

## **Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference 1 September 2016 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 1 September 2016 at 12:00 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-01sep16-en.mp3>

Adobe Chat Transcript

<https://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-chat-council-01sep16-en.pdf>

on page:

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

### **List of attendees:**

**NCA – Non Voting** – Carlos Raúl Gutierrez

#### **Contracted Parties House**

Registrar Stakeholder Group: James Bladel, Volker Greimann, vacant seat –proxy Volker Greimann

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group:

Donna Austin, Keith Drazek, Rubens Kühl

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA):

Hsu Phen Valerie Tan

#### **Non-Contracted Parties House**

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG);

Philip Corwin, Susan Kawaguchi, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Tony Harris, Paul McGrady, Heather Forrest

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Amr Elsadr, Stephanie Perrin, David Cake, Stefania Milan,

Edward Morris, Marilia Maciel

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA):

Julf (Johan) Helsingius

**NCA – Non Voting** –

Carlos Raúl Gutierrez

### **GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:**

Olivier Crèpin LeBlond– ALAC Liaison

Patrick Myles - ccNSO Observer - absent

Mason Cole – GNSO liaison to the GAC - absent

### **ICANN Staff**

David Olive - Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and General Manager, ICANN Regional Headquarters - Istanbul

Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director

Mary Wong – Senior Policy Director

Julie Hedlund – Policy Director

Berry Cobb – Policy consultant

David Tait– Policy Specialist

Emily Barabas – Policy Analyst

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Nathalie Peregrine - Specialist, SO/AC Support (GNSO)

Terri Agnew - Specialist, SO/AC Support (GNSO)

Mike Brennan - Meetings Technical Services Specialist

Coordinator: Recordings have started. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, Operator. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Council call on the 1st of September, 2016. And when I do the roll call would you please acknowledge your name when it is called so that we are sure that you can be heard because we have got several motions to vote on today. Thank you very much. Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Rubens Kuhl.

Rubens Kuhl: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: James Bladel.

James Bladel: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Volker Greimann.

Volker Greimann: I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: And Volker will be standing in for the vacant – will be holding the proxy for the vacant seat in the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Valerie Tan.

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

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Phil Corwin.

Phil Corwin: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Good morning.

Glen de Saint Géry: Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Here, Glen. Thanks.

Glen de Saint Géry: Tony Harris.

Tony Harris: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Marília Maciel. Marília, are you on the line yet? And in the Adobe Connect I do not see Marília yet. Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: I'm present.

Glen de Saint Géry: David Cake. I do not see David on the line nor in the Adobe Connect yet.

David Cake: I'm present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Ed Morris. Oh, sorry, David, you are. Yes. Yes, present. Ed Morris.

Ed Morris: Here, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Stefania Milan.

Stefania Milan: Here.

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Stephanie Perrin. Stephanie? Sorry, did I – I haven't seen Stephanie either. Julf Helsingius.

Johan Helsingius: Here, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Carlos Gutierrez.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you, Glen. I'm on the line.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, Carlos. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Mason Cole. I do not see Mason on the line yet. And for staff we have David Olive, Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Emily Barabas, David Tait, Nathalie Peregrine, Mike Brennan and myself, Glen de Saint Géry.

May I all remind you please to mute when you are not speaking because there is noise on the line and please say your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you so much, James, and over to you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Glen. James speaking. And welcome back, everyone, from your summer breaks. I hope everyone had a nice summer or for those of you in the south, Heather, that are getting ready to celebrate the beginning of spring.

As per our standard procedures if there are any updates to your statements of interest or any other declarations regarding your status as a councilor, please raise your hand now in the Adobe room or otherwise get my attention on the call.

Okay thanks. Seeing none we'll move on then to the agenda, which has been posted, yes, sorry, I'm still seeing that echo. I'm wondering if staff could track down which line that's occurring on and help us out. And a reminder to please mute your line if you're not speaking. Thanks.

Okay, moving on to the agenda, which is posted here in the Adobe room and was circulated by Glen. Does anyone have any updates or recommended edits to the agenda before we get started? Okay seeing none then I will assume that the agenda has been adopted.

And we'll note the status of the meeting for our last meeting which was on July of 2016 and I believe they were approved last week. Is that correct, Glen? Can you confirm the status of the minutes being approved?

Glen de Saint Géry: Sorry, I was on mute. Yes, they have been approved because of the automatic process that after 10 days on the Council list without any comments the minutes are automatically approved then. Thank you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Glen. And just a procedural question, although we didn't call it a meeting, would there be any minutes or any other recorded archive of our email ballot session that was held in early August or just the ballot itself serve as the minutes in that case? I know it wasn't a meeting but it was an action of the Council and I want to make sure that that's captured somewhere.

Glen de Saint Géry: It hasn't been officially done, James. But I will do it with pleasure in making it – in sending the results to the Council list. They were actually sent to the Council list but I will do it again in a more formal manner.

James Bladel: Thank you, Glen. And if there are no objections from councilors I think we should proceed to do that just to ensure that that's captured in the same location as all the other minutes of the official meetings.

Okay great. So then moving on to Item Number 2, which is the review of our open projects and open action item list, if we could have that pulled up on the screen? And there haven't been a whole lot of substantial changes to this list since it was last reviewed, but there are a couple of items of note so this time turn it over to Marika and she can walk us through those items that require an update. Marika, if you're on the line and you don't mind could you give us an update on those items that have changed?

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you James. This is Marika. So the project list is on the screen. I think you actually should have also received a redline version that was circulated to the Council list which is intended to make it easier for you to see what changes have been made compared to the previous version.

So I think the main changes here is that we added an entry for the GNSO Review Working Group which is in the process of being formed. I know that Julie is working with several of you to identify members for this effort. And we hope to commence this group shortly.

I believe we moved over the privacy and proxy accreditation issues PDP to the implementation phase after the Board's adoption of those recommendations. And we also created a new entry for the Work Stream 2 activities of the CCWG Accountability to reflect that that's now in a working group phase while the Work Stream 1 recommendations or Work Stream 1 efforts still remain in the implementation phase.

So I think those are the main changes in regards to the other efforts. Updates have been made to reflect the current status of work. But for most of the other efforts work is basically ongoing. So I don't know if there are any questions I can try to answer.

James Bladel: Thank you, Marika. Any questions from the Council on the status of our projects? A quiet group this morning, Marika, so we're going to let you off easy.

Okay thank you for that update. And again, this will be circulated on the list for anyone who wants to comment perhaps outside of this call. But otherwise, we'll consider this part of our agenda closed.

So if we can go back to the agenda please? Okay, very small. Okay next item is Item Number 3, we have one item in our consent agenda which is a adoption of the changed timeline for filling the role of the GNSO liaison to the GAC. If you recall, we passed a motion on this in our meeting in Helsinki.

But, we did have a few dates that were updated here. And they're shown here on the agenda. And I'll just go ahead and walk them through for folks who don't see them.

The chairs would submit a motion to Council of the first choice for GAC – for liaison to the GAC on the 28th of October. And then that would be discussed, considered and presumably adopted by the Council on the 7th of November while we are in Hyderabad.

So if there are no – well I guess should ask. Are there any questions, discussions about this change? I believe this is just moving everything up one day to reflect some of the changes that we are getting ready for in relation to the schedule for ICANN 57.

Yes, thank you Marika is pointing that out in the chat as well. So this seems fairly noncontroversial. If there are no questions, then we can move to a vote to adopt the consent agenda. Okay, Glen, would you mind conducting the vote? And let's do so by voice acclamation vote, thanks.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, James. Is anyone objecting to the consent agenda being passed? Are there any abstentions? Will all those in favor please say yay.

(Group): Yay.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. James, the consent agenda passes unanimously.

James Bladel: Thank you, Glen. And thank you for keeping us on our toes with the yay. And appreciate that. Okay, great, moving along then to Agenda Item Number 4, which is our first formal vote here.

We have a motion to approve the recommendations from the SCI, the Standing Committee for GNSO Improvements. And this motion, I believe, is the culmination of the remaining work of the SCI as we transition this group to be folded into the effort to implement the work coming out of the GNSO review process.

So the motion was made by Amr and seconded by Rubens. And if there are no objections I could turn the floor over to Amr and have him introduce the motion. Amr, if you're on the line...

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, James.

James Bladel: ...and are willing to do so please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, I am on the line and perfectly willing. Thanks, James. Okay well this motion is not just about the SCI being disbanded and moving on to – moving its mandate to the GNSO Review Working Group, it's also about the GNSO Council adopting the recommendations coming out of the SCI on its final two projects.

So one is the – are the new procedures for electing GNSO Council chairs and vice chairs; and the other is formalizing the procedures on the submission of motions and making friendly amendments to those motions.

So those – the recommendations coming out of the SCI were subjected to a public comment period. A couple of comments were filed in support of the recommendations. I'm just curious, would you like me to brief you on what those recommendations are or would you just like me to go through the resolve clauses?

James Bladel: I'll put that question to the Council. Does anyone – would anyone like a review of the recommendations themselves? Or has everyone had an opportunity to review those offline? Amr, I don't see anyone jumping up and down to get a review of those so feel free to move to the resolve clauses.

Amr Elsadr: Great. Thanks, James. This is Amr again. Before I move to the resolve clauses let me just provide some context on why these recommendations were made. Primarily the project on the chair and vice chair elections for the GNSO Council came as a result of the elections in Dublin. And if you all recall, we did not – the Council did not conclusively elect a chair at that meeting.

So Council asked the SCI to look into this. And so the SCI came up with a bunch of – sort of stepwise approach to how the situation could be handled in the future. And I think it's a fairly thorough approach taking into consideration timeline, making sure that any delay in the election of Council chair and vice chair would not delay the work of the Council, I mean, the work that the Council needs to get done.

I think they're fairly straightforward and, as I said, thorough. And I'm happy to endorse them.



Regarding the recommendations on the submission of motions, no changes were made to the current practice except perhaps that it sort of formalizing – it would – if we adopt this motion it would be formalized in the Operating Procedures that if there is no seconder to a motion that a motion would not be discussed during a Council meeting. So that may be something – I’m not sure if we ever actually had a motion that wasn’t seconded on the Council agenda but this is something to take note of I think.

So if I could go through the resolve clauses now. Resolved 1, “The GNSO Council adopts the modifications to the GNSO Operating Procedures relating to motions and the Chair/Vice-Chair elections.”

Resolve clause 2, “The GNSO Council instructs ICANN staff to post the new version of the GNSO Operating Procedures, effective immediately upon adoption.”

Resolve clause 3, “The GNSO Council thanks both present and former members of the SCI, as well as Policy Staff and the GNSO Secretariat supporting them for the work they have done on behalf of the GNSO over the years since the SCI’s formation. The SCI is hereby disbanded.”

And if I could also comment on the last resolve clause, Resolve Clause 3, this is really just a follow up to a motion that the Council adopted on its July 16 meeting to replace the mandate of the SCI with the GNSO Review Working Group.

And I would like to also make another comment, maybe not in my capacity as an NCSG councilor but as in my capacity as the Council liaison to the SCI, there have been a couple of concerns raised regarding the Council decision to disband this committee.

One was that the SCI performs an important function and it is still not clear how this function will continue should the GNSO Review working group itself eventually complete its mandate – it’s primary mandate of the – of implementing the recommendations that the Board – the ICANN Board adopted concerning the GNSO review by the independent examiner, Westlake.

Another one was that the SCI, in its charter, is also mandated to perform periodic reviews of the GNSO itself. And this is not strictly speaking mandated to the GNSO Review Working Group, although I do believe the charter of this working group provides it with enough flexibility for the Council to request – to make the sort of request if it deems it necessary.

But I think those are two important points. And I felt I was obligated to convey them to the Council in my capacity as liaison to the committee. And I think it may also be helpful for me to attach a comment to my vote on this motion to just make sure that this is captured appropriately. And I'd be happy to answer any questions anyone has. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Amr, for introducing the motion, providing the context and for – of course for relaying those sentiments from the SCI back to the Council. So at this point before we move to any kind of a vote we'd open the floor for a discussion. And I see there's some discussion in the chat over the language and the text of the Resolve Clause 3. Could certainly open the queue for a discussion of that as well.

Heather, you're up first.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. I'm happy to kick that off in relation to the third resolve clause since I essentially kicked it off there in the chat on the sidebar. I notice that there's been a fair bit of discussion on the Council list of the word, "disbanded." I don't recall – I take Amr's point that that really is a offshoot, if you like, if our earlier motion of our July meeting, July 27 meeting. And I don't recall if we used the word "disbanded" there.

Even if we did, I wonder if – we've got a few suggestions now in the chat. I think in light of the fact that we are thanking the SCI for its work I think it's more appropriate to use, let's say, a word that has that sort of a tone, a positive tone as opposed to disbanded. So I'm open to any of the suggestions here, wind up, retired, so on and so forth. And Wolf-Ulrich points out that it's elsewhere in the document as well. In any event, my two cents. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Heather. I see – I think general agreement that perhaps the word "disbanded" although we may have referenced that in the motion that was adopted in late July, that that is perhaps conveying – or has a negative connotation.

And I see some alternatives being suggested in the chat. I don't know if we're arriving at any consensus on a positive alternative for "disbanded." Phil, however, is pointing out that the word "disband" is used twice in Whereas 6 and Resolved 3. So if we fix it in one place for consistency we should probably fix it in both places.

Some of the options put out were retired and it looks like concluded. I don't know if folks have strong feelings about either one. I think – and then Mary I think puts out the option that we really wouldn't necessarily have to have that phrase at all. We could simply thank them for their work and leave it at that.

I don't know, and perhaps – I see Amr has his hand up – but I think the question to Amr and other participants on the SCI would be that is – would either of these terms more accurately capture the sentiment that the Council has for this group and expressed in the motion adopted in late July. And address the concerns or some of the questions that were raised by the SCI. so I'll turn it over to Amr. Go ahead.

Amr Elsadr:

Thanks, James. This is Amr again. Yes, I think retired is an all right alternative to disbanded. And I have no objection to replacing disbanded with another word if it makes folks feel better. I'm not so sure about concluded seeing that this was a standing committee, it wasn't a committee that was supposed to deliver a project and then sort of go away similar to how GNSO working groups operate. This was a standing committee and there was no foreseeable conclusion to its work until the topic of the GNSO Review Working Group came up.

I also note Mary's suggestion, and I think it may also be worth consideration, especially that the decision to actually disband the SCI is not being made as a result of this motion. That decision was made in the July 16 motion with Resolve Clause – that following the completion of these two projects that are up for a vote this time around that the SCI would be disbanded when these two projects are concluded.

So the decision was made then, it wasn't made now. It isn't going to be made now. And we don't necessarily need to point out that we are making it now. So I think Mary's suggestion is not a bad one. But I'm perfectly happy to accommodate Council members in making amendments to this motion depending on how they see fit. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Amr. And I think there's general agreement that Mary's suggestion, particularly for Resolve Clause 3, is – there's some support for that of just dropping that last sentence entirely from Resolve Clause 3 and ending that at, you know, the thanks, which I think is more consistent with how we typically adopt a motion that concludes the work of a PDP working group or another similar effort.

Then I guess that only leaves the loose end in Whereas Number 6 where we would say essentially instructed the SCI to disband/retire following the completion of the two tasks now before the Council.

If in fact, we use the word “disband” in the motion that was adopted in July then perhaps we can leave that in Whereas 6 and drop the last sentence of Resolve 3. It's not entirely purging ourselves of the word “disband” but at least it is consistent with the previous motion. Any thoughts on that, Amr, or anyone? Okay, Amr has some agreement – indicated his agreement in the Adobe Connect.

Any objections to that approach? I don't think this is necessarily controversial. Okay, I see Heather has indicated no objections in the chat. Okay so if we could have staff – Amr, if you will take that as friendly, and Rubens, as the seconder. Okay. We've got friendly on both. And we've got agreement from – I've got to scroll down here, sorry, that was agreement from Paul. Okay.

Thank you, gentlemen. So, staff is working on that. We see that they have made those changes in the motion. So if everyone could take a quick look at that while we go to Amr. Go ahead, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks again, James. This is Amr. You know, just wanted to say that I certainly consider this friendly. I have no problem with the amendment. But I also, again, wanted to stress the question of what the views of the Council are on when the GNSO Review Working Group completes its mandate how will the function of the SCI as has been – which is being moved to the GNSO Review Working Group, how will that continue in the future?

I think this is a question we don't necessarily need to answer now during this meeting, but it is something we should be aware of and I believe something we

should address in the coming months just to make sure we have all our bases covered. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Amr. That is an excellent point. And I think it was at least partially discussed perhaps not comprehensively discussed, when we chartered that group. And my question is, and perhaps we can ask staff to take an action item to confirm that the charter of the successor group, the group that's implementing the GNSO review, has some task or has the question put before it of how to manage improvements on an ongoing basis and whether some sort of an SCI version 2 is necessary at the conclusion of that effort.

I see Marika has her hand up. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I can already confirm that that is in the charter. I think the function of the charter is that the first priority will now go to developing implementation plan for the GNSO Review recommendations. But of course, you know, the door is open if the Council identifies any issues that it deems more urgent than dealing with the GNSO review implementation that those can be handled by the working group.

But the charter also foresees that at the point that that group actually concludes its work on implementing the GNSO review recommendation that there will also need to be a consideration on whether that group then continues as another kind of standing committee to deal with potential ongoing issues relating to the GNSO Operating Procedures and/or bylaws or whether another mechanism needs to be created. So I think that is already foreseen in there.

But as Amr said it's something that indeed both the Council as well as the working group will need to give thoughts to as they go through their processes and work.

James Bladel: Thank you, Marika. And, yes, I do – I thought that Amr's concerns sounded familiar so I'm glad to hear that that is at least partially captured in the charter for the subsequent group.

So I guess my question is, Amr, is that satisfactory to address your concerns? Or if not perhaps we can follow up a little more comprehensively after this call. But it is, as

you indicated, probably outside the scope of this particular motion to do so. And I see in the chat that Amr is thanking Marika so.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, this is Amr, James. As I am thanking Marika and thank you all – thanks very much for this.

James Bladel: Great, thanks. And thank you for your service as the liaison to the SCI or probably should say most recent liaison to the SCI. I know there have been others in the past and we should thank all of those folks as well. And I think that's covered in Resolve 3.

Okay so if there are no other comments the queue is clear. And we can move to a vote on this motion. Glen, if you don't mind, we could proceed with a voice vote if there are no objections?

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, James. All those who are not in favor of the motion please state your name. All those who would like to abstain from the motion please state your name. Hearing no abstentions and hearing that no one is not in favor of the motion, all those that are in favor of the motion please say, "yay" again.

(Group): Yay.

Man: Again.

(Group): Yay.

Man: Yay.

Man: Yay again.

Glen de Saint Géry: Great. Thanks. Again the motion passes unanimously.

James Bladel: Thank you Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: And will be reported as such.

James Bladel: Fantastic. Thank you, Glen. Thank you Omar and Rubens for the motion, thank you to the SCI past and present and presumably future.

And just a time check here. I'm now 33 minutes past the hour and getting behind here on the agenda.

So we'll move onto Item Number 5 which is our second motion of the day. It is the adoption of the IAG recommendations for WHOIS conflicts of national law. This motion was made by myself but it has been I think lingering a little bit here for context. And it was also seconded by Wolf-Ulrich so thank you Wolf-Ulrich for that.

It has been lingering a little bit here since the end of May when we received the report from the IAG and was discussed in our meetings in Helsinki and in July.

If there are no objections I can go ahead and introduce the motion or at least the whereas clauses. And then we can kick off a discussion.

So the motion is resolved, the GNSO Council has reviewed the IAG Final Report. And there's a link. And concludes that the proposed modification to the procedure conforms to the intent to the original policy recommendations and as such the GNSO Council confirms it's non-objection to the modification being implemented by GDD staff as outlined in Appendix 1 and there's another link as soon practicably feasible.

Resolved 2, the GNSO Council recommends as soon as the modification has been implemented all affected parties are informed accordingly.

Resolved 3, furthermore the GNSO Council requests that the ICANN staff – that ICANN staff monitor the implementation of the modified procedure to determine whether the modification addresses the issues identified by the IAG Final Report and report back accordingly.

And finally resolved 4, the GNSO Council thanks the IAG for its work and notes on the minority views included in the Final Report the GNSO Council requests that these are shared with the Next Generation Registration Directory Services PDP Working Group as the broader WHOIS issues raised in these views are expected to be dealt with in that PDP.

Those are the resolved clauses for this motion. And then if there are any questions or discussions now we can take a queue.

And first up is Volker.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, James. And I regret having to do this. But registrars have reviewed the proposal contained in the IAG Final Report carefully.

And we've come to the conclusion that the proposed modifications to the procedure is not helpful or desirable as it would not improve the ability of contracted parties to comply with local law.

Adding a trigger that is in fact impossible to use and manage jurisdiction means in our view that the IAG has failed in its task assigned to them by this council. And therefore this motion should not pass on that ground alone.

The original GNSO recommendation as adopted in the – by the ICANN Boards back in 2006 clearly references that a contracted party needs to clearly demonstrate such conflict but does not specify at that time which form it's demonstration would have to take. This correctly implemented would give contracted parties a much needed amount of flexibility to provide such demonstration prior to being faced with enforcement action by either ICANN staff, ICANN compliance or a local privacy law enforcement.

The originally proposed procedure goals are detailed in the Final Report so I will not quote them here. But suffice it to say that the proposed new trigger does not meet the goals of the original recommendation.

The proposed new procedure is too narrow and too restrictive to be useful and adopting it at this time would limit the options of contracted parties to discuss and negotiate (the list for) ICANN where local laws prevent them from following policies or contractual obligations.

While the proposed trigger is broader than the trigger in the current procedure it is a trigger that when taken to the real world is simply not effective as it assumes a role



for certain agencies or parties that these agencies or parties do not have or willing to take on.

The alternative trigger is essentially a trap for contracted parties as it requires them to contact an agency primarily tasked with fining and penalizing violations of privacy laws and notifying them of a potential violation essentially triggering the start of an enforcement action against the requestor.

The new trigger is therefore further exposing contracted parties to a risk that it was supposed to remove. This simply will not do especially since a workable trigger process is already in place for example, for the data retention specification of the 2013 RAA which would recommend and satisfy the requirements of most contracted parties.

We propose that this council should refer this back to the IAG and request that they provide the recommendation that will prove useful in the real world and fully meets the expectation of the goals outlined in the original recommendation.

We recognize that more workable trigger proposals have been discussed but were blocked by parties that would not even be affected directly by such conflicts. The arguments against those triggers were not convincing as the use of a trigger mechanism in itself does not predicate the outcome of the process.

We therefore propose that these triggers be revisited by the group with the understanding that the use of a trigger does not automatically result in ICANN dispensing the contracted parties affected from their responsibilities. But rather as the initiation of a process where based on a trigger mechanism further reviews initiated and necessary by ICANN.

That's my statement.

James Bladel: Thank you Volker. Next in the queue I have Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks James. I suppose that Volker's comments perhaps take some of the joy out of what I'm about to say.

What I intended to remark was to say that the IPC was very pleased to see the Registry Stakeholder Group put this motion forward in the first place. I do know that and I'm happily let's say aware of the fact that at the end of our last meeting I posted a comment on the list to say that, you know, I was fairly disappointed speaking as an individual, not on behalf of the IPC. That I was fairly disappointed as a counselor in the way that our previous discussion on this motion went in that it focused on the substance and not on question at hand and the precise wording really of the question before us.

And it seems that we're right back in that same position again. I note Volker's comments that the outcome of the IAG, the proposal was "Not helpful or desirable." And that's not the precise wording of the motion. The motion asks us to confirm whether the proposal conforms to the intent of the original policy recommendations.

So I'd be very grateful if Volker or James yourself could offer some comments to that specific point. Let's make sure we vote on the motion that's in front of us which is whether this thing conformed to the intent of the original policy recommendations. Thank you.

James Bladel: So Volker, thank you Heather. Volker has rejoined the queue. But he's behind Marilia. So Marilia do you mind if I go with Volker first so he can respond to Heather's question?

Thank you Marilia. Volker go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Yes. Thank you, James. And thank you Heather for asking the question. I think I and most registrars that have responded on our mailing list to this proposed motion have felt that it does not conform to what they have been asked to do essentially because the trigger that is proposed when used exposes the registrar to additional risk.

Therefore the proposed trigger or the motion that we have here does not conform to the original proposal and the original intent of the original motion because it does not in any way provide a new way or new means to trigger the mechanism to allow contracted parties not to be in a situation where they would have to violate local law.

As I said this looks like a trap that would trigger enforcement action by local law enforcement agencies rather than a mechanism that would allow registrars to or registries to initiate a process within ICANN to have certain requirements looked at from the perspective local law requirements.

James Bladel: Thank you Volker for that response. Next up is Marilia, go ahead.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much James. This is Marilia speaking. Yesterday the NCSG had their (multiparty) call. And as you can imagine this was one of the topics that we discussed the motion on our call yesterday.

And I think that it is a general feeling between our counselors that in spite of the best efforts (unintelligible) IAG the policy proposed, the report fell short in not directing the issues concerning conflicts between WHOIS and privacy law.

So in our opinion we need to have a more thorough consideration of the problem. And we need perhaps to revise the GNSO policy itself on the matter.

NCSG counselors as you know they do not have a direct approach. But those that wrote for this motion, for the approval of this motion do. So on the expectation that this aspect of the policy will be reviewed soon either in ongoing processes or a process to be created on this regard and I personally think that the suggestion made to refer this back to the IAG is not a bad suggestion at all.

We also have an additional concern which is related to the role of the GAC in the process that the IAG created for the alternative trigger. The report mentions that the country where the national law has been flagged to be in conflict where WHOIS should be consulted in the process and it's not clear from the report what will be the weight of the GAC member opinion on this issue.

As we know the Data Protection Authorities nationally they work in a way that is independent of national governments. And sometimes they have the responsibility to oversee branches of the government and this policy may upset the balance that exists on the national level and the independence of that protection authorities. Because of that it's our opinion that if this report gets approved the GNSO should follow-up on the recommendation of these suggestions to make sure that if GAC is

supposed to give an opinion, this opinion is not something that we will wait on the process in terms of the final decision that will be made. It will be a matter, should be consulted. That consultation will be (merely) advisory.

Having said that this is what we discussed yesterday. But as I mentioned our counselors do not have a directed vote on the issue. But we wanted no matter the outcome of the proposal, the motion to express our concerns on that.

Thank you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you Marilia and good point. I noticed there is a queue with Donna and Paul. But I have a question for staff. Marilia and Volker both referenced referring this work back to the IAG but as Mary pointed out in the chat, well I'll just go ahead and come clean.

I am not clear on the status of the IAG. If this group still exists and whether or not there is still an IAG to refer this work back to or whether it would need to be re-chartered or reconstituted in some way or if we would have to create or charter a separate group up to and including a PDP to address this issue although that seems just off the cuff, that seems redundant given that we have a PDP ongoing that is looking at some of these in the context of an (RDS).

So I just would put the question on the table and I don't mean to hijack the queue. But two speakers have now referred or made reference to sending this back to the IAG and I just – I don't know that that – I don't know how that would work.

But we'll go next then to Donna. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks James. Donna Austin. So from a Registry Stakeholder Group perspective we largely support Volker's statements. We do consider the recommendation is that...

Woman: Yes, I can hear you. I can hear you.

Donna Austin: So I just wanted to put on record that the Registry Stakeholder Group does support the statement that's been made by Volker. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Donna. And I have Paul.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady for the record. So I guess my questions are based on the fact that at least for another month or two I'm still a freshman counselor.

What's – how do we deal with situations like this where we have essentially – I assume this reached us because there was a consensus among the group that did the work. And that group was I again assume probably representative and, you know, contracted parties were involved, non-contracted parties were involved in the process.

How do we – you know I guess I'm just – I feel hesitant to essentially overturn consensus because now we don't like it, right. So is this – can I just ask? Is this a normal thing? Do we do that a lot? Do we veto consensus even when a broad group of the community was involved in bringing this to us?

I just would like to understand how we are – how this is on the table. Thanks.

Man: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Thanks Paul. It's a good question. And I think I'm not really sure if I'm in a position to answer it specifically. I – from my perspective I think that the IAG is a bit of a weird duck because it is in many respects, it's not a PDP but it is in many aspects operating similar to a PDP.

And so I think that that is – well I think that's actually in some ways the source of the friction here is that it is bounding up against policy which would be out of scope for anything but a PDP.

So I think that's potentially part of the confusion. But I think that in this particular case I would also note that I think the IAG from my understanding suffered from a lack of participation from some groups.

And I don't need to call those groups out. But the reality is what it is and that...

Man: Right.

James Bladel: Some of the groups did not fully engage in that effort.

I don't know if any other counselors want to weigh-in specifically on Paul's question but I have a couple of other folks in the queue. Next up is Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking and I'll be speaking here on behalf of the ALAC. Although the ALAC hasn't conducted formal discussions or in fact a formal vote on this topic there has been a discussion or several informal discussions going on within the ALAC and in the at large community.

And we – the voices that have been heard broadly support the concerns that were expressed by Volker Greimann today in the call.

So that's the position at the moment. But we are certainly eager to see where the discussion takes place on this call. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Olivier. Next up is Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much James, Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I'll spare everybody a lengthy rant because I think my views are quite clear. I wrote what I thought was a decent but it's called an appendix.

And the whole construction of the WHOIS, it's a law policy, strikes me as one of the few people around that has actually worked in a reasonably senior position in a data protection office as absolutely absurd and exposes the registrars in particular to multiple risks that – legal risks that don't strike me as fair or reasonable.

And the whole idea that you would not be able to comply with law without this triggering mechanism and some kind of authority from a Data Protection Commission that in many cases is not able to give you such a letter, just struck me as absurd.

So I'm actually speaking to respond to Paul's use of the word consensus. This was a very fractious group and we were constrained and bound by the remit of the particular group.

And so I think it's very difficult to call that consensus. Most of the people who participated were not in support of this. And it was I would say a workaround.

Now I leave the registrars to speak for themselves but certainly there were quite a few of us saying this is nonsense. We should review the policies.

So and unfortunately and as Marilia has given you an excellent summary of our discussion, our discussion is basically we are stuck with a policy that needs to be revised because it doesn't make any sense. We have not done an active consultation with the data commissioners who we're looking for a trigger from and the RDS even in optimal years to get to the policy revision that is required.

So tossing it back to the IAG to have another round of vigorous discussion let's put it that way just doesn't strike me as useful.

And I see in the chat Heather is saying the question that (unintelligible) on the IAG was asked to deal with. That is the problem. The IAG was asked to figure out where there's another trigger that would work better than the no man's land that the registrars have found themselves in and the answer is this doesn't work. We heard it from Volker.

So tossing it back to the IAG again strikes me as possibly not too useful. And I wonder if some of us who are busy working on the RDS have time to pour into the IAG because we – that process requires participation or we'll get something equally un-useful out the other end.

So I don't know whether I'm clarifying here except that I would vigorously object to calling the conclusion they reached a real consensus. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Stephanie for those comments. I have Volker and Paul. Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes, thank you James. And I would like to thank Paul for his comment because I'm very aware that this and interesting situation that we are currently proposing here.

Normally I would say that a consensus call would have to be respected. However the council is the guardian of the process. And if we feel that even though the working

group or the IAG has in this case, has reached consensus but on the matter that it wasn't tasked with or the content just does not meet the requirements of the task that was put before it, then we should be able and I think we do have the right to refer it back to them and tell them you didn't do your job correct because you missed certain points, certain interpretations, misinterpreted certain things that were part of your mission and you didn't clearly delineate or work out or even left to the side.

I think that is part of our role as the GNSO Council. And while it is a rare thing that we do that and I can't remember one situation where we did that and during my tenure as a counselor I think that is a tool that while best used rarely can be used in situations where it should be used.

As a second thing, like I said in my presentation I think we should make absolutely certain that the – when this goes back to the IAG we are very clear that we would like to see that the IAG makes sure that the proposed procedures conform to the intent of the original policy recommendations.

And that the intent is to allow contracted parties to negotiate with ICANN, to present problems to ICANN, and find a solution in cases where policy conflicts with local law.

And that has to be workable to be in conform – and to conform to the intent of the original policy recommendation. If it doesn't work it does not conform to the intent and it should be referred back again and again. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Volker. Paul.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady. So I guess I'm a little concerned about the idea of there – something being sent to us presumably following a consensus call.

And then we as a council deciding that there wasn't consensus because people who were unhappy with the outcome says there wasn't consensus, right. That to me seems like a freeway of an exception where anything that is unpopular even though consensus was reached in the process gets off ramped.



And so I guess I'm not persuaded by that. I'm also not heartened. In some respects we're actually talking about a motion that's not been made because there's no motion in front of us to send it back.

So we should be a little bit careful. But even if that motion had been made and that was what we were really discussing instead of the motion that was actually made it doesn't sound like the IAG, you know, was terribly, you know, if it really was as fractious as people say it was. I don't know why sending it back there would be the thing to do anyway especially with the, you know, PDP on this topic essentially already up and running.

So again I guess I just express my hesitancy about the council interposing its collective views. Overturning consensus when consensus has been reached by the – an appropriate working group. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Paul. Next is Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Sorry. That was an old hand James.

James Bladel: Okay. Then next is Donna and then we should probably try to bring this in for some kind of a landing folks. Donna go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks James. Donna Austin. So I just want to make the point that if this and, you know, Paul we can argue all day about consensus and, you know, whether the group met it or not.

But the reality is that this is the solution is unworkable. And one of the challenges is if this gets voted up, right, so we argue about whether the intent of the motion is that the recommendation is consistent with the policy, the challenge here is that if we – if the council votes this up and agrees to the additional trigger which the contracted parties have – knows is unworkable then ICANN relies on that trigger. And the contracted parties' house is in no position to negotiate, might be the wrong word but to find an alternate way to address this conflict with national laws.

So that's my real concern here. What we're doing if the council votes this up is that we put the contracted parties' house in a position where staff are going to say no,

you have to use this trigger because that's what the consensus was of the IAG. And that's the only one available to you.

So that puts the registries and registrars into – boxes us into a corner that we can't necessarily get out of. So that's my real concern here. This is unworkable.

So we don't, you know, from our perspective we don't want to vote this up because it's going to box us into a corner that we can't get out of. So we'd rather acknowledge that the recommendation is unworkable. And let's see if we can, you know, find a way out of this. Because ICANN staff will rely on this trigger and that is a really bad outcome from the contracted parties' house. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you Donna. And thank you to Volker and Stephanie, Paul and Heather. And I'm sure I've forgotten someone but all speakers for weighing in on this. This is a challenging issue. This is bending a lot of our processes by the way it's come about and it is and I'll just go ahead and offer some color commenting. It is taking a broken process and attempting to fix it but as we're hearing from some it's – there are concerns that that's not effective.

But just from the perspective of process here from the council, we need to find a path forward. Now at this stage we could certainly submit the motion for a vote. And let the cards fall where they may. I have heard reference to sending this back to the IAG. I think that opens up a number of questions as well for example does the IAG still exist or would it need to be reconstituted. And would that actually be a useful exercise.

I'm happy to defer the motion. But unfortunately that only buys us some time. And then it becomes, we're right back in this situation here in about a month.

I'm also happy to withdraw the motion and I will state for the record that I made this motion because our deadline was approaching. And I took to heart Heather's concerns that this was flopping around on the deck and had not seen any motion movement since our movement and since our discussion of it upon receiving the report in May. And it was just kind of sitting in limbo there.

Maybe that was premature on my part. But I certainly wanted to light a fire and kind of kick this thing in the pants and get some movement on this topic. And get it in front of the council.

If I withdraw the motion I should note procedurally. And I think that that makes the seconder, Wolf-Ulrich, the maker of the motion and that anyone else could come and second the motion and then it would still be unwithdrawn so it would essentially take a – both of us to agree to withdraw the motion.

And then of course that would again leave open the question of where do we go from here with this IAG Report and this issue of WHOIS conflicts with national law.

So I am open to suggestions here. I, you know, don't want to drive a train off a cliff if you don't have to but neither do you want to build the tracks to go that way inevitably and - just trying to catch up on the chat here a little bit because there's a flurry of posts going by and comments. So questions, comments, suggestions?

All right I think - oh Omar. Go ahead.

Omar Kaminski: Thanks James. This is Omar. I apologize I was dropped off the call for a few minutes and I might've missed some of the discussion but I'm not clear on why the motion is being withdrawn now instead of the council voting on it and taking action whether the motion passes or fails. Would you mind clarifying this one more time James and apologies again.

James Bladel: Well that's simply one of the options Omar. We haven't made any determination either way. I'm offering to withdraw the motion that I made in an effort to get some movement and some direction on this issue. If it is - needs some more time, some more discussion then I'm happy to withdraw it on the assumption and the condition that some of the folks who are raising these comments and concerns today would meet in the interim to discuss whether, you know, if and when this is resubmitted and try to work on some language that is acceptable.

Rather than performing surgery and trying to close these gaps that we're hearing on the council trying to bridge these differences with amendments to the language I'm offering to withdraw it and essentially send this for rework. However if that's not the

course that the council would like to pursue at this time then we can simply move forward with the vote but neither course has been decided yet Omar. Thanks.  
Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: So I understand, you know, the concerns and this is a difficult issue but I'm also very concerned that we're sort of setting a precedent that, you know, if we just go ahead and vote and I'm assuming this would be voted down so that it would be a no vote would win on this motion at this point that, you know, we've asked some group in the community maybe it's not a PDP but - to take the time to work at this.

Obviously there was some level of consensus and maybe understanding that level would help us in our work to decide on what to do going forward but, you know, and then we sort of unilaterally say no you got it wrong, go back. In some ways that's very responsible of the GNSO council but on the other hand, you know, if we haven't all spent time on this group and really delved into this then do we really know that that's true? We have a lot of contentious PDPs in place right now and I would be very concerned if this would be, you know, this happens routinely with recommendations from PDPs.

So I - to me it would be better to maybe get a little bit more information, defer this one more meeting and/or even if we had to defer it to Hyderabad and, you know, maybe can we talk to the IAG and get a better idea of, you know, the level of consensus on this group?

James Bladel: Thanks Susan. Good thoughts. I think that in some ways your comments align with the concerns raised by Paul. So I think the - oh and just a note that I don't know that we have a mechanism to defer to Hyderabad. If we defer the motion it will come up on our next call which is before Hyderabad with no opportunity to defer.

So I think our two choices - our two viable choices are to - for me to withdraw the motion which is essentially saying we need more time. We need to have some discussions either with the IAG to go over the report or convene some of the stakeholder groups and constituencies that are raising these concerns here at counsel. So withdrawal equals more time. We put to a vote and I think you're correct: it sounds like it will not pass.

That is not necessarily the end of the line however as I think even the folks who have indicated that their stakeholder groups will not allow them to vote or have directed them to vote no I think that voting no in some ways is a clean slate and essentially says that we'll take the IAG as informative, it's report as informing future work but this is not the route that we want to go and that we need to look at tackling this a different way, perhaps through a PDP.

So I think that's kind of how I'm - and please weigh in if you feel like I'm off track here but I feel like withdrawing the motion says we need more time but we think we can salvage this and in putting the motion to a vote presuming that it does not pass is essentially saying you need to take a fresh look at this. It doesn't necessarily terminate the work. It just terminates this avenue for the issue and that's just my high level view on this and I would welcome corrections particularly from staff if I'm going - coloring too far outside the lines.

I see that the queue is clear and I would note that a withdrawal means that the motion can be reintroduced either at our next meeting or Hyderabad or thereafter or never. It really essentially is an undo for the submission.

I don't see anyone lined up so why don't I go ahead and propose to this group that I withdraw the motion and if that is agreeable to Wolf-Ulrich then we will take this off the table, off of our agenda. That does leave it as a potential to be resubmitted and - either in its current form or in some other form and I would ask then as an action item that we convene a group of counselors and/or representatives from the leadership of the different stakeholder groups to understand the path forward on this and whether or not if and when this needs to be reintroduced and I see Wolf-Ulrich is agreeing with the withdrawal. Thank you for your concurrence on that Wolf-Ulrich.

Okay well best of intentions - no - what is the saying? No good intention goes unpunished so as my - I take full responsibility by the way for the record for introducing this motion in advance of the deadline by - I knew it was in trouble from the minute it was submitted but the withdrawal, I take responsibility for that.

So then moving to - I'm sorry. Go ahead Paul.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady for the record. James, I just wanted to say no apologies are necessary. I thought today's discussion on this was helpful and so I think sometimes things like this don't make it in the first time around. That's - or even the second time around. So that - I just wanted to say thanks for putting it forward and having - giving us an opportunity to talk through it. I've certainly learned a lot from it and I think others probably have too. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Paul appreciate it and I really hope that we can - and I don't mean to call anybody out but I note that we have really helpful, constructive and spirited conversations on this during council meetings and I would hope that we could do some of that in the interim between council meetings. I think that would be maybe the best way to kind of move this train down the tracks a little bit. So but thank you Paul. Good thoughts and to everyone who contributed in the conversation. I guess my final parting thought is we need more of the exchange that we just had so more of that I think will benefit this issue.

Okay then that was the easy stuff and we are 13 minutes into our second hour so let's move on to agenda item number 6 which is a discussion and this discussion - and I'll raise this as well as - I'll turn it over to Paul as well to add his thoughts but we received a letter from Chairman Crocker and this was received in early August when we were all on our break and this was regarding the status of the subsequent rounds of new DTL applications and the letter's posted there in Adobe. Thank you (Steph) for putting that up.

But I noted in sending this to the council that the board is asking us a specific question here which is that it would be helpful to understand - and I'm just trying to read here from the letter. It would be helpful to understand whether the GNSO believes that the entirety of the current subsequent procedure PDP must be completed prior to advancing a new application process under the current policy recommendation and that they've asked us to review this question and of course we would review this with the leadership of that PDP.

Just procedurally there is - there was a board workshop upcoming so there was some question of whether or not the board was seeking an immediate answer to that question in advance of their workshop so that could be a subject of those discussions. I think we've since learned that this is not expected to be addressed

during that event however the - I believe it is the desire of the board to have this as part of a community discussion in Hyderabad.

So there is the boundaries we need to - we don't necessarily have to answer the question in this call or at this meeting but we certainly need to be working on our response to the board's questions to have them ready for - well in advance of Hyderabad so that they can be posted and reviewed by the community and then everyone can come to India prepared to discuss these issues.

So with that said I note that Paul McGrady is the liaison to that subsequent issues PDP. I don't know Paul, if you had some good posts on the council list regarding an approach on this. I think it was Phil also had some thoughts as well so I would open this up for council discussion on both the substance of the letter itself and the process and approach that we as a council and working of course with the PDP and the larger community can use to formulate our response.

So with that I see Phil up first. Phil, go ahead.

Phil Corwin: So this is Phil. I don't want to preempt Paul. I just wanted to get in the queue. So if Paul has something to say I defer to him.

Paul McGrady: Thanks Phil. This is Paul McGrady. So I don't know that I have much to say other than the co-chairs of the subsequent procedure working group are very willing and interested in being a part of this process and I think that we can either have them on our next council call briefly or find some other mechanism to hear from them or we could put questions to them in writing about where they are in terms of, you know, timing on some of these issues.

The work of that group is moving along but there are still some very basic issues that are being considered such as, you know, will subsequent procedures be round, so will they be perpetually open, application periods, will there be something else entirely, and so, you know, I would like to give them the opportunity to sort of do their best to predict what the future will look like and how quickly it will look that way but with the caveat that, you know, we've essentially just gotten started with this.

I am very thankful to Phil for putting forward the views of the BC and I think going back and actively encouraging other constituencies and stakeholder groups to do something similar would help them form the discussion as well, and so with that I will turn it over to Phil to talk a bit as well about the BC position and specifically Phil, you mentioned in the chat that you thought the question was too narrow and I'm curious to hear more about that. Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Yes thank you Paul and this is Phil for the record. Yes within the BC I've raised this issue when we first got the letter and we've had a rather robust discussion within the business constituency both during our last members meeting a week or two ago and also by email exchanges.

Number one, the consensus position we've seen in the BC is that there are in fact three ongoing processes that should be considered before finalizing the details of the next round whether it's going to be a discrete round or a permanently open application window and that's not just the work of the subsequent procedures PDP but the work of the rights protection mechanism review PDP which is completely related to and we're required to coordinate with the subsequent procedures PDP. It's clear that both of them are related to the next round and the issue of whether the new TLDRPMs are working as effectively as would be desired is very important to BC members. I'm sure it's important to other constituents and groups within the council and then we've got the review team on consumer choice competition and trust under the AOC and that's also related to this.

As to the practicalities of dealing with the board has requested which seems to be whether we could have a work stream one and two approach similar to what the accountability CCWG has had dividing issues between those that must be concluded prior to a next round and those which can be tinkered with after that process begins.

Speaking only for myself now as one of the co-chairs of the RPM working group I don't see any practical way we could divide up our work in that manner. That's not the way we've set forth a work schedule. We are adhering to our work schedule. So far we're on time and we project being finished with our work and putting out and starting on a draft report and recommendations mid-2017, summer 2017 and having that draft report and recommendations out next fall and concluded and recommendations to the board by the end of 2017.



So that's the timetable we're looking at. I don't know how the CCTRT could do a work stream 102. I leave it to the subsequent procedures PDP to speak to that issue but it would seem strange to have a working group on subsequent procedure and have a subsequent round before it's completed its work.

Having said all that the BC has no desire to unnecessarily delay a next round. We are aware that there are businesses which would like to submit up brand applications as soon as possible. We don't think it's probably likely that we could get just a dot-brands round that excludes IDNs and communities and general applications. So - and I guess we could look at whether all the work has to be done and completed and adopted and a board vote up or down on it before a subsequent round is open but I think the BC position would be that whatever modifications procedures and RPMs would have to be in place before any new TLDs in the second round actually were delegated and opened for business, but again we've got a PDP on procedures and how do you start new round procedures before their work is done?

So I'll stop there. I hope that's helpful but the one very clear thing that I hope will emerge is that the BC believes that the board's question about the subsequent procedures PDP is too narrow that we need to consider the RPM review PDP and the review team on consumer choice competition and trust as a kind of trifecta to be considered in advance of a subsequent round. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Phil for that comprehensive response from the BC. I see a queue coming up here but I just wanted to note that the language of the letter does contain a qualifier that says, "For example: assuming all other review activities are completed". And so I took that to mean the CCT review team but I think it is an open question of whether the board intended to include the reviews on the RPMs as part of the other PDP which would fall under the GNSO's remit in that qualifier. So think that's a good point and I thank you for identifying those dependencies and prerequisites that are also attached to subsequent procedures.

Next up is Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks very much James. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking and on behalf of the (ALAC) on this topic. The (ALAC) new GTLD working group has been discussing this

and has looked at the correspondence and after some discussion has conducted a straw poll of its members to find out where they stood.

The response was unanimous in saying that - and I'll just read it from the section there: "Do not start the process of a subsequent round until all necessary reviews have been completed and their reports and recommendations have been fully concerted by the ICANN community and board. This includes not just the subsequent procedures PDP referenced in Chairman Crocker's - Chairman's Crocker letter but also the RPM review PDP and the consumer choice competition and trust review mandated by the affirmation of commitments", and I hope that helps.

James Bladel: Thank you Olivier and thank you for contributing the (ALAC)'s - or at least the general sense of the - I try to avoid spreading this like temperature of the room but the general sense of the (ALAC) on this particular question. Next up is Donna. Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks James. Donna Austin. So just from a registry stakeholder group point of view (unintelligible) subsequent procedures PDP sent around a list of questions for the various SSACs to respond to which the registry stakeholder group did but we also had an additional - or highlighted an additional area that we thought was important and that was so the PDP - the subsequent PDP working group to kind of pass its work to understand what we've required, policy work, what's the implementation and how can we - how is it possible to streamline that to do it in the fastest way possible. "Fastest" isn't the best use of the word but to streamline the process to make it more efficient.

Some of you that may have been in Helsinki might've heard Jordyn Buchanan suggest that, you know, we could kick off a (unintelligible) of rounds - or additional rounds now given the existing process that we have. I'll relay that to everybody else to disagree with that but I would like to mention that the registry stakeholder group is actually - had a discussion with the board during interactions on constituency day around this for - I don't know, the last maybe three to four meetings and what - and the reason being that what we would like to see is we - I think it's really important that there is a common understanding of what has to happen before we can kick off any subsequent procedures.

And - but we also need to be aware that, you know, that the current timeline I think Akram has said that 2020 is the likely timeframe for starting a next round but, you know, that's an eight-year gap between when the 2012 round started and in initiating, you know, another process.

So how do we balance what needs to be done with ensuring that we get a reasonable timeline in there to any future around -so understanding that there is demand already for new GLTD is (unintelligible) reference certainly from some brands and, you know, there's - the figures being thrown out already that, you know, that the next round will result in, you know, 10,000 applications. So I think Paul made the comment earlier that that puts a pretty big administrative burden on ICANN.

So I think, you know, when we think about this request we should also think about it from a GNSO council perspective. What's our obligation to try to make sure that these things are done in an efficient and timely manner? So once we understand what the, you know, what needs to be done in order to get to that step to initiate a next process what do we think is a reasonable timeframe to do that in because I think, you know, really anything beyond 2020 is untenable. So I think there's an obligation on us to try to understand what needs to be done but to try to identify or put a line under it in terms of what timeline are we aiming to as well. So I'd just like to put that on the table that I think we need to consider that (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Thank you Donna. Tony is up next.

Tony Harris: Yes I'd like to refer to the place in the letter where it says that the board is looking for a sense of whether future application process could proceed while policy work continues, et cetera or that a set of critical issues should be identified to be addressed prior to a new application process.

We haven't finished discussing this in our constituency in the ISPCP but I think we can possibly point out the following things. I think we would definitely support the set of critical issues being identified upfront because if technical problems arise as we've seen with what the universal acceptance (unintelligible) will be dealing with right now that directly impacts the operations of ISPs and our call centers and the complaints that we get.

Secondly I think that for applicants who are going to invest and get involved in getting an application through - perhaps not a big brand. That's not - that probably wouldn't worry them but other types of applications, I think they need clarity on things that have gone wrong or haven't let's say prospered in the first round or that we've had in 2012. Are those things being rectified? Is there - are there mechanisms to improve the roadblocks that many applicants have found? I'm one of them and I think also this would serve to help people decide on whether they want okay apply or not for a new GTOD and I don't see how that can be something which is worked on post-application process and attributably applied. It doesn't sort of sound right. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Tony. Next I have - just to go through the queue here I have Susan and the Paul and then I put myself in the queue here because we probably need to close down the discussion here. I'm certainly aware that this will be a topic that will continue after this call but we need to be respectful for our agenda as well. So Susan, you're up next.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks James. This is Susan Kawaguchi for the record. So I do think that the GNSO council to echo Donna that we have a responsibility to really look at this and figure out what needs to be done but, you know, there's so much more involved to this than the three working groups or review teams that, you know, have been mentioned in my opinion. You know, we have an SSR review team coming up that will be seated soon and then in a few more months the Who Is review team.

You know, we're already asking a lot of the community and I know this has been a constant issue for the last year at least. You know, maybe once (IANA) transition is done then, you know, the community will have more bandwidth but so we have a lot going on and I don't know how focused we really are on the burden this would put on ICANN.

Personally from a Facebook point of view, you know, we are seeing serious issues with compliance and abuse in the new GTLDs. There's patterns of abuse that are now, you know, you can see a pattern instead of it just being okay this is the one off. Now we're seeing patterns of abuse with some registries and then that, you know, how to work with ICANN compliance and rectify that is in my opinion almost nonexistent. There's no availability of solutions I guess, and so, I mean, there's a lot of issues out there that we're starting to really see the pattern. We need to make sure

that this is a secure and stable environment and adding 10,000, you know, if that's really - I've heard that number several times, you know, adding that to ICANN's workload is - and the results we're getting now I'm really skeptical in their ability to handle it.

James Bladel: Thanks Susan. Okay. Thank you.

Susan were you done or were you just waiting for (Steph) to clear that (unintelligible)...

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes that was it. I'm done.

James Bladel: Oh okay all right. I just - there was some noise on the line. I wanted to make sure that you had a chance to finish your thoughts there.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

James Bladel: Thank you. Excellent comments. Paul, you're up next.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady. I tried to raise this on the list and I don't think I did an artful job. I'm trying to understand what the motivation is for this letter in the first place, right? I asked if it was about application fees. And I think the list response was essentially no, it's not about money.

And then I'm kind of wondering is the board under pressure from somebody to move this along more quickly than it looks like it's going to be moved. Is the letter purely for their information and planning purpose? It's not designed to make anybody feel like we need to move faster.

Does anybody have any insight into why the letter came in the first place?

I wanted - you know, obviously we want to be responsive to the board but I'd also like to understand the motivation for the letter so that - you know, so that we're responsive in, you know, the most respectful way we can be, right, because clearly this is an important enough issue for, you know, Dr. Crocker to send the note. So any insight on that would be very welcome. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Paul. I agree it would be helpful to understand if they were trying to address some specific external pressure or something perhaps that is coming through the board. I would suspect -- although I have nothing to back this up -- is that it's probably a mixture of motivations. There might not be one single motivator.

But we could certainly consider whether that is something that we could include in our response as to ask them in our response if there is something in particular that is driving this concern or that is prompting this inquiry, you know, and perhaps even put out feelers and see if we can get ahead of that prior to our response.

Tony, is that an old hand or? I wanted to make sure the queue was clear before I tried to summarize our discussion here and move us through our agenda. I don't know if Tony's still on the line.

Okay. So I'm just trying to summarize here what - because I think we captured a number of good points here in this conversation.

And that's exactly what I was hoping to achieve with this agenda item is that first off I think Paul's original suggestion going back to when he kicked off this topic of making sure that the other stakeholder groups and constituencies follow the BC's example and put the - you know, some sort of a formal consensus statement towards the GNSO, I think that we should ask each of the leaderships of the FCs and Cs to do that and to help us inform this in addition to and alongside of the examination of this question in the context of the PDPs.

Phil I think has identified some key dependencies, not only with the subsequent procedures but also the review of the RPMs and then the review team associated with the consumer trust. I think Rubens and Susan have noted some other reviews that are either ongoing or starting that may also be relevant to addressing the board's question.

I think Donna and Tony as well I think raised some practical concerns about -- and I'm going to shoot from the hip here a little bit so I certainly don't want to attribute these thoughts to them because I don't know that I've captured them -- but something

along the lines of, you know, can we be working on some of these things while an application period is open.

Can we be - which items are on the Work Stream 1 critical path, if you will, and which items can be addressed on the fly as we go? And while that sounds ad hoc, it's probably worth remembering that we are still here in 2016 -- toward the end of 2016 - - working on things that affect applications that were applied for in 2012.

So it's not like the opening of an application window is the end of a process. It's actually the beginning of another lengthy window that gives us the opportunity to continue to address these matters.

So which of these have to be done before that window opens? Which have to be - can be done during? Which can be done after? And I think that's generally what the board is asking us to do is sequence this out for us here and show us how all of these parts inform each other and fit together.

So that's generally what I took away from this conversation. I thought it was a helpful and constructive discussion.

I do note however that we are on the hook to provide a response in a relatively timely manner so let's boil it down to some action items.

I think first and foremost if we could ask staff and councilors to identify someone from each stakeholder group and constituency that will take this back to their respective groups and work on developing a statement that conforms somewhat to the model that we heard from the BC and also from the ALAC and try to bring that to the council list as soon as possible but certainly not any later than the document cutoff for our next meeting later in September.

So if there are no objections, we can set that as a deadline for that particular piece of homework and have everyone else go out and collect those informations. And then we will also in parallel pursue a similar course with the subsequent procedures' PDP.

I noticed, (Sue), we've got a couple of folks joining the queue. Donna's - oh okay, Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Just a question to clarify. So what is the timeline? I'm not seeing this as a short timeline.

James Bladel: Sorry Susan, I think maybe I probably glossed over that a little too quickly. But we were concerned that we had to have something resolved on this particular call and we've since learned that I believe that it is the board's intention to have a discussion, a community discussion, on this topic in Hyderabad.

So we should have a response to the board well in advance of Hyderabad -- just shooting from the hip here, that looks at early to late September and our next meeting which I believe is September 29 -- or something that we can present outside of a meeting we can present to the board in early October.

Susan Kawaguchi: So there wouldn't - you know, that seems very short but. So we wouldn't have the opportunity to talk to the - discuss this with the board our first day of meetings in India and then they could discuss with the community?

James Bladel: I don't think it's necessarily an either/or, Susan. I think we can certainly do both.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

James Bladel: But I think that we - you know, to the point of the letter, we've been asked to do something fairly specifically to allow the board to prepare for that session in India. And I think that we should work to equip them with our thoughts so that they can hold those sessions in India.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

James Bladel: But I think, you know, this is going to be ongoing. I think if we can get some feedback from the stakeholder groups, the constituencies, the DNSO Council, synthesize all those up -- even, you know, stitch them together with the responses we're getting from the PDPs -- all of that can be fodder for the discussion in Hyderabad.

Okay. But thank you again for - everyone. I thought that was a constructive conversation.



We have 17 minutes until Heather's weekend begins so let's see if we can plow through some of the rest of these agenda items.

Item number eight: council discussion on proposed cost control mechanisms and the validation of the budget for the CCWG accountability and the ongoing work there.

Just a note that I think we should thank staff, not just the GNSO staff but also the ICANN executive staff, CCWG co-chairs and the Office of the CFO -- for holding that Webinar. I note that a number of councilors and other members of the GNSO community were able to attend that Webinar. And I thought it was very informative and helpful. And I note that a number of the folks who attended that Webinar raised some fairly thoughtful questions and it was a good discussion.

So oh, you know, what? I did skip number seven. Sorry Rubens, my apologies. We'll circle back to that one. I apologize for jumping ahead but, you know, wishful thinking on my part.

But I just wanted to note that we at some point to be asked to approve the budget that includes the cost control mechanisms for the ongoing work of CCWG accountability. I think one of the biggest items that was discussed most extensively and probably because it was one of the largest cost drivers of the CCWG work was the Legal Committee that was established and proposed.

But if anyone has any thoughts on that session, the Webinar, any of the topics that were raised in that session or any recommendations on how or proposals on how the council should go forward or anything else that we need before we would consider approving that - those cost control mechanisms and that ongoing budget, we can open up that discussion now.

Okay so I have a queue. I have Paul and Ed. Paul, you're up first.

Paul McGrady: Thanks James. Paul McGrady here. So I guess what I took away primarily from that Webinar was that if there is serious consideration of reopening up ICANN's formation of jurisdiction in the Jurisdiction Work Stream 2 subgroup that this budget's woefully

inadequate for that. I mean, it took millions and millions of dollars to settle on California where we already were.

And so I'm wondering if we're asked to approve it, do we approve it subject to an understanding that that issue will not be reopened because if it is, this is not enough.

I mean, do we have - should we be affirmative in stating as a council that we feel satisfied that Work Stream 1 should not be overturned by changing the jurisdictional - you know, the formation jurisdiction? I think that it's sort of - asking us to approve this sort of forces that question out.

I think it would be appropriate for us to say that we don't think Work Stream 1 should be overturned by looking at the jurisdiction formation issue and that the jurisdiction subteam should look at things that are, you know, important but not necessarily that question.

So I just throw that out as an open-ended question since the approval process will force us to look at that, the legal budget, and say whether or not it's sufficient.  
Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Paul. And I remember you were raising that during the Webinar and I apologize that I neglected to cover that in my summary.

I - you know, I -- and maybe just naively -- I came away feeling a little bit better -- at least listening to (Thomas) and some of the co-chairs -- that that wasn't within the scope of what Work Stream 2 was tasked to do.

But to your point, if we need to use the approval process to fiscally constrain that work to limit that jurisdiction question, then we should consider doing so. Ed, you're up next.

Ed Morris: Yes thanks James. Paul's right. If we're going to change jurisdiction at this point, Lord, you're looking at over \$5, 6 million in legal expenses alone every six months. There's no question about that. I don't see that as a likely outcome but if it were to happen, this whole thing has to be torn up.

I do have a few concerns. And by the way the Webinar was excellent. And thanks to everybody who organized it.

Travel is a concern for me and particularly those of us who are actually doing the work in Work Stream 2. Twenty slots period. And they're going only to members. Now members were those who were appointed by the organization. But when I look at the people doing the work and I look at the members, there is some overlap but not a great deal.

So we're actually going to have a situation where the rapporteurs -- the ones who are organizing the stock groups -- will not be at the face-to-face meetings unless they have other forms of support whereas members -- some of whom aren't even active in Work Stream 2 -- are getting support.

I think that's not the way we should go. I think we should at least let the tri-chairs know that that's something they should look at again.

I'm a bit concerned about the lack of support for staff expenditures. When I delved into the numbers, we're looking at the equivalent of \$808,000 for staff support for Work Stream 2 as compared to \$1.7 million for staff support for transition implementation.

Now I'm already experiencing some of the lack of staff support. As a rapporteur for the CEP Group, I get my staff report three weeks late and it's horrid. I mean, I know in council we are spoiled with our great staff but I get something that was outdated and is about a year old. And I've sent it back. And that's a concern.

I can speak a little bit more clearly to the legal expenses. We - we're budgeted at \$1.4 million which is about 13% of what we spent in Work Stream 1. Now we have resurrected the legal executive -- which I'm on. There are seven of us on it. We did - we hired the firms. And I think it's a good group of people that work well together and this is a good thing.

However they are restricting us in what we can do. One of my concerns there is they have Sidley almost as a project manager.

So when we do make a response, I would suggest that we ask them to reconsider that and put it back in the hands of the Legal Committee where it was.

And here's the reason for this. The lead counsel on Sidley bills us at about \$1,250 an hour. These are public records. The name consulate Adler bills us at \$625 an hour. I would like to us to have the ability -- with the budgetary constraints we're under -- to send the questions to the most cost efficient independent council.

We're also being told to use ICANN in-house and Jones Day where appropriate. Knowing the folks on the Legal Committee, I doubt we're going to find that appropriate very often.

One last point about the \$1.4 million which I thought was quite unusual. That is the total amount for legal expenditure we're budgeted for for the entire Work Stream 2 project.

Now what's unusual about this is Work Stream 2 is going to be conducted over two fiscal years, fiscal year '17 and fiscal year '18. We only had \$1.4 million for both fiscal years which, you know, (unintelligible) we could mean a lot when I was doing the budget letter for us earlier this year. I can't recall another project of ICANN that has a budget spanning two years.

So one of the things I think we should suggest -- given our concern that it's not enough money -- is to suggest that that \$1.4 million is what we have available for fiscal year '17 and we revisit the issue for fiscal year '18 as the time comes. Thanks so much James.

James Bladel: Thanks Ed. Appreciate your comments and I know that you're very close to a lot of these issues like a number of other folks but appreciate the specifics on that.

Just noting the time here, we have eight minutes remaining. We have a couple of other items to go. So I put myself in the queue just more as a bookend here. But Phil, you're up next.

Phil Corwin: Thanks James. Phil Corwin for the record. Yes I was on that Webinar too. And let me state -- these are personal views -- I'm all in favor of working within a reasonable

budget and not spending money unnecessarily. Having said that, I have to observe the issues being addressed in Work Stream 2 are not issues that are less important than the ones that are addressed in Work Stream 1. They are simply issues that didn't have to be resolved prior to the IANA transition.

Many of them are very important issues regarding staff accountability, board accountability, increased transparency of the organization. And frankly those are issues where I wouldn't be comfortable relying on Jones Day or in-house legal staff just to make sure you're getting a fully comprehensive and impartial advice.

I think the lawyers committee may feel the same way based on what Ed just said. I think it's fine to have a lawyers committee vetting this stuff.

What I'm - so I'm basically concerned that 10% of what was spent on the Work Stream 1 issues is unreasonably low.

I'm also concerned that even if that \$1.4 million is expended and the lawyers committee recommends allocating additional amounts that the final decision on whether there'll be any more money allocated to additional legal advice is for the board, which is the group that is most - we're most focused on in terms of accountability. So I have some real problems.

And finally in regard to \$1,250 an hour billing rates, you know, I'm sure they're giving excellent advice for that money but that's an extremely, you know, high, very top-of-the-chart hourly rate.

And in this day and age for this level and volume of work, organizations generally negotiate rates which work out to a considerably under-the-hour hourly rate. And if ICANN is paying \$1,250 an hour, then somebody needs to negotiate better with the law firms. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Phil. And I think you're correct to point out that really its legal costs are a significant driver for the overall budget.

Okay I put myself in the end of the queue here because I - unfortunately due to a time constraints, we're going to have to saw off the discussion here. We have a

number of folks that are going to drop at the top of the hour. And I'm worried in fact that we might lose quorum so that's - we've - gives us about five minutes.

I skipped number seven. It was an accident at the time but now it's intentional. We're probably not going to have a moment to circle back on that.

But that is a review of the cross-community working group on the Internet governance. And just a note that we will be asked I believe in Hyderabad to re-charter or consider re-chartering that group or perhaps converting it into something else.

The item number eight which we just discussed.

There's item number nine which is planning and scheduling for Hyderabad. Heather made some good proposals to change the approach that we have to scheduling GNSO sessions. So thank you for kicking that off Heather. I think that was very helpful. Wolf-Ulrich and others I think weighed in as well.

I put some ideas or some bullet points there and there doesn't seem to be any objections but if you have additional thoughts or concerns, please respond to that thread.

Otherwise we will proceed according. But otherwise I would say for planning, make sure you are starting the VISA application process because all indications are that that is a real bear and takes some time to navigate getting through that. And if we run into areas where we need assistance from the Travel or Meetings Team, then perhaps we can liaise through GNSO staff and Glen to make sure we get the necessary documentation. I'm saying that with an eye to Carlos' recent post on the list.

So that brings us to AOB in three minutes. Just a note that we do have that note from Chris Disspain regarding the status of IGO acronyms. The note references that there will be upcoming - there will be a proposal forthcoming.

We have - are still awaiting that proposal but I think it's fair to say we could expect that in advance of our next meeting. So be on the lookout for that and certainly feel

free to kick off the discussion on the mailing list if you'd like to discuss the specifics of Chris' note.

We have open liaisons that we've also discussed. And I think that there was a good proposal from -- I believe if memory serves -- that was Amr about opening that up, not only to current councilors but to incoming councilors who will be coming after - who will be seated at Hyderabad. And I think that's a good point.

We have a timeline coming up for chair and vice-chair elections which, yay, we get to do that again. And that will happen in ICANN 57. So we'll start that - we'll take that to the list and make sure that that timeline is posted and published.

And then I believe it was Phil that wanted to discuss AOB item number 10.4 which is proposed measures for the two-letter labels that would be released.

Okay, so I have a queue here. I think Ed, is that an old hand? If so, if you wouldn't mind clearing that. I have a couple of minutes here for Marilia and Phil. And I certainly want to give you both an opportunity to speak before we start to lose councilors. So please be mindful of that. And Marilia, go ahead.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you James. This is Marilia speaking. I will be very quick just about point seven that we sort of skipped. I think that the CWG on Internet governance has appeared in the agenda of the council several times. And I personally fail to understand what we are looking at here.

If we are looking for specific join the charter or if the council wants to review the charter, I think that we should be clear about which are this point so we can convey this to the chair and the co-chair of the CWG so they can internally discuss and present their views on the issue as well. I think that we are inviting them over and over again.

We are lucky to have Olivier as a like liaison in any case but I think that we are sort of raising the discussion without getting anywhere. It could be good if we can formulate our concerns or our requests more clearly. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you Marilia. And to be clear, I think that here it was a discussion point for - to review. We last had an update from this group in Helsinki and we will have to consider the charter in Hyderabad. So in the intervening council meetings, it's showing up as a discussion item.

And so nothing specific is being asked except to discuss and give all the councilors an opportunity to raise questions. So - but thank you for that point. I think it is good to remind ourselves to be specific. Phil, you're up.

Phil Corwin: Thanks James. Phil for the record. Quickly on 10.4, we can take that to the e-mail list. I just want to better understand the process and make sure that we're not having a staff-created policy where there should be a GNSO-created policy for two-letter - treatment of two-letter, second-level names at GTODs.

On 10.1 I previously expressed my concern that this board subgroup has been meeting for nearly two years with a GAC IGO small group and has had no similar closed-door meetings with anyone from the GSNO when they're trying to resolve a conflict between GNSO advice and GAC advice.

On whatever specifics that are coming from them, I just want to note that in two hours I will be co-chairing a call of a working group on two of the rights processes for IGOs. And we're today beginning our work on our final report and recommendation.

So if that board group has anything to tell us, they better tell us soon if they want us to consider at all. We've been waiting for more than a year. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Phil. And that is a good point. Donna, you're up next.

Donna Austin: Thanks James. Donna Austin. So Phil, on the two-character issue, I have a very good understanding of the process that has been developed over the last two years. I'm not sure that it falls into the category of, you know, staff-developing policy. But if you could on the list explain why you think or you fear that is the case that would be helpful and then we can continue the discussion then.



This process on two character has changed course a number of times and ultimately the reason being because of a number of interventions from the GAC along the path of the last two years. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you Donna. Okay. So we have a couple of items here that folks have noted that they will raise on the list. And I would ask them both to please do that quickly while it's fresh in mind for everyone else. And for others that want to weigh in on those items, please do so on the list.

I take Amr's point that we've deferred the CCWG IG twice now so we will move it up a little bit higher in the agenda so that it benefits from the time. And I do apologize again for skipping it this time.

You know, just another final parting note here before we let everybody go that we can take as many of these items to the list. And I think we should encourage folks to raise these items and discuss them on the list so that we can maximize our times on the calls which is a little more scarce.

So with that, I would ask if there are any other points of order here. Otherwise, we can adjourn this particular call and take these items to the list with an updated action item from staff to come.

Okay. Team, the queue is clear. Thank you everyone for your time, particularly those who woke up very, very early and for those like Heather who stayed up very, very late. Certainly appreciate everyone accommodating this schedule and will look for your comments on the list and talk to you again in a few weeks.

Man 1: Thank you.

Man 2: Thank you all.

Man 3: Have a good one.

Coordinator: Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining.

Woman 1: Thanks a lot.

Woman 2: Operator (Barbie), if you can please disconnect, I'll remain in line. Concluding recording. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

END