just a discussion item?

Brian Peck: Just a discussion item.

(Stéphane): Thank you. So Alan is next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. We seem to have an echo suddenly. I'll go ahead anyway. The paper was - is driven by a lot of comments and a lot of actions that have happened over the last couple of years in preparation for the new GTLDs and specifically was triggered by comments that were made to as was pointed out a few minutes ago a different comment period.

There was a comment period on defensive applications. Unfortunately the term defensive registrations was sometimes used in that context but defensive applications at the first level.

Some respondents took the opportunity to talk about second level defensive registrations. And that was at least in part what triggered this - the board request for this briefing paper.

I think we do need a comment period at this point. I think we need it specifically focused on second level defensive registrations in light of this paper and in particular to give an opportunity to those who believe we do not need additional mechanisms to speak up.

Since those who spoke up did so not in response to a particular question but just because they felt the time was right to do it, I think we need time for a balanced comment period on the entire issue so that if

we go ahead either with an issue report or an STI like effort or something we have input from all parts of the community and can then make some level of decision as to whether we need to go forward, if we need to go forward what form it should take.

I think at this point we have a rather unbalanced position because it's really being forced by those who do believe that additional rights are necessary. And I think we need a more balanced review from the community before we proceed. Thank you.

(Stéphane): Alan thank you. Just to add to the conversation Jeff has now had to drop off the call. He's asked me to convey a proposal which would be that we may want to request an issue report on this and include it with the protection of IGO's work that is currently going on so that this can have - this can be a single PDP done at - you know, all together rather than have three separate work streams going on concurrently.

And Jeff says that the STI approach as it was as it was seen during the new gTLD program felt a little bit too rushed and that the STI approach worked reasonably well because there was preparation there before that had been done by the IRT to feed into the STI.

But here we don't have that level of preparation. So those are two comments. And let's now turn to (David).

(David): Thanks (Stéphane). And I think I was just picking up on the PowerPoint presentation there where we've got its intent is to encourage community discussion regarding the existing RMPs and possible changes prior to the election of new gTLDs.

Then that's where I think - I think this, you know, it needs to be quick. And she's not going against what Jeff said there, it doesn't need to be rushed but it does obviously then need to be something which is quick.

So I think I'd certainly favor something like an STI type of procedure. It might be feasible and if it's an expert group.

But two additions on that I don't think it should be IPC led that's for now - without a doubt. But we should have and as Zahid mentioned that perhaps a comment period, a public comment period so we can get a good idea of what the concerns are and then if need be followed up with that.

But I mean an issues report is another obviously of doing this but it's going to take a little time. So I didn't know how close that is to do prior to delegation of new gTLDs. I (report) that's not going to happen.

(Stéphane): Thanks David. And there would be two avenues there that the council would need to explore. And issues report would be a motion so that would have to come in at the next meeting.

We could encourage a comment period be opened. And my understanding of that is that we don't necessarily need a motion for that. So unless I'm wrong please someone correct me. But that could be done perhaps a little quicker.

Let's turn to (Thomas).

Thomas Rickert: Thank you (Stéphane). Just to add what has already been said, what I observe now is that we have the IOC or CRC Discussion Group which was formerly the Drafting Team.

We have the PDP that was already mentioned. We have this briefing paper. We have an awful lot of open questions regarding the URS and implementation and possible changes to it.

And currently there is a quite vivid debate about the technical implementation of the trademark clearinghouse all of which have sort of the common denominators that the questions behind those efforts are are there enough protections? Are the proposed protections strong enough?

And finally do we need differentiation of target groups, maybe “ordinary trademark holders, IGOs or organizations that derive their protections from treaties such as the IOC and RCRC.”

So I think that the council would be well advised to sort of amalgamate those efforts or its responses into a single line of action.

I’m not sure whether requesting a public comment phase to the briefing paper would help us at this stage. I mean we would get a quick response. But at the same time it might be sort of repetitive to what we’re actually trying to achieve.

So I would like to hear more discussion about strategic options that we as a council have to address the issues that I just mentioned and the best quality and most expedient way. Thank you.

(Stéphane): Thanks (Thomas). (John)?

(John): Yes I want to agree with everything that's been said even though some of what's been said is counter to - some of the comments are contrary.

The thing - the context of the tools we have in our kit in order to both expedite and integrate that it may be that the issues report is really the only and best way for us to go.

We could instigate a public discussion using the briefing paper as the initiating documentation. But it strikes me that that doesn't get us the aggregation, the consolidation of all the issues that seem to be making a lot of sense to my ear this morning.

So and a public comment period is essentially just, you know, rearranging the process. I mean I realize that an issues report would require a motion which couldn't come until the next meeting. But maybe we could - and you could have an interim meeting.

Meeting we could draft that motion today and have our conference call in eight days just for that specific purpose and move things on quickly which would be additional interesting counterpoint.

But I do think that the consolidation of all the issues that (Thomas) has suggested, I do think that the speed that (David) has suggested, I do think that registration's at the second level are - those are essential to (unintelligible) recommended BC.

And anything we could do to consolidate and expedite would be well received I think.

(Stéphane): Thank you. Margie do you have something to tell us about the procedures that have been suggested?

Margie Milam: Yes. I wanted to clarify that there's no need for a motion for a public comment forum. So I think you're correct (Stéphane) on that point.

And then the other point I wanted to make is one of the things that staff we were thinking of doing is since we've got the IGO issue report open right now for public comment and we're in the process of finalizing it for, you know, to prepare the final issue report, you know, this issue could be wrapped up in that.

And I just wanted to get the council's viewpoints on whether, you know, that would be appropriate.

In other words, you know, the issue for the IGOs is second level and it shouldn't be looked at just at the (unintelligible) level, at the Red Cross level or at the broader level.

And that's what the final issue report, you know, could explore so that you don't have to go through the start of another issue report unless the council feels that they'd rather have the issue fully briefed on the broader issue of second level.

(Stéphane): Thank you (Margie). So we have a couple of more suggestions that just to summarize them, one that we might want to look at an expedited motion to open an issue report specifically on this with an interim meeting set just for that, another that we blend this work into

the ongoing work on the IGO Protection Issue Report and blend the comment periods there.

Let's continue the discussion then. I have (Brian) Zahid, Ching and Alan, Mary. And then let's close it off after Mary. (Brian)?

Brian Peck: Thank you (Stéphane). I just wanted to voice support I think for as well a public comment period wouldn't necessarily be a bad thing just to hear more from the community.

I'm not sure that I agree with what some of the previous people said. I think Alan mentioned that people - that the comments weren't necessarily balanced.

You know, I think people were expressing legitimate concerns and I think other people had the opportunity to voice comments. But I think it's always good to hear more.

But I do want to agree with (David) what he said previously. I think something like an STI type mechanisms might be extremely helpful. I think particularly when we're talking about the implementation issue that there seemed to be a growing laundry list of that seems to be an expeditious way to deal with those.

And then perhaps we want to also think about a PDP as well potentially to think about additions maybe rather than implementation issues to the second level protection particularly at the public comment period that (Kate) said that's something the community feels is needed.

(Stéphane): Thanks (Brian). Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: Thanks Stéphane. I got off mute quicker this time sorry. I was going to say that, you know, that there's two separate issues here.

There's the IOC RCRC which has a defensive a second level issue. But basically the entire basis of their claim in the sense if you will is that they are special, they have special rights.

And we being every time they speak and if you're going to deal their issue they're talking about (ex-anti) protection -- something that should just not have happened, not stuff that they have to go after using URS or, you know, trademark clearinghouse or other mechanisms.

Also as far as defensive registration as a subject is concerned I mean if I'm looking at the briefing paper the briefing paper clearly states right at the top in the background, now the issue is talking about trademarks.

It says and I readout from, you know, I read - let me read this into the record it says that the perception that they would need to submit defensive gLTD applications as a means to protect their trademarks and it goes on further to talk about second level protection.

Also and it's talking about trademark and rights holders of that nature. That's a very different sort of right.

Currently for instance in the URS the only right that is available is trademark rights. It's not the IOC RCRC so they're excluded from that process.

So maybe if you were going to conflate these two things it would create more confusion. And I think a more focused approach in the two different areas would be helpful. That's just my view.

I think and also if you open all of it together as a public comment period then, you know, when people are submitted the comments they need to be clear on exactly what issue they're submitting it.

And if we have the IOC RCRC and the issue of second level defensive registration put together then the trademark holders are saying what they have to say and IOC RCRC saying what they have to say I think it may cause some confusion.

So I'd be in favor of having, you know, not conflating these two, at least that's my thought.

A public comments period specifically on defensive registrations at the second level would be something that I would support and support for (Brian) and (David) said earlier as well. Thank you.

(Stéphane): Thank you. Margie is your hand still up?

Margie Milam: No sorry. Taking it down.

(Stéphane): Thank you. Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you (Stéphane). I would just like to make my point brief I guess. Other has made some points related to whether we should combine the effort between this one and the IGOs.

I mean my personal view is that we have - and I mean we have put together quite a number of resource I mean past few years on the right protection (unintelligible).

I'm just getting a sense if we add this to another (projio) we issue a report is that whether the community will just think that the rights protection mechanism has been in place but is not enough.

So we're actually as this group is adding another new layer for this protection mechanics. So I'm just worried that if this would never be enough for another layer of mechanics.

And speaking as a registry I think the community and especially the industry, we have used this term defensive registration since we have new gTLD in 2000, 2004 I mean for this round.

So this has been used widely in this business. So I'm just I'm trying to make it clear I mean just maybe others can help make a clarification on what exactly that in this potential issue report, I mean the meaning and the definition of the defensive - I mean the defensive registration if it is not about the summarized process of each gTLD in the past or in the future and what can it do to, you know, to really guarantee the rights for I mean the (unintelligible) owners. I just like to put them on the records. Thank you.

(Stéphane): Thank you Ching. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. Three quick points, first of all a clarification of when I said of the current comments we have are not balanced it was because those were made in response to a question that wasn't asked.

And therefore some people chose to answer a question that was unrelated really to the question that was asked in the comment period on top level defensive applications.

And I think if we're going to take those comments into account we really have to do it in a more balanced form. So that was the reason I suggested that.

I'll point out that at this point the URS one of the - and I'll try to use the terms that we that'll be used about it.

One of the critical defense mechanisms that is supposed to be making the new gTLDs palatable is un-implementable. And we have not even heard a plan from staff as to what process they're going to use to try to make it implementable or replace it.

I don't know why there is that long delay but we - but I don't see how any group can start deliberations on other protections when we don't even know right now if the URS which was considered a cornerstone of the current protections is going to exist or not or in what form.

So I think that's something that we need as input before we can go forward.

And terms of how we go forward I think we really need to understand what kind of additional protections people are looking for at what level to focus the argument, the discussion.

So I really think we need more input. It is not clear to me and I would like to ask staff how an issue report on this subject would differ substantially from this briefing paper?

I know it would have some - some components that are required by bylaw for an issue report in terms of recommendations and statement about scope.

But really would it be considering different content or is it just going to be a rehash of this document adding the structural pieces? Thank you.

(Stéphane): Thank you Alan. And we'll finish with Mary as suggested earlier on.

Mary Wong: Thanks Stephan. So without repeating what others have said in the interest of time particularly (Thomas) and just now Alan, I guess there's a couple of things.

First of all the point that this may or may not be a big issue and not going into that but it has come about because of comments that were made in respect of a different comment period.

I would be wary of doing a number of the things that have been suggested. Specifically opening a public comment period on this I think it's not a good idea.

Secondly having some kind of expedited motions at a special meeting to consider it I think sends the wrong message to the community as to the prioritization of this item or other work items.

So to the extent that this is an issue that we want to pursue in the next I don't know, six months or a year then I don't think we're left with that many options.

Margie's idea of combining the final issue report I think has some merit in part because - and I (somewhere) as Zahid was saying about the different basis upon which the IOC NRC and then the IGOs are basing their arguments for special protection versus the general trademark issue.

But there is significant overlap for one thing. For example the IGOs are basing at least part of their argument on an IT basis, the article 6 general (preparers) convention.

So first of all substantively I think there is some overlap among at least some of the second level issues we're dealing with.

And secondly in terms of workload management as well is just having things not slip through the cracks or be duplicative it seems to make sense to go for some kind of an amalgamated or consolidated approach.

What that might be I'm not sure. I think Margie's idea has some merit. But I do want to push for some kind of consolidation instead of us really what we're doing now is having three or four separate tracks.

We've got the IOC RCRC Drafting Team discussions. We've got things to do when you come to the IGO issue.

We've got specific questions about the URS. And finally now we have this issue and I just don't think having them at separate tracks is a good way to go. Thanks.

(Stéphane): Thanks Mary. We'll close off the discussion there. We've had 40 minutes on this item already. We have several options that have been on the table including a simple comment period, including blending the IGO work with this track including requesting an issue report.

These will be shown in the minutes of this meeting and I would encourage counselors to continue this conversation on the list to try and determine some next steps which we have unfortunately failed to do with any clarity today.

And having said that we will then move back to the standard agenda as previously planned and go back to our previous Item 3 which is just a very quick look at the election procedure that I have pushed to the list as a proposed procedure for the upcoming leadership elections.

This was already discussed in Prague. This is a mildly updated version of what was already discussed by the council in Prague just to add a bit more detail as required.

But the procedure itself hasn't changed. So we are looking to ask for nominations for or submissions of nominees from each house chose for the position of council chair no later than September 26.

And nominees would be required to accept their candidacy and submit a candidacy statement in writing to the secretariat by September the 28th. We would - this is for the house sorry, for the chair elections only.

We would then look to organize a meeting with the council members in a kind of question and answer session with the councilmember's during one of the Toronto working sessions.

We would then call for voting to take place during the open council meeting in Toronto at the AGM. (Unintelligible) that would be on October 17.

We would follow the procedure that was followed last year. We would have the council meeting with the current council and that would be completed.

We would then ask for the new council to be seated. We would have a meeting with only one agenda item on that new council's meeting and that would be the chair election.

That meeting would still continue to be run by me as current share, my term being up at the end of the AGM.

So the new chair if elected would take office immediately after the AGM and would therefore lead the first (ever) conference that the council has after the Toronto AGM.

And as a reminder as far as the vice chairs are concerned each house is able to follow its own procedure and determine for itself how it wants to elect nominate or whatever it wants to do for the vice chairs.

So the procedure that we are looking at is only for the election of the chair. Any questions or comments? Zahid? Off mute Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: I'm here sorry. This is - I'm getting trouble with something. (Stéphane)  
yes just a quick question. We were discussing this in our CE call.

And what we couldn't actually basically sort of get more information on  
is what would be the status of NCA voting in the election process?

Do they get a vote? Do they not get a vote? What happened next time  
and how do we expect that to work itself out in the next - in this  
election?

(Stéphane): Yes thanks for that question. So we are suggesting that the new  
council vote. This means that the new see the newly seated NCAs  
would be the ones that would be called a vote.

As you know we have three NCAs, noncom appointees two of which  
have a vote and one does not. And we refer to that NCA as the  
homeless NCA so each of the two voting MCAs are assigned to one of  
the two council houses.

That's choice a determination is made by the MCA's and each house.  
And it is our hope that that work would be completed by the time we  
come to the AGM. This was the case last year. It was the case the  
previous year.

And so we do not anticipate any need to change that for this year's  
procedure. Does that answer your question?

I'll take that silence as agreement. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thanks. Thank you. My recollection is that due to an issue raised regarding the selection of the MCAs that last year the noncoms said that it would designate where each NCA goes. And I presume that was going to be continued.

(Stéphane): You are absolutely right Alan and thanks for putting me straight on that. We have not heard from the noncom in this regard since that procedure last year.

So I cannot confirm to you at this time that it is their intent to dictate where the NCA would go.

But you are absolutely right at this point was made last year and an issue was raised and the noncoms said it would assign itself the MCAs in which case...

Alan Greenberg: Yes I was going to say it may be good to check with the current chair whether this NCA plans to assign all three or just the ones that they're appointing or whatever their plan is just so we know ahead of time what we have to do.

(Stéphane): (Unintelligible) assign all three. And I will ask Glen to make a note of this as an action item for me to contact the current noncom chair and ask or get confirmation that that remains the plan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

(Stéphane): Thank you Alan for that useful comment.

Any further comments on this? Hearing or seeing none can I call for anyone who would object to this procedure?

If no objections are voiced then we will consider that this procedure is approved and we will operate the voting according to this procedure. Does anyone object to this procedure?

Thank you very much. So we will carry out the elections in this manner and move to Item 4. And this item has been put on the agenda because we now have an agreed - a renewed sorry, .com agreement.

And there is a link in the agenda there so that you can go to the board resolution that indicates renewal of the .com agreement between ICANN and the .com operator.

This being the case you will recall that there was a request to hold off on the Whois policy development process work on the thick Whois sorry, PDP until such a time as that agreement had been concluded.

This having being done the question is now I asked should we move forward on this work before the previously agreed upon date of November for starting it so that we don't waste time on this work?

In order to introduce of this topic we have asked Marika Konings from ICANN staff to provide us with a quick update. Marika is this something you can do?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Hello everyone. I think (Stéphane) actually you said most of it but just to refresh people's mind on where this PDP stands.

This is actually an issue where the council requested an issue report back in September of last year. Staff prepared a preliminary issue report and then a final issue report which was published in February.

And then as a result of that the council actually initiated a PDP on this topic at its meeting in 14th of March and I think I believe that was in Costa Rica.

However then at the wrap up session following that where we started discussing okay so now the PDP has been initiated and the normal next step is then to form a drafting team that would develop a charter, you know, following which the council normally then adopts a charter and the working group kicks off and then starts its work on the issue.

Some suggested that, you know, at this point in time it might be appropriate to wait a little bit with a next step and then see what the outcome was going to be of the .com negotiations as they were also discussions whether the issue might get addressed as part of that.

So however now that the .com agreement has been concluded or the renewal has concluded and it's clear that (stakeholders) are now going to be addressed as part of that. The question is indeed does council still want to wait until after 30th of November 2 restart the PDP or does it make sense to continue now?

And indeed the next step would be to draft up a call for volunteers to form a drafting team to develop a charter for the PDP Working Group.

(Stéphane): Thanks Marika. Just to clarify would a motion be needed to restart that work do you think?

Marika Konings: This is Marika, in my view no. I think what we did do a motion on delaying it but I think if, you know, if there would be a agreement here on the call that people want to start now I think it's probably something we can just record in the minutes that the council decided not to wait until that day but actually start now as the PDP was already initiated. It's more a question of the timing.

(Stéphane): Thank you. (Jonathan)?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Stéphane). I think it's just important to remind myself and hopefully my colleagues as well but I think the reasons for the delay were not solely if not - and arguably not principally associated with the .com agreement.

I think - and the negotiations was taking place. I mean I think there were a couple of other factors that were under consideration at the time.

And from my recollection they were the following really. There was lots of work going on in a variety of different Whois topics.

There was certainly a concern over the overall workload therefore in these various parallel tracks.

There was some discussion about the fact that this was a piece of work that didn't affect all of the registries but really was targeted on and affected one particular registry operator or registry.

So I think although, you know, we've just been introducing this topic we focus on the fact that there was of course the background work going on in the .com agreement so that this may also have produced an outcome on thick Whois.

It wasn't the only factor we were considering. So in discussing it I just urge that we bear in mind those other factors as well. Thanks.

(Stéphane): Thanks (Jonathan). I also feel that it's important to clarify although I believe that everything you've said is absolutely right, there is - the process has been initiated, i.e. there was a vote. There was a decision to initiate this work.

If you recall when we decided to delay there was actually concern voiced that we were setting a precedence for not doing a PDP when it's been voted upon.

So I think we also have to look at the other side of the issue that you're raising and tread carefully because we do have a positive vote to initiate a PDP.

And I don't think that either the work load, the single registry operator being impacted by this or the other Whois work at this stage can be good reasons for delaying a PDP that the council has agreed it wants to initiate.

But that's a personal view. Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: Hi, thank you. I just wanted to share the views of BC. We discussed this earlier and we've - it's our view that we would like this PDP to

move forward amongst other things of course because of the recent contract of .com. And it should apply across the board.

I understand why maybe this wasn't part of the .com agreement. But and so it makes more sense now they should be a PDP that should apply to everybody.

I understand it's, you know, at the moment there were only a few that it doesn't apply to but nonetheless I think we should move forward.

And we have two volunteers who already want to be part of the charter drafting team. One would be (Lisa Cooper) and another (Susan Callgucci) who was a part of the Whois Review Team. So we would like to see this move forward.

(Stéphane): Thank you Zahid. (David)?

(David): Thanks (Stéphane). I couldn't have prepared it and I haven't spoken to Zahid beforehand at all on this but we'd certainly support it in IPC.

We've discussed it as well in IPC certainly the formation of a Whois PDP drafting team. And just like Zahid and rather spookily we got two volunteers. One is (Jonathan Zurk) and the other one is (Steve Mechilitz). So I'm echoing and Zahid perfectly there and it wasn't planned.

(Stéphane): Thank you. Any further comments? In which case I will call for does anyone disagree with the re-launch of this PDP immediately?

Now we have to take into account the fact that some people aren't on the call. There are - our rules do state that if we are voting for something we only allow absentee voting in certain cases.

I would suggest that we apply similar rules to this instance even though as Marika told us earlier on what we're doing here is simply dealing with an issue of time.

We're not dealing with the PDP itself. That as I said earlier on has been voted on. So I do want to make the point that I've called for a disapproval mindful of the fact that some counselors aren't on the call today.

But also I'm mindful of the fact that in my view this decision does not require any type of absentee voting possibility because we are just dealing with a timing issue.

If anyone violently disagrees with that assessment please speak up?  
(David)?

(David): Sorry I hadn't put my hand down. I'll put it down.

(Stéphane): Okay hearing none no disagreement to either restarting the PDP or doing it in this way we will reinitiate the PDP.

We will move on to Item 5 and look at the Whois Review Team Final Report. You will I hope, all remember that we had - we briefly touched on this in January, the Prague wrap up because there's a board resolution asking us for a response by August the 31st which is extremely short time-wise for input to this final report.

So we are asking the question of how the council should respond to this or how does the council want to respond to this?

In order to introduce this topic we have asked Margie Milam to provide us with a quick update. So Margie over to you please.

Margie Milam: Yes thank you (Stéphane). You pretty much covered - I did not intend to go give you an overview of the report.

What I did do on this slide that you see in the Adobe Connect Room is just show you so you can see, refresh your memory on what the Whois Review Team recommendations are.

But really this is more of a process issue for the council to decide what the next steps are in light of board resolution asking for input from the various SOs and ACs by August 31.

And so that's really the, you know, the point for - to kick off the discussion.

(Stéphane): Thank you Margie. So can I open this up for discussion please? Ask if there are any comments or suggestions on what next steps we could take care?

It looks like Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks and just so as NCSG has stated we feel strongly that these are policy issues and so much as the council loves doing work on Whois I

think we need to go through policy development if any of these things are to be implemented.

(Stéphane): That doesn't really help us answer the board by the 31st of August except to say unless I've misunderstood your suggestion would your suggestion be that we respond with the notion that we'd look at doing some policy development work on this?

Wendy Seltzer: Yes that we can't as a council say yes go ahead but rather that the way for us to respond is to take this is a policy development matter.

(Stéphane): Thank you. Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: Yes I was just again, this is something we discussed on our BC call earlier.

And the way that the Whois Review team is put is it's not sort of subject to in it's - in a sense the GNSO, per se. It's a mandated review under the AoC and the board has to take that on board and then decide whether it wants to implement it or not.

If it feeds back in -- and let's remember that the Whois Review team has, you know, a public comment period. They went to everybody. They went to the GNSO and even the constituency -- the (unintelligible) stakeholder groups.

So this is sort of a final report that we have here where I think the expectation of the Whois Review team under the AoC was that it would be implemented. And I think that's one of the views we got, at least from one of the members who was on the Whois Review team, that

there is disappointment within the Review team that this would have been something that would have been implemented.

And the - and the discussion should be around that as opposed to saying, "Well, I guess we need to start a PDP and do the whole thing again of it's respect to policy issues." I mean - but that was a - that was just a - sort of the thoughts and responses.

On moving forward I think it - I, you know I'd like to hear from Margie, who just made a presentation, and see is it possible to - for us to sort of filter some of these things and say, "Well, which are the ones that definitely need a PDP? Which are the ones that can be dealt with in implementation mechanisms?"

And, you know, and that's where we can respond much more - with much more agility to the board's request. And if there are some things that definitely are part of PDP -- well, you know, we can think about it.

But saying that the whole package -- whatever the Whois Review team has proposed -- it should go into APDP or should be PDP's -- tends to be sort of something I think a lot of people may be disappointed with and it may not help the board move forward.

So, you know, these are the thoughts that we had. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Zahid.

And as a practical issue then, it may be useful to suggest that we write some kind of response - written response to the board by August the 31st. Now in order to do that, we could try and do what we normally do,

which is to ask someone or to volunteer to do an initial draft and then discuss it on the list.

We do have the time to do that. So that would be my suggestion, just listening to both you and Wendy that we might just look at at least responding with a letter to the board, you know, rather than running the risk of not responding at all within the deadline that's been set.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

I think the (unintelligible) is on the board to identify which issues are policy and which issues it believes it does not need policy advice on. Certainly some of the issues are about as far from GNSO responsibility as one could imagine.

I don't think it's within our mandate to decide where compliance reports to in the staff organization of ICANN, and there are other things like that. So to say the whole setup of policy recommendations are GNSO policy, I think, is a laughable matter.

Now it is not unreasonable for us to -- in a letter to the board or in a comment to the board -- identify the things that we believe do require a policy that is advising the board that we think they should not act on certain issues because they're very much policy, and that we certainly could do by that period of time.

Ultimately it's a board decision what it - what it needs policy advice on or what it doesn't. But we should certainly input into that process if we

believe strongly that some of the issues do require PDP deliberations -  
- whether it's a PDP or some other process.

Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Alan.

(Brian)?

(Brian): Thanks, (unintelligible).

I just wanted to agree with what Alan just said and also what Zahid said earlier -- that I think it definitely would be a mistake to blanket these all under the category of policy development and that we should parse them out and look more carefully at the - at the list.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, (Brian).

So if there's no further discussion, may I suggest that someone volunteer for an initial draft or to try and drive us into the direction of the response that we'd like to provide to the board?

If there are any volunteers, please make yourselves known now or on the list later.

(Thomas)?

(Thomas): Yes.

I just have a question. I mean it makes perfect sense to find out which of the topics are actually requiring GNSO policy work. But at the same time how is the link to or how does this oppose to the current RAA negotiations, which also touch upon some of these issues?

Stephane Van Gelder: And you're asking that question of who?

(Thomas): Well if you would volunteer to answer, I'd gladly take an answer from you.

Stephane Van Gelder: I'm -- no, I'm afraid not.

That's not my role. But unless Margie wants to answer, we'll just write the question down and try and get you an answer.

Margie Milam: I think...

(Thomas): Because I think in order to give a - give a full answer to the board, we would know how this interrelates.

Stephane Van Gelder: Margie?

Margie Milam: Stephane, it's me.

I mean, it's - as staff we're taking the position that we've been asked to look at them as well, but we haven't formally gone through each issue to identify which one's appropriate for PDP versus not. And so that is some work that's being done on the staff side to kind of assess them.

But the point that you raised, (Thomas), is, you know, there's different ways of doing this. You could do it through a PDP -- and there's - certainly a lot of this is appropriate for a PDP versus through contract negotiations, and a lot of this - several aspects isn't - is part of the negotiations.

So there's just multiple tracks of being able to do this. And then really for the council the question is, you know, "What kind of track do you guys prefer?" And that's the - hopefully what the Drafting team could, you know, kind of sort out on the types of, you know, things that the council would like to, you know, initiate a issue report and start a process on.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Margie.

Any further comments or question? I know that (Brian) has volunteered on the chat to draft a letter for which I express my thanks. Any further comments? In which case, hearing none, we will move on to item seven, which deals with the face renewal notices work that has been going on.

This was an item that we'd initially planned for our Prague meeting, but ran out of time before we were able to get to this item in Prague. So once again, apologies to Mikey who as on hand there to provide a report.

And thanks to Mikey for being on hand once again in this meeting to provide an update presentation of the updated fake renewals notices report that this group has produced.

Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Stephane. This is Mikey O'Connor, for the record.

And on your screen is actually the red line version of the report. We had a little conversation before the meeting about what the best way to do this was, and it seems to me that the way to zero you in on this is to just look at this very short report.

If you're in my circumstance I'd recommend zooming in a little bit, because it's pretty small type. But if you go to page three on the Adobe Connect gizmo at the bottom, that gives you the background.

This is a very narrowly chartered, very narrowly scoped drafting group. It's not chartered to do much except go to the registrars and ask the registrars what the situation is with regard to fake renewal notices.

Basically, we were chartered to go out, build a survey and summarize that survey, which we did. We got a little outside of our brief by also coming up with a list of ideas about how to proceed, and those are coming in a minute.

When we came back to you the last time -- I think in Costa Rica -- the request from the council was, "Why don't we go out for public comment just to find out what the community's reaction was to that?"

And so in the middle of that page you can see the first real substantive change to this, which is that we did. And as a result of those comments we've updated this report, so I just very quickly want to take you through the updates.

Primarily where they fall -- let me just scroll down and I'll give you a page number. There's a - there's a long description of the survey, and really the first substantive change comes on page 20 -- let's start on page 23.

So if you just roll with the little buttons on the bottom of your screen until you're to page 23, what you should be seeing is something that starts off with our first recommendation, which is to add a section to the RAA that addresses business practices.

And that recommendation did not change. That's the one that is completely outside of its scope -- completely un-chartered activity of the Drafting team -- came up with as our suggestion.

And you have to remember that this was presented to you as just that. We were not really chartered to make this series of suggestions -- we just did because we were so far into it. And so you are completely welcome to ignore everything from this part of the report on.

If you go to the next page -- page 24 -- you start to see that our first recommendation was just make a change to the RAA period. And that's the one we like the best.

On the next page begins a series of ideas that we'd think are fine but we don't like as much, mostly because they involve PDPs and it was at least the view of this Drafting group that this is such a narrow issue that PDP may not be warranted.

But starting on page 24 is the first of a whole series of suggestions of where you could put this on a PDP. The first two -- add this to one of the IRTP PDPs or add it to an upcoming PDP on the RAA if there is one -- we aren't sure. This was written quite some time ago, so it may be that that issue has changed.

The next one was - is in blue. It's at the bottom of page 25. And this is the first change due to public comments. We added this as an option that if the Whois PDP structure supported it, this might be a place to put this topic, because this does have a lot to do with, in many cases, Whois abuse. So that would be an option for you.

We as a Drafting team, remember, are lukewarm to these ideas. We don't oppose them. We put these in our lukewarm category.

The next one on page 26 is to come up with a very narrowly focused PDP on fake renewal notices itself. In the pro section of this, one thing to point out to you is that this might be an opportunity to do a fast track PDP if you all wanted to do a pilot project - pilot PDP that was a fast one.

Because this is such a narrow issue, this might be one to try that out. And there's one for you to think about.

We then didn't make any changes until page 28, where what we had on page 28 was our view that we didn't, you know, we basically moved that one higher in the - in the stack.

And that concludes our little summary. We - at - then at the very end we have the public comments we got, which are summarized. And

you'll note that there are some substantive comments in these public comments that have to do with the content of the policy issue.

And we did not include those in this report, because we were not chartered to do policy work. We were chartered to do a survey and then we got a little bit off the reservation and came up with some ideas on how to proceed.

But we were very uncomfortable as a Drafting team addressing policy issues, because we really weren't chartered to do that. So that's kind of the story in a nutshell.

The original question was, "Is there smoke, or is there fire?" We stand by our conclusion that there is an issue here that needs to be addressed in some way. We still think that the preferred approach would be to simply change the RAA to handle that, but we've provided you a bunch of options as to other ways to proceed.

And Stephane -- with that, I'll let you run the meeting. And if there are questions, I'm happy to answer them. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Mikey, thanks very much.

Can I call for comments or questions at this time, please? And as a reminder, this is another item where we are looking for ways forwards rather than just discussion. Thank you.

(Alan)?

(Alan): Thank you.

I'd like to speak to the notion of a fast track PDP. The recommendation number one, which is the recommended one, implies this solution is simple enough that a few people in a room can come up with wording to insert in the - in the RAA and that it would be generally acceptable to all.

If that is indeed the case, then the concept of the fast tract PDP we've talked about -- this fits the bill exactly. That is, there is not a lot of controversy, we know what the answer is or can come up with the answer quickly.

I think it would - it would do a number of things. It would demonstrate to the community that the GNSO can act quickly. And right now, that is not the impression the community has about the GNSO.

It would put in place a fix to this problem which would not wait five years for the bad actors to be forced to sign the new RAA. And those are the people likely impacted -- the ones who are not going to staff - step up right away and sign.

So it would solve the problem, it would address it in a way that's acceptable, it would demonstrate to the community that we indeed act quickly, and I think it is the way to go.

Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you, (Alan).

Any further comments or questions?

Mason Cole:       Stephane, it's Mason.

Zahid Jamil:       This is Zahid. I'm having trouble in the room.

Can I get in the queue?

Stephane Van Gelder:     Zahid, please go ahead.

Zahid Jamil:       Hi.

It's smarter to say yes. I - first of all, Mikey, thank you for the hard work on this. We know that you had to sort of be deferred from the last call, so we thank you for your patience and being available today to brief us.

Also what I wanted to say was I agreed with (Alan). You know, it seems like something that can be - I don't think every type of fake renewal notice can be resolved by maybe the RAA, but I think most of them can with respect to resellers and others.

And that - and that language can I hope be drafted quickly, so I would also support a possible fast track as an option. But I just wanted to know whether this is something that staff is considering at the moment in the negotiations?

Maybe if some, you know, I don't know if Margie's still on the call. And if she is, is this something is being considered in the negotiations with the registrars at the moment, or not?

Margie Milam: Yes.

Stephane Van Gelder: Margie, is that something you can answer?

Margie Milam: Yes, I certainly can.

I mean, you've seen the documents that have been published on both sides regarding the - where we are on the draft. This is not being actively negotiated.

So if you want to be included in the negotiations, you know, that - you might want to think about how to do that.

Zahid Jamil: Yes.

Mason Cole: Stephane, it's Mason.

Stephane Van Gelder: Mason, please go ahead.

Mason Cole: I agree with (Alan).

I think this would be - this would be a candidate for a fast track PDP. I - one of my questions is whether or not the council has fast track PDP mechanism available to it. I don't understand that they do.

So, you know, if there is one, perhaps we could put it to use. I don't - I don't disagree with that. I agree that, you know, look, we all - we all know who we're talking about here in terms of the bad actor.

There is one particular bad reseller and I think - I think Mikey and his team successfully identified that fact. What I might offer to the council is to confer with the registrars and see if they're, you know, figure out what the fastest method of dealing with this is and then come back and offer that for the council.

I'll be glad to do that on the registrar's behalf, if that's acceptable to the council.

Stephane Van Gelder:     Mason, thanks very much.

I think that's a very positive suggestion, although I shouldn't possibly - probably I shouldn't comment at all. But I will say that the notion of a fast track PDP is something that we've discussed several times.

But you are right, there's no mechanism available to us right now to do a fast track PDP rather than apart from just agreeing to do it fast. But there's no specific notion of fast track PDPs in our bylaws at the moment.

(Alan)?

(Alan):     Yes.

No, I was going to say that there is - the PDP group explicitly did not come up with a fast track. However, we do know how to streamline what we have. And I think at the same time, this group could identify potential bylaw changes that would create a fast track in the future.

But, you know, it could be done in well under nine months, should we choose to. We do have that ability with today's PDP -- and probably identify a way to - way to cut a few more months off of it, given the nature of this type of problem.

So this one would not be as fast as it possibly could be in the future, but I think we have to go through the exercise at least once to know how to draft rules for how to do it even better in the future.

Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, (Alan).

It does seem that Mason's suggestion to confer with the registrars and see what possible options the registrars can suggest is possibly the most useful one available to this at this early stage before moving on to anything else.

So I'd be interested to get an idea from people speaking on what their thoughts are on that. Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: Hi.

I think - I think that's an excellent suggestion for - on behalf of Mason. And, you know, the sooner we can get that the better it would be, because if - for instance, if it's not that, it would have to go straight into the negotiation with the - for the RAA, then we need to know this early enough so that it, you know, we have that option.

Otherwise, if it gets delayed, then it might not be available as an option. Then, we have to sort of look at a PDP or something else. So I think this is an excellent way forward.

So I just wanted to say I agree with what Mason said and I hope it comes back soon. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Zahid.

(Thomas)?

(Thomas): Thank you, Stephane.

Talking about fake renewal notices, I was reminded of an article that was I think posted yesterday by Thomas Roessler on CircleID, as well as on his personal blog.

And if this is a - this is an easy topic for the council to deal with, we might jump on his idea and talk about Whois' data reminder policy as well. If - in his short article -- which is very worthwhile reading -- he says that he was part of the group at the time that installed the ICANN Whois data reminder policy and he recommends that ICANN should get rid of it as quickly as possible because it opens room for vulnerabilities.

You know, you simply just need to send terribly inaccurate Whois data to the registrant and ask him to use a link to have that data rectified and thereby phish the person's data. So that's just one aspect.

And yes, I know that it's a little bit off topic now, but, you know, when we need to discuss this very subject in a very quick PDP possibly, maybe we want to take care of the other issue as well in order to eliminate one of the vulnerabilities.

Mason Cole:     Stephane...

Stephane Van Gelder:     Thanks.

Mason Cole:     Mason again.

Stephane Van Gelder:     Thanks, (Thomas). I think that's very useful.

I have Mikey next. And Mason, was that you again?

Mason Cole:     Yes, please.

Stephane Van Gelder:     Yes.

So Mikey next -- then Mason.

Mikey O'Connor: Mason, do you want to go ahead?

Are you responding to (Thomas)?

Mason Cole:     I am, in fact.

Do you mind, Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: No, that's fine.

Go ahead.

Mason Cole: Thank you. Mason speaking again.

(Thomas), you make a - you make an outstanding point. That is an issue of vulnerability. I think that there would be significant members of the community that would disagree with that -- not disagree with the fact that it's a vulnerability, but would disagree with the idea that you should get rid of Whois reminders.

I think I respectfully say to the council that what we should do is focus in this instance on finding an expeditious way without over-blanketing the community to deal with one particularly known bad actor and not, you know, not deal with the situation in a way that, you know, sort of over-solves the problem when, you know, when really all we need -- we need a surgical knife here.

We don't need a big blanket solution. And that's the - that's the gist of my offer to speak with the registrars about how to deal with this in the quickest way.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Mason.

Mikey next. I put myself in the queue after Mikey's speaking as a registrar, please. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again.

Just to build a little bit on what Mason said earlier, that's one of the reasons that the Drafting team was lukewarm about all of the piece key processes, is that this is a very narrow topic and the PDP is a pretty blunt instrument to hit this topic with.

I want to build a little bit and say having just gone through two years of the DSSA where we were chartered to fly an airplane that we had to build while we were flying it, please - if you're going to launch a fast track PDP, build the process before you launch it.

The concern that I've got about taking the current PDP process and sort of taking nips and tucks out of it is that the process itself of taking - of changing all that may take longer than a regular PDP to do.

And so I just - as a member of the Drafting team, I'm sure that the rest of the Drafting team would come in behind me in supporting this - the offer that Mason's made as a much more constructive approach to this particular one.

But if you decide to do a PDP, please don't burden the group that works on this PDP with the process of developing the fast track process. That would be overwhelming.

Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Mikey.

So I had myself in the queue next. Just wanted to add to the comments made on the Whois data reminders. This has been discussed before and I believe -- although my may - memory fails me -- it's been

discussed at council level when we've discussed certain types of Whois work that we have going on.

And I did indicate then as I do now as a registrar that there is feeling that the current system of Whois data reminders is flawed. I think Mason is right in pointing out that there's no agreement on stopping the system or canceling it outright.

However, it certainly is one that causes registrar customers issues because some of them get a very high volume of Emails sent and it does open up certain vulnerabilities, as (Thomas) suggested earlier on.

So I think even though it is slightly off topic, it may not be that much off topic and it is something that we should have in the record as a worry for at least some registrars -- certainly the one that I represent.

(Alan), you are next and possibly last on this topic.

(Alan): Yes.

Just in response to Mikey, I was not advocating at all that this - that a PDP group be chartered to answer this question and develop a new process. I was suggesting that that group would use the existing process as documented, which I think is the only way a PDP group could work, and nevertheless taking as fast a path as it - through it as possible within the rules, and perhaps as an extra output, identify some change to the - some ways it could be changed in the future.

Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, (Alan).

Thanks to all for this discussion. Thanks to Mason for proposing a way forward on this. So Mason please move ahead with your proposed way forward of consulting with the registrars and coming back to the council as soon as possible, I guess, with proposals for options, or solutions, or next steps on this issue.

And...

Mason Cole: I will.

Stephane Van Gelder: ...let's move to item eight and the Internationalized Registration Data working group final report.

On this...

Man: (unintelligible)

Stephane Van Gelder: ...we have asked Julie Hedlund from ICANN staff to provide us with an update before once again moving into discussions of our possible next steps on this issue.

So Julie, if I can ask you to do that now, please.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Thank you, Stephane. This is Julie Hedlund, for the transcript. And I will refer to the slides that you see in the Adobe Connect room. And

just to remind all of us, the Internationalized Registration Data working group produced a final report, which contained four recommendations.

And just to move through them briefly here, they recommended that there be the development of a data model for domain name registration data.

And you may recall that the SSAC gave a presentation in Prague on SAC 54, which is a report on a suggested domain name registration data model. And so that relates specifically to that recommendation.

In addition, there is a recommendation for joint SSAC/GNSO work for the SSAC and the council to request a common issue report on translation and transliteration of contact information.

And the third recommendation is on protocol development -- that staff and the community would identify a domain name registration data access protocol that meets the needs of internationalization.

Moving to the next slide.

Then, there is a fourth recommendation that ICANN would take appropriate steps to require gTLD registries and registrars and persuade ccTLD registries and registrars to support the following standards.

And these are standards that are already in use in many cases and available now -- that is, for domain names both A-Label -- pardon me -- A-Label and U-Label, telephone and fax standards referring to IT, UT standards and email standards and then registration status, EPP

status, where applicable, date and time standards, et cetera. And there's, of course, more detail in the report with respect to what those exact standards are.

But I'll move quickly to next steps, because I think that is where most of the discussion lies. As you may recall on June 27 at the Council meeting in Prague, the Council passed the motion that approved the delivery to the Board of the IRD Working Group's final report. That motion also requested staff to draft a joint letter from the GNSO and SSAC to the Board to go along with the report to the Board and also agreed to review the report's recommendations and advise the Board with regard to policy implications.

I did send a draft letter for - to you, (Stéphane), to Patrick Falstrom jointly late yesterday for your consideration, you know, for the GNSO Council's consideration and for the SSAC's consideration, as requested and, of course, stand ready to assist with any changes to that document.

And finally, just to note, because we were discussing it here today, as you know the Board requested of all the SOs and ACs to provide comments to them by the 31st of August on the Whois Review Team final report. The SSAC is preparing comments, and that Whois Review Team final report specifically endorsed the IRD Working Group report's recommendations and the SSAC in its comments will plan to reinforce those recommendations in its comments to the board.

And I stand ready to answer any questions that you may have.

(Stéphane): Thanks very much, Julie. So let's open this up for discussion. (Alan).

(Alan): I'm sorry. My hand's up from before.

(Stéphane): Okay, sorry. Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: Hi there, yes. Thanks, (Stéphane). Zahid here. I just wondered would this be - would it be helpful for the Council to similarly as others have done, endorse the sport and send it in a letter to the Board? Or do we need a motion? What do you think, Julie, is a good way forward with this?

Julie: I think it's up to the Council to decide. Certainly the Council could make a motion to endorse the recommendations in the report. That is an approach if there is agreement on it.

(Stéphane): Can I just ask, as we have already approved delivery of the final report, does that not count as - I mean has that been perceived as - sorry - rather than what I was about to say - has that been perceived by the Board - do you know, Julie - as approval of those recommendations or simply what I understand it to be, which was that we agreed to have the report sent to the Board but not to approve any specific recommendations within that report?

Julie: I don't know what - if there's a particular perception in the Board with respect to this motion. I think that the motion did try to separate out the fact that there are recommendations that may have policy implications, particularly the issue of transliteration and translation of contact information and that there could be additional discussion and advice with respect to how to address those recommendations.

So I would say that if the Board were to receive the letter and the letter does note that the SSAC has approved the report, there could be a perception that delivery of the report could constitute endorsement of the recommendations therein. And if that's not the intent of the Council, it may be necessary to make that clear in the (unintelligible).

(Stéphane): Thanks. Ching.

Ching Chiao: Yes, thank you (Stéphane), and just like to add perhaps some clear (unintelligible). If you and other counselors may recall in our last meeting, Toronto, and the meeting before that was that we are considering on this report. We know this work has been in - I mean in (unintelligible) for sometimes and we like to make sure that this report mention various reasons, including the new gTLD process.

So we as a Council, we would like to make sure that we are working with SSAC in a timely fashion, then we deliver this report with the reservation if say that because in the report there are several recommendation as to - Julie pointed out, and we are expecting the staff working with SSAC to develop let's say, for example, in the Recommendation 1 in IRD.

So if I recall correctly, on Recommendation 3, the staff now should be working with the guidance - under the guidance with SSAC on developing several data models for the community to consider how to actually implement the IRD - I mean the recommendations.

So I would say that at this point is that we deliver the reports with the Board, but the actual work needs to be initiated on - with the instruction from the Board. The staff will have to initiate it - that work on the

recommendation. And then if there are - there is to be policy implication, then the GNSO Council will have to reconsider whether there should be initial report or - I mean given a (DDD).

(Stéphane): Thank you, Ching. Any further comments? There's a suggestion on the chat that we maybe drop the letter to be sent by the chair to the Board and approve it on one of our next consent agendas. Can I suggest that we refer to that suggestion as a possible way forward, and continue this discussion on the list unless others have comments - additional comments that they'd like to make now?

Ching Chiao: Sorry, (Stéphane), can I jump in quickly?

(Stéphane): Please do.

Ching Chiao: Sure, thank you. I will support the way to have a letter and/or a clarification sent to the Board, but potentially we might just simply ask about whether the implementation plan or the data model, the timeline for that plan, what would that be? Maybe we can, you know, simply just do - ask in the follow up is that we're - we have found this timely, but we would like to then seek for their - the Board and the staff, their clarification on the timeline of this kind of - this project.

(Stéphane): In which case, may I suggest that just like any other - like the other letters that we're trying to draft, we seek for a volunteer to do an initial draft and discuss it?

Ching Chiao: Sure, that sounds good to me, and if I may be of help, I'll help and draft something and send to the list.

(Stéphane): Thanks, Ching. I think that was a clearly pointed comment from me to you. So thanks for catching that. Thomas?

Thomas: Thanks, (Stéphane). I would be fully in favor of putting this on the consent agenda. Nonetheless, can you maybe ask or maybe I can ask the question to the Council whether there are any counselors that could foresee potential objections to that handling of the matter.

(Stéphane): Didn't understand the question.

Thomas: Whether there is a - one or more than one counselor who can foresee that they or their respective groups would like to object to putting that item on the consent agenda, because that would be good to know now.

(Stéphane): I think it might - I understand now. I think it might be difficult for people to answer before seeing the draft, but it's a fair question and perhaps one that we can bring up again as we get into the actual draft itself? Okay, so would that - I'm seeing no further questions on this. I will thank Ching for volunteering to draft an initial letter here and we'll take the - we'll take it from there with further discussion on the list on this.

We'll now move into Item 9, which was another item that we have as a carryover from the Prague wrap-up. And we discussed the possibility of a small group forming to examine possible actions do - are bylaw mandated 2013 GNSO review. This was obviously a topic of great interest to many, if not all of us, and we had on the agenda here a report from the group on possible actions ahead.

Actually I think I put that in there, but I do not believe that the group has been formed or that we decided to form a group. I believe that we discussed it. So maybe I got slightly ahead of myself drafting the - this part of the agenda. However, I did ask (Rob) Hoggarth to provide a small or short update to the Council on perhaps what's expected in the review of the bylaws mandate and what we need to look at. So (Rob), are you able to give us that information?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, (Stéphane), thanks. I'd be delighted to. Can everyone hear me okay?

Man: Yes.

Robert Hoggarth: Great. Yes, this item was originally, I think in the agenda two items. It was the GNSO review and an impact of new gTLDs on the existing GNSO structure. So I'm going to briefly touch on each of those issues in just about a four-minute presentation here.

While you guys talked about the issue in the wrap-up session, there were also a number of other public discussions on the topic in Prague, and I'm sure there were a lot of private discussions as well. I recall from your wrap-up session that you discussion the potential for a group to get together, but there was no real consensus at the time on, you know, what the ultimate decision would be on the part of the Council.

So for the purposes of this meeting, what I thought would be useful for me to do is, as you said, (Stéphane), confirm what the bylaws say on this, spot some resources for all of you for your future discussions and also try to identify some potential community and Council next steps over the next 30 to 60 days or so.

So let's first turn to the bylaws. For those of you who want to look it up later, Article 4, Section 4, Subsection 1 of the bylaws touches directly on this, and I'll read it, because it's just three lines for you. "Periodic review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years based on feasibility as determined by the Board."

And I think a number of you have interpreted that feasibility comment as giving the Board some flexibility in terms of what it can do. If I were asked my personal opinion on this, I think that the Board has some but really little flexibility in terms of the overall timeframe. But I do think based on my past experience, it does have flexibility in quote unquote "how the review is to be conducted."

And I think this was really reflected in dialog with a number of your communities in various meetings with the Board members. In particular, this topic came up in the Board's meeting with the registries, with the Commercial Stakeholders Group and with the registrars to varying degrees. If you look at the transcripts for the various meetings in Prague, it was eight pages' worth for the CSG, four for the registries, and a page-and-a-half for the registrars.

And the conversations in all those meetings I think touched on both the concept of your review and the timing of it as well as, you know, what is the impact of new gTLDs and, you know, 1400, 1900 new applicants into the existing structure. And the one - there were two things that really came out of those meetings that were a common element I think from the Board that you should all consider in terms of what your future options are.

One is that in two of the meetings, Steve Crocker relatively informally asked the chairs of the various constituencies and stakeholder groups to jot down, and he said I think in two meetings, quote unquote “very briefly one page worth of thoughts or general comments that come to your-all’s mind about what the impact is likely to be or what the impact will be in your minds of, you know, of the new gTLD participants on your particular stakeholder groups and constituencies and on the GNSO structure generally.”

And I think in both meetings where he mentioned that specifically, there was positive feedback from your colleagues and your communities that that might be done. So I think that’s one sort of touchstone or place to look at here.

The other was that in two of those three meetings, Bertrand de la Chappelle and Ray Plzak mentioned the effort of the Structural Improvements Committee where they basically said, “Look, we are working on examining what the review is likely to look like. We’re developing criteria that we want to discuss with the community.” And they also flagged the potential for a session in Toronto to focus directly on what the impact of new gTLDs will be on the GNSO and more broadly on the ICANN organization as a whole.

And so those were the two real critical nuggets I think that came out in Prague and that offer you-all a number of options. I think the first is there’s that clear invite from the Board chair for input. I interpret that as coming potentially from each of the individual stakeholder groups and constituencies as well as an opening for you as a Council to provide some sort of insight. And in doing so in two ways, one in terms of

commenting on what the timing of the review might be or how it might be conducted and secondly, on just the overall impact.

So maybe some contributions on planning for this potential Toronto session. And the two key people there obviously are Ray and Bertrand, but clearly other Board members, (Bruce), (Steve) and others made comments from all your various meetings about this. So I think there's clear Board interest in that.

And if you look at the schedule of the SIC over the next couple of months, they're scheduled to meet some time in the early to mid-September timeframe, and so if you-all are going to put together something, I think the next 35, 45 days would be the timeframe to do it. You can get something in by early September. That'll give the SIC members an opportunity to look at it, and that will inform this Toronto (unintelligible).

The other aspect of this, and it was a distinction that Ray Plzak made in a couple of the meetings, is he made an effort to distinguish for the folks who were listening the difference between structure and operations. He really emphasized the fact that we've been (unintelligible). They are looking at operations not necessarily structures.

But at the same time, (Steve) and (Bruce) for a Board perspective were saying, "You know, we aren't held to or stuck with a review process for us to make recommended to what the GNSO structure might look like." So I think there's a lot of opportunity out there particularly in the short term, and the time is really right for some comments to go in. And I think they should focus not only on the timing

of the review but also on some of the broader points about what some of the new players now might look like, how they could potentially be involved.

And I think a point that Kristina Rosette made in one of the meetings, also an important aspect of how to potentially involve those new players in the review discussions so they can feel a part of the community before they're officially contracted parties or wherever they'll fit.

So (Stéphane), that's sort of a general overview in terms of flagging some issues for you. If you think it's useful, I can put together a document with the links to these various sources for those of you who are interested in reviewing some of the transcripts or other stuff like that can have some more information. And I'll stop there for questions and for your guys' discussion. Thanks.

(Stéphane): Thanks very much, (Rob). Any comments or questions please for (Rob) or general points on this that people want to make at this stage? Question does remain on our own specific method for considering this issue and whether we do want to create a group to look at this specifically or continue a more Council-wide discussion on this. And it would be useful to get direction from the Council certainly with regards to that.

Sounds like everyone's gone to sleep. Zahid perhaps you can wake us up.

Zahid Jamil: Hi, thanks. I mean I'm just recalling the discussion we had in the wrap-up session. I think there was enough discussion. I think, Wendy and

myself, Bill and others said that they would like to have a group formed, and, you know, I just thought that, you know, I'd reiterate that, because I think that's where we were headed. I haven't heard anything to the contrary so far. And I think we would need to do something like that if we are to respond.

And I'm looking at the bylaws Section 4 (unintelligible). It says a review that has to happen every five years. It tells you exactly what the time is. It says shall - we can't delay it. There's no delay mechanism, and, you know, it talks about what the scope needs to be. So I think having a group do this would be helpful. Thanks.

(Stéphane): Thank you, Zahid. (Alan)?

(Alan): Yes, I'll point out the bylaws don't give us provision for delaying PDPs, but we delay the PDP on Thick Whois due to circumstances. I think the Board has at least that much discretion. And initiating a PDP to look at among other things structure at a time when the components of the GNSO were about to change radically is about as poor a use of resources as I can imagine. And so I think yes, we need to put together a group and maybe say that if indeed that's the general consensus. Thank you.

(Stéphane): Thank you, (Alan). Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thanks, (Stéphane). I guess it's a follow-on to some extent from what (Alan) said. I think there's a key point here to folks on this issue of feasibility, which (Rob) also highlighted at the beginning in understanding what is actually feasible and they're not quite how one defines feasible but also what's sensible at the current time.

That said, I'm not opposed to a group at least addressing this, but I'd quite like to understand what the scope of that group is. Is it how - you know, what - when we bring together a group of people to look at this, the review or what elements are - what's the (unintelligible) group.

So that's - maybe that's maybe a question to Zahid to just try and flesh out what we think we're going to get from this group, what we expect and put on this group of people? What are we actually expecting to achieve with that?

(Stéphane): Yes, thanks Jonathan. You cut out halfway through, but I think we got most of your question. I think the - if I can offer an answer from the discussions we had in Prague and from the - from experience of similar small informal groups. The idea is just to concentrate a discussion between a select group of people that can just push the discussion forward and get back to the Council with some proposed next steps or outcomes.

So these groups are informal. There's no (unintelligible) in a set process. The idea here was that if you recall in Prague at the wrap-up, we heard a variety of views on this issue, and some were adamant that the review should start at the bylaw mandated time if not sooner whilst others made the point that (Alan) just expressed, that starting the review in the current timetable would be a waste of resources due to the upcoming changes that the GNSO is about to see.

So the idea of getting a small group of people in a room to discuss this was born out of the realization that there is a wide variety of views on

this. So I hope that helps. I'll turn to Wendy and we can continue the discussion.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: And Wolfgang.

(Stéphane): And Wolfgang after Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. I'll reiterate my interest in being part of the group and just as strongly as (Alan) seems to feel the other way, I feel it would be criminal of us to waste the opportunity of a review at a time when the structure is changing and we could implement it along with changes rather than in a separate cycle.

(Stéphane): Thanks Wendy. Wolfgang.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes, I just wanted to say the same thing. Like Wendy, I would be also ready to serve in such a group. It - probably it's like not a traditional working group, but, you know, it's more like a think tank, you know, to think a little bit out of the box, because after six or seven years or nearly ten years under ICANN 2.0, I think the hope ICANN as we realize, you know, although from other corners of the organization, you know, is ready for change. And it's always good to have some people, you know, which have the inside knowledge to think out of the box and to say, "Okay, what would be the alternatives taking into account all the experiences we have on the ten years."

So not to wait that somebody from outside comes and comes with proposals which are probably dislinked (sic) from the real experiences. So it would make sense to start here and now and to give this group a rather, you know, general mandate which would allow them also to

think out of the box and not to give some very specific tasks, you know, what to do.

(Stéphane): Thanks Wolfgang. Any further comments? So I would make two suggestions. One that we do form a group and that someone volunteer to be kind of coordinator for the group just to make sure that the group does have discussions and that doesn't need to be done now.

We'll call for people who are interested in being part of the group to say so on the list. We've heard that Wolfgang, Wendy and others are interested. I will also express my own interest in being part of the group. And we will try and move this forward in this informal way on what does remain a very, very key topic for the GNSO Council, I believe.

Having said that, we've now run out of time for this meeting. We have one agenda item left, which is one that we've been trying to get to for a while, and I suppose it's quite strange that when we want to discuss management of work and our current workload, we never quite seem to get to it, because we have too much on our plate in the meeting that we're trying to discuss it in.

But once again, I propose that we push this agenda forward - this agenda item forward to the next meeting so that we can end almost on time here today, although it is an item that has been interest in discussing from myself and others. So we will get to it, but perhaps we will only get to it next time.

And talking of next time, I just want to bring your attention to a couple of suggested calendar changes that Glen has sent to the Council list,

the following discussion within the Council Leadership Team, as you'll recall in Prague, I made the point that I thought it was crucial that we streamline our agenda working up to the open Council meetings that we have three times a year at the ICANN meetings just to make sure that we don't have a teleconference mere days before that meeting, which tends to empty that meeting of a lot of its substance.

We had a look at the calendar. We were clearly headed for that kind of a situation once again with a meeting scheduled a few weeks before the Toronto meeting. So we've taken the decision to change the calendar around with the dates that Glen has proposed. I know a few have commented that they had no problems with the date changes, but some do. So please let us know if there are major problems with that, but I would strongly urge that we have a meeting at the end of August, have one in September and then not have one in October until the AGM.

With that, let me just quickly ask if there is any other business that someone would want to bring up? Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: Yes, I just posted this to the chat, (Stéphane). I just wondered, you know, we heard earlier and going back to the defensive registration issue, staff said that they'd done a briefing paper, which is highly general sort of high level. Is it possible for us when we're considering doing maybe an issues report, et cetera to do - ask them to do maybe before that a briefing paper, which would be more specific and a little more about the measure that could be possibly undertaken?

I just thought I'd put that out there, and maybe we can have this considered in the next meeting. But I thought I'd just put it out there now. Thank you.

(Stéphane): Thanks, Zahid, and (unintelligible) would have taken due note of your question. Any further AOBs?

Man: Happy holiday.

(Stéphane): Yes, seeing or hearing none, happy holidays to all of you who are taking some during this summer period. And thank you for your time today. I look forward to speaking to all of you at the next conference, and in the meantime please refer to the Council list as suggested for all of the agenda items that we wish to pursue during the month of August. Thank you very much. Speak to you next time. Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you, (Stéphane).

Man: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thank you, (Stéphane).

Man: Thank you, bye.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Goodbye, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Woman:       Bye.

END