

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Council meeting  
Thursday, 13 July 2017 at 21:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-13jul17-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p5hfunq2kzt/>

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

Date: 13 July 2017

Coordinated Universal Time: 21:00 UTC:

<http://tinyurl.com/ydfq7c6q>

14:00 Los Angeles; 17:00 Washington; 22:00 London; (Friday 14 July) 00:00 Istanbul; 07:00 Hobart

**List of attendees:**

**NCA – Non Voting** – Erika Mann (Absent – apology sent)

**Contracted Parties House**

Registrar Stakeholder Group: James Bladel, Michele Neylon, Darcy Southwell

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 (left 1 hour 20 minutes into the call, Proxy given to Wolf-Ulrich Knoben), Paul McGrady, Heather Forrest

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Martin Silva Valent, Stephanie Perrin, Stefania Milan (Absent-apology sent, Proxy to Marilia Maciel but since no show proxy then given to Martin Silva Valent) Ed Morris (Absent-apology sent, temporary Alternate Avri Dori), Avri Dori, Marilia Maciel (Absent), Rafik Dammak, (on call but due to audio issue gave proxy to Stephanie Perrin)

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Julf (Johan) Helsingius

**GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:**

Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison

Ben Fuller - ccNSO Observer

Carlos Raul Gutierrez– GNSO liaison to the GAC

**Invited Guest:**

Jeff Neuman – Co-Chair of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

**ICANN Staff**

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

Marika Konings – Vice President, Policy Development Support - GNSO

Mary Wong – Sr Director, Special Adviser For Strategic Policy Planning

Julie Hedlund – Policy Director

Steve Chan - Senior Policy Manager, Policy Development Support

Amr Elsadr – Policy Manager

Berry Cobb – Policy consultant

Emily Barabas – Policy Analyst

Mike Brennan – Technical Support

Sara Caplis – Technical Support

Terri Agnew - Secretariat Services Coordinator, GNSO

Michelle DeSmyter – Secretariat Services Coordinator GNSO / GDD

Coordinator: Recordings are started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 13th of July 2017. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? James Bladel?

James Bladel: Here.

Terri Agnew: Donna Austin?

Donna Austin: Here.

Terri Agnew: Rubens Kuhl?

Rubens Kuhl: Present.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Keith Drasek?

Keith Drasek: Here.

Terri Agnew: Darcy Southwell? We will go ahead and track down Darcy. Michele Neylon?

Michele Neylon: Here.

Terri Agnew: Valerie Tan?

Valerie Tan: Here.

Terri Agnew: Phil Corwin?

Philip Corwin: Here.

Terri Agnew: Susan Kawaguchi?

Susan Kawaguchi: Here.

Terri Agnew: Paul McGrady? We'll go ahead and check into Paul as well. Just circling back I do show where Darcy Southwell has joined us. Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen?

Terri Agnew: And we'll go ahead and track down Wolf. Rafik Dammak sends in his apologies. He's given his proxy to Stephanie Perrin. Stephanie Perrin?

Stephanie Perrin: Here.

Terri Agnew: He's given his proxy to Stephanie – thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: Stefania Milan sends in her apologies. She's given her proxy to Marilia Maciel. Marilia Maciel – proxy to Marilia Maciel. Marilia – and we'll go ahead and connect with Marilia as well. Heather Forrest?

Heather Forrest: Sorry. Sorry – mute. Present.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Tony Harris?

Anthony Harris: Yes I'm here.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Ed Morris sends in his apologies and his temporary alternate is Avri Doria. Avri Doria ?

Avri Doria: I'm here.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Martin Silva Valent?

Martin Valent: Here.

Terri Agnew: Johan Helsingius?

Johan Helsingius: Here.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here.

Terri Agnew: Carlos Raul Guterrez?

Carlos Guterrez: Here Terri on the phone only. Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Ben Fuller? And I do show where Ben is connected and we'll go ahead and work on his audio. Erika Mann also sent in her apology as well. From staff we have Mary Wong, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Amr Elsadr, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Michelle Desmyter, Mike Brennan for technical support and myself, Terri Agnew.

If I could please remind all to state your name before speaking for remote participation and transcription purposes. With this I'll turn it back over to James. Please begin.

James Bladel: Thank you Terri and just as an audio check can you hear me okay because I know a number of folks had audio problems?

Anthony Harris: Perfect.

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: I do confirm the audio as well.

James Bladel: Great. Thank you. Okay thank you Terri and welcome everyone to the GNSO Council call for the 13th of July 2017. As Terri noted we have a number of apologies for today's call and we have the folks who are either alternates or proxies, so please be aware of that when that comes up for a vote.

I just wanted to just personally say thank you to everyone who was able to attend and to staff as well since we moved this call while we were in Johannesburg.

We moved the call up a week and that compressed the entire calendar and everyone on staff, you know, Emily, Nathalie, Terri, Marika, Mary, Steve and I'm sure I'm forgetting folks did a fantastic job of getting everything lined up given a shortened and abbreviated window in between meetings so thank you very much for that.

Let's move then to Item Number 1.2 for updates of Statements of Interest. Does anyone have any updates for their Statement of Interest or their status as a Councilor?

Please raise your hand in the Adobe room or get my attention if you're audio-only. Okay seeing none does anyone have any recommended changes or edits to our agenda?

The agenda was circulated to the Council list earlier this week and it appears in the center window and the right hand column of the Adobe room. Any comments or edits to our agenda at this time?

Okay thank you. Let's then move on to 1.4 and note that the minutes for the previous two GNSO Council meetings – that was our meeting in – on the 18th of May as well as our meeting in – was posted while we were in Johannesburg.

Our meeting in Johannesburg – the minutes were circulated to the list on the 10th of July so just a little earlier this week, and they are expected to be posted to the GNSO Web page on the 20th of July.

So if there are any comments or concerns or notes regarding those minutes, please take a look at get those responses in before the 20th. Okay next up on our agenda is a review of our projects list and our action item list.

And if I could ask staff to pull those up and acknowledging certainly that there probably have not been a whole lot of movement on these items since our last meeting was only just a couple of weeks ago.

But we will run through them in an abbreviated fashion and give everyone an opportunity to weigh in with any questions or comments or to table any new ideas that they might want to raise.

First up is our projects and as you can see we have no items in scoping or initiation. We have several items that are considered to be active working groups including a couple of PDPs and our participation in Cross-Community Working Group efforts.

I note that one of those, the CWG on – see I missed it or maybe it's already been moved off. I was looking for the one on country and territory names. Oh there it is second from the bottom of Section 4.

I'm expecting that that will probably be moving into a Council deliberation phase as of this meeting or the next. Heather or Carlos as participants on that group do you think it's the – a correct assessment to say that we'll see some movement on that project code? Heather go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks James. Look there isn't a set timeline in either the charter or the final report. What is necessary is that we need to take a vote on expressing GNSO support or not for the outcomes.

I would suggest that we – and the reason it's still a discussion item on today's agenda and not a vote is we need a bit of time to discuss in light of the broader environment let's say on developments in relation to geographic names.

I don't think we want to be strategic. I'm not suggesting we push the vote out indefinitely but it may be that we need a bit more time than August. So I would suggest James that this is certainly something to be done before Abu Dhabi.

We're going to put our ears to the ground and see where the ccNSO, the other chartering organization, is on this but I would suspect that this is probably on our agenda for August/September. Thanks.

James Bladel: Perfect. Thank you Heather for providing that update and we'll look to the next meeting then to see some movement on the CCWG on country and territory names.

Does anyone else have any comments or updates on the status of our existing working groups? And Heather I didn't catch if that was an old hand or – okay.

And then you see as well we have a number of items that are in the implementation phase. I think most particularly we have a couple of things, for example the PDPs on translation/transliteration, privacy/proxy accreditation issues, PPSAI, the holdover item for inter-registrar transfer policies and the Thick WHOIS PDP as well.

So all of those are in some various states of implementation. I think we are – we're – I'm hearing just as – from the registrars that we will see some updates on the IRTPC issue, perhaps not in time for this meeting but between now and our September meeting as well.

Okay. Next up we can take a look at our action item list and I'll give staff a moment to load that. Okay and just noting that items that are green are marked as completed and will not appear on the next action item list.

Items that are blue are in progress. So scrolling down it looks like we've – I think blue – the first item blue or the changing of the name of the GNSO has been deferred so that one probably – the green item – first on green item should actually be blue.

We have an item on our agenda today regarding the appointment of the GNSO representative to the Empowered Community Administration. We are considering the fundamental bylaws changes and the PDP travel team support pilot program.

I can report that per our discussions in Johannesburg we have transmitted that notification to all of the active PDPs, and we are receiving applications for travel support from PDP leadership individuals and Donna and Heather

and I will set up a meeting early next week, I believe Monday, to evaluate those applications.

The ICANN60 schedule is a work in progress and will be discussed later today. The GAC communiqué for Johannesburg – that's been drafted and is on our topics for today.

The chair election schedule has been posted and hopefully all of your stakeholder groups and constituencies are on track to conduct their internal elections and get those results submitted to the GNSO, which I think the deadline for that was sometime in September.

There is a – an open discussion item, which we can talk about. It was listed as AOB on the standing committee for budget and operations and making that more of a yearlong process rather than a deadline-oriented effort.

The CCWG on IG is on our agenda today. The change of registrant issues is in progress but will not hit our agenda today. I expect that we'll see some of that in the interim between now and September, and the reconvened PDP is also underway but not on our agenda today.

WHOIS is complete and the outstanding PDP improvements and IGO recommendations are still open. So just noting a couple of items where the color coding is off but I think everyone just – since it's been just only a couple of weeks since we went through this action item list, and I think everyone's got a good handle on where we are.

So does anyone have any updates, comments or questions for me, for staff or for any of the PDP or working group leadership on any of these action items? Okay seeing none then we could probably close this and go back to our agenda.

Thanks everyone for sitting through that little bit of tedium while we give staff a window here to open that up. So – okay then moving on to Agenda Item Number 3, which is our consent agenda, the consent agenda consists of one item at this time and that was the selection of myself as the GNSO representative to the Empowered Community Administration.

Just as a reminder we – as a Council we adopted a process which essentially asks the chairs of the Council to select one from the three of us. I've been serving in an interim capacity since this was called for back in, you know, back in the early part of the year.

And I think we all just decided it would be much simpler if we just continued forward with that through – from now through Abu Dhabi and then make the next change in conjunction with the next set of chair and vice chair elections, which will be coming up at that meeting. So hopefully that's a fairly non-controversial decision...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...that was arrived at from the chairs.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: And if there's any discussion on this item we can certainly move it to a full vote agenda item, but otherwise in the absence of that we can move to a – an acclimation vote on the consent agenda.

I see a couple of folks typing so I'll just let that play out for a second here. Okay. Okay so if there are no objections then Terri would you do the honors and conduct the vote on the consent agenda item please?

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Certainly. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion?  
Please say your name. Hearing no one would anyone like to vote against  
this motion?

Hearing none would all those in favor in the motion please say aye.

Group: Aye.

Terri Agnew: Stephanie Perrin, the proxy for Rafik Dammak, please express your vote.

Stephanie Perrin: Aye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. And we are still missing Marilia Maciel who is proxy for Stefania  
Milan. We'll continue trying to reach her as well. At this time with no  
abstentions or objection the motion passes.

James Bladel: Thank you Terri. And just to confirm with Marilia missing and also holding a  
proxy for Stefania that does not change our – we still have a quorum and we  
still successfully passed the motion.

I just want to confirm that and maybe rather than put you on the spot and  
make you – through – dig through the bylaws maybe that's something you  
can just confirm while we move on with our agenda if you don't mind.

And we should probably continue to try to reach out to Marilia because we're  
down to – for some of the other items. So just a note that Mary has posted in  
the chat that the GAC has confirmed Thomas Schneider will remain the  
GAC's representative to the ECA until his term is up, which I believe is – also  
coincides with ICANN60.

And one other note here is that I anticipate that almost all of the work  
associated with the – our community will occur between now and presumably  
the end of July, and after that I expect it will be fairly quiet again.

So – but I certainly will report back to Council if there's any updates on that. Okay thank you everyone for participating in that item, and we'll move on to Number 4 and this one's a little more involved.

It's a proposal by the board that was sent to the Empowered Community to change the – amend the fundamental bylaws for reconsideration requests. This was the subject of our first ever community forum, which was held in Johannesburg on the second day I believe of the meeting.

And per the new bylaws we have to – we - as a decisional participant the GNSO has to either approve or deny this by – I believe by the 21st. So very close to the deadline for our original date for the meeting, but it certainly helps that we've moved this up a little bit.

We do know that some stakeholder groups and constituencies within the GNSO have already indicated their support for this proposed amendment to the fundamental bylaws, and that we had some other groups that were still working to obtain that.

I can report just from the registrar perspective that we did have a brief consultation with our ExCom and informed them of the approval from other areas of the GNSO.

And I believe we now have a green light from our – Council support it as well. That's something that's changed since we were all last together again in Johannesburg.

So I'll introduce the motion. I'm still looking for a second if anyone is so inclined and then we can proceed with the discussion and a vote. Okay thanks Donna.

Donna's seconding so we can record that. I'll just note the result clauses. The GNSO Council votes to approve the amendment to Section 4.2 of the ICANN bylaws, being an amendment to an ICANN fundamental bylaw as detailed in the board resolution of 18 May 2017 and there's the link.

Two, the GNSO Council directs the GNSO Secretariat to forward this resolution to the Empowered Community Administration before the expiration of the approval action decision period as required under Section 1.4, Article 1, Annex B of the ICANN bylaws.

And three, the Council – GNSO Council directs James Bladel, the GNSO interim representative to the Empowered Community Administration, to coordinate with the other four decisional participant representatives to ensure that the Empowered Community Administration observes and completes the appropriate processes outlined in Section 1.4(b) and (c) of Annex C.

That's the motion as made by me, seconded by Donna and we'll open up now for a queue if anyone would like to discuss this topic or our next steps associated with this - fundamental bylaws.

It's not a very controversial or engaging topic apparently or we just got all of our thoughts out on the table in the community forum perhaps. Yes not controversial.

I was just saying that as well. Okay well if there are – no one is interested in speaking for or against this motion we can certainly just proceed to a vote in the interest of expediting this, because we do have a number of other items that might not go so smoothly.

So if there are no other concerns then Terri would you mind conducting the vote on Agenda Item Number 4? And if you would please if there are no objections we could proceed with the – a vote by acclimation.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say your name. Hearing no one would anyone like to vote against this motion? Hearing none would all those in favor of the motion please say aye?

Group: Aye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Thank you. Stephanie Perrin, proxy for Rafik Dammak, please express your vote.

Stephanie Perrin: Aye.

Terri Agnew: And we are still trying to reach Marilia Maciel who holds also proxy for Stefania Milan, but even with the two absent the motion does pass. So at this time officially with no abstention nor objection the motion passes.

James Bladel: Okay thank you Terri and thank you Councilors and thanks everyone to – who participated in the community forum in South Africa. I thought that was a good shakedown for the – for this process and for the Empowered Community Administration.

The next item on our agenda is a placeholder, and the placeholder is there because the Council would have to consider and vote on any petitions arising from a stakeholder group or constituency to reject the fiscal year '18 operating plan and budget.

I'm not aware of any proposed petitions at this time but that certainly doesn't mean that they're not circulating out there. So at this time I'd like to formally ask any Councilors if you are holding a petition from your stakeholder group, constituency or ExCom on behalf of any of those groups to reject the fiscal year '18 budget and you would like the GNSO to consider that petition.

It doesn't look like anyone has a petition to reject the budget. I would note that – and Mary's probably going to correct me here if I go too far afield. But I would note that petitions may arise from other stakeholder groups – sorry, other SOs and ACs and that those petitions would be necessary to be considered by the GNSO by the – think it's by the 21st of July.

So it may become necessary - if another petition is filed by some of those other organizations it may become necessary for us to discuss it on our list and to conduct either an electronic ballot or to hold our meeting on July 20 as scheduled in order to consider that petition.

So – and I'm just trying to keep up with the chat here. Yes. No petitions so far that I'm aware of and Michele yes this is a new thing. So – okay but just to note that you do have a meeting on your calendar for July 20 to consider petitions that might arise from other SOs and ACs, and if none are presented then it won't – would not be necessary for us to hold that meeting on the 20th and it will be canceled.

Okay thank you for your indulgence on that little bit of bureaucracy and we'll move on then to Item Number 6, which is a Council vote on approval of the review and response of the GAC communiqué from Johannesburg.

Phil Corwin has taken the lead on drafting some language because the main thrust of the GAC advice coming out of Johannesburg was involving the IGO access to curative rights, which is currently the subject of a PDP.

And so Phil and a small team got together to work on these - particular response that you see in the document in front of us. That language was circulated to the list and Marika has taken it and put it into our, you know, standard template that we use for these types of responses.

Additionally, the two co-chairs of the Sub Pro PDP, which is Jeff Neuman and Avri, made a recommendation that we respond to some mentions of the geographic name sessions that were included in the GAC communiqué.

But these were present in the communiqué but they were not part of the GAC advice, so they don't – as you could see they don't exactly fit this template format.

It's just a couple of columns there on Page 5. And I note that a number of folks perhaps may not have had an opportunity to fully review that addition. But given that we, you know, this was a big part of the meeting - the Policy Forum in Johannesburg and given that we have had a number of discussions on this topic at the Council level, we want to try to see if we can have it both ways here and get this included into our response in a timely fashion while still preserving the value and the impact of the response when the board meets with the GAC, which is scheduled for early August.

So our options here are to discuss the entire document, discuss anything that we'd like to add as far as on the addition on Page 5 and go from there. At this time I think other folks would like to weigh in.

I know that the registries had some discussions here so would certainly invite their Councilors as well as Jeff/Avri if they would like to weigh in on this topic as well. But first in the queue is Paul so Paul you're up. Go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks James. Paul McGrady. I just wanted to raise my hand and I'll put it back down but as we get past the issue of the IGOs and we get to the paragraph that Rubens added at the bottom regarding geo terms, I'd like to talk through the language that's been proposed there.

But I didn't want to, you know, I just wanted to be put in the queue a bit towards the end. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Paul and that's fair. Let's take a look first at the IGO bit as well because that I think is the issue that was - I don't want to say targeted. That's not the right word but that was the issue that was the focus of the GAC's invite to the board in the Johannesburg communiqué.

So let's take a look first at that and I would certainly invite Phil or any of the other folks who are pretty close to this to weigh in. I know Phil did quite a bit of heavy lifting putting this language together.

And specifically I think the theme of this response is that the PDP, you know, recognizes the divergences between GAC advice and the PDP's at least initial recommendations, but it is taking those on board as part of their comments. So Phil I'll let you speak to that first part if you don't mind. Go ahead.

Philip Corwin: Yes. Yes thank you James. Phil for the record. I'll be as brief as possible. The – while this was the only item of GAC advice in the Johannesburg communiqué, there's really nothing new in the advice.

It's really - just as with geo names it's a reiteration of a prior position. What's new is that I guess this is based on a discussion in the open face-to-face meeting of the Curative Rights Working Group in Johannesburg that we not surprisingly – well because it's consistent with our initial report where we made the recommendations, which substantially deliver – differ from the GAC advice which was advice to establish an entirely separate CRP simple – only for IGOs and to deny domain registrants any – national courts in regard to such disputes with IGOs.

And then they went on to call on the ICANN Board to ensure that we've – the working group had adequately reflected – well I guess they want the board to tell us that our final recommendations should reflect the input and expertise provided by the IGOs.

I refrained in the draft comment from stating explicitly that the board had no power to direct any working group to reach any particular conclusion. But – and instead the draft response simply says that the working group fully considered the IGO input despite their decision not to participate as official members of the working group, and that our initial report released in January contains a discussion of several pages in length of the IGO small group proposal.

So in the draft response I tried to be comprehensive and non-confrontational while, you know, noting that the working group has given full consideration to all input we've received from IGOs and from the GAC, and that in fact it's likely that our final report will make some changes in response to input we received in comments from IGOs and others on our initial report.

And I'll stop there. I think it's fairly clear what they've said and what the response says and happy to answer any questions.

James Bladel: Thank you Phil and just thanks not only for putting this together but also taking point on this issue in Johannesburg. And we certainly note that when something shows up in the communiqué like this it usually is the subject of some very passionate discussions on the ground, and I was there for a few of those so I recognize that.

So I don't know if anyone has any questions or anything to add or questions for Phil. I think it's a – it just – my understanding Phil is that the – your PDP here is reaching a – nearing the end of its work and should be issuing its final report sometime between now and Abu Dhabi. Is that correct?

Phil Corwin: Yes, that is correct, James. We held a 90-minute call earlier today. And we've got some – we've got some decisions to make very shortly that will decide the final course of our work. But I think we're going to be in the stage of agreeing on what's going to be in the final report and drafting it before the end of the summer based on where we are now.

So I don't see any reason we can't have a final report done at least I'm hoping at least a month before the Abu Dhabi meeting. So, you know, that's our intent and there's no reason now to think we can't complete our work and get that report drafted, particularly since we're not contemplating a great number of significant changes from the initial report though the ones we are contemplating are of some degree of significance.

The only other thing I'll say on this issue personally is that I don't know "made" was the right word but given all the effort this Council has put into trying to integrate the Council into the policy development process and inform them of how it operates, I was a bit concerned to see language in their advice which called on the ICANN Board to ensure that the working group's recommendations adequately reflect input and expertise provided by IGOs. I think calling on the working group to fully consider that input is fine, but asking that our final report reflect the viewpoint of one particular group of commenters I don't think is appropriate.

But again, in the response I drafted for Council consideration, I didn't focus on that point, but I thought I'd, you know, it'd be reasonable to raise it among us during this call. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. And I was asking for a timeline because this is probably – this particular PDP is probably the last time that we'll be active when, you know, when subject to a GAC communiqué. And I'm presuming that its final report will be considered as potential mentioned in the communiqué for Abu Dhabi.

I see Donna is in the queue so I'll go to Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. Given that this has been a – quite a contentious topic for some period of time, and it looks like we will be in the position again of having conflicting policy recommendations and GAC advice, I wonder if there's some way to communicate to the Board when we send

back this response that we think there would be some value in having the opportunity to run through the recommendations with the Board and specifically address the GAC advice, you know, how the GAC advice was dealt with in the PDP recommendations before we get to the stage of a Council vote.

I just – I'm really conscious that we're, you know, I understand the path that we're on and I understand the reasons that we're on it, but I'm wondering if there's any value in making sure that at least from our perspective the Board understands why we got here and the work that was done within the PDP working group itself specifically as it relates to the GAC advice and the Small Group proposal.

So I'm sorry, James, it's a little bit off topic, I know it's not directly related to the content of what Phil's provided here but I just wanted to flag it now because it's going to be on, you know, it's only a couple months to Abu Dhabi so maybe it's worth considering. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna. And I think that's a really great suggestion that we would run through these – run through the proposals – the recommendations themselves but also an analysis of how the Small Group proposal and all the participation and contributions from the GAC and from IGOs, you know, however large or small, how those were taken on board, how their comments were factored into the final report and then presenting that all to the Board, I think would be helpful in avoiding the situation that we're in with the Red Cross and Red Crescent names.

Just a thought that we should probably start that process now but we don't want to put the cart too in front of the horse because as Phil mentioned, we're still awaiting a final report with final recommendations probably in the next month or two. So yes, but we should keep that in mind and maybe we'll just reach out to staff and have them connect with their counterparts on the Board to discuss that possibility.

Any other folks have questions or comments on this – on the language of this response? My only thought – and if you'll permit me, Phil, I just – I want to make sure everyone is comfortable with this as a Council response. I know, Phil, you're very close to this issue, you have a lot of expertise and a lot of history on this and I just, you know, it appears like we're, you know, we are channeling, if you will, the response of the PDP to, you know, and then kind of wrapping that around the Council response. I think that's okay as long as everyone's on board with that, but I just want to note that to some extent what we're doing here the Council is not necessarily taking away from what the PDP is doing or nor are we making any other assessments on our own.

We have really, in many respects, just taken the position of the PDP and made it our own, which, you know, again, there's not anything wrong with doing so, I just want to make sure that we're all of the understanding that that's what we're doing.

I see Phil and then Heather and then Jeff – no, okay. Phil – or I'm sorry, Rubens, I'm sorry. Go ahead, Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks James. Rubens here. As Marika mentioned in the chat, I have circulated for the drafting team an addition about the geo names section in the GAC communiqué. And instead of suggesting that addition which is somewhat controversial because it still have to be discussed even among – inside the various stakeholder group and by other stakeholder groups and constituencies, I'm now suggesting something that I put in the chat but I read here for the benefit of those only in audio.

That would be "The GNSO Council also takes note of the geographic names as top level domains section of the communiqué (unintelligible) advice documents. GNSO Council will be commenting on this topic in a separate communication to be sent at a later date." This way we can discuss the idea

of what should we respond to that but keep a mark, a placeholder saying hey, we have something to comment about that and we'll be doing so.

So this is the one way I could find to incorporate guidance from the stakeholder group that included both the need to comment on this topic and if we couldn't comment on this topic even to defer this motion which is not something that we would like to do since even now the stakeholder groups thinks that this should move as fast as possible through the process. So that's the suggestion I put on the table for the motion (unintelligible). Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Rubens. I just want to note that we're still kind of wrestling with making sure everybody's okay with the items on IGO protections and the Curative Rights PDP first but I note your proposal and the language that you've put in the chat. I think Jeff wants to speak to this as well as one of the cochairs of the SubPro Group but I'm just going to ask if we can tackle one controversy at a time and see if we can, you know, bring the IGO conversation in for a landing and then we'll take on the question of what to do with our response on geo names. So if I could ask you to just kind of hold that thought for a little bit here, I want to see if Heather – Heather, are you speaking to the IGO Curative Rights issue or did you want to...

Heather Forrest: Yes, James.

James Bladel: Okay good. I just wanted to make sure. Once we've got everything clear on that then we can move onto the geo names. But, Heather, you're on IGO.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thanks, James. Heather Forrest for the record. Look, I appreciate everything that's been said to this point in relation to the text and IGOs. And I don't think any of us, not at least that I've heard, so hopefully I'm not mischaracterizing anyone's position, I don't think any of us fundamentally disagree with the accuracy of what's stated here, that's certainly not the case.

I think I have some reservations in two ways and one of them, I admit, is fairly pedantic.

One of them is just the volume of information here. I know it's good to remind the Board of where we've been and how we've gotten there, I'm just afraid we're at a stage where this has been in our response to the communiqué more than once. We've got a big volume of information here. And I just wonder if the downside or risk to that is we're going to get ignored on this, they're going to look and say, oh, it's this again, and not pay as close attention as they might do to a few short snappy phrases that, you know, either points back to our earlier response or something like this.

I just – I open it for consideration. I'm sorry, James, I've maybe opened a kettle of fish on that. So perhaps a tighter text. The next thing maybe in considering drafting that tighter text would be I'm concerned in light of our broader – in light of our broader environment and the item that Jeff and Avri have asked to speak to, which is the geo names point. I think we want to tread fairly carefully, you know, again, I think we're all committed on a substantive level to articulating the role of the GNSO in this space. And I just think we want to be strategic in terms of how we do that.

And I actually think in that regard, James, it's good that this sits next to geo names and that we have Avri and Jeff here because I'd almost like to hear their views on what risks this (tone) in the IGOs might have on the broader grenade which is – or landmine or whatever we want to call it – that is geo names because we're really at a fundamental point in terms of, you know, existential the role of the PDP question. And with that in mind, I understand you want to clearly differentiate the two, but I would almost like to consider the tone on this in light of and in the context of why we have Jeff and Avri on the call today. So those are my comments, thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. So if I can sum up, you are throwing a hand grenade into a kettle of fish. We all are now showered in the fish guts. But no, it's – I think it's

particularly apt because you're correct, both of these issues cut across, you know, we can talk the substance, and I think you know, it's fair to say that Phil and the folks drafting this first response have nailed the substance, but I think there's this undercurrent of challenge or questioning or skepticism applied to the legitimacy of the PDP to address these issues.

That's the common thread that's kind of running through both of these topics, and I think that's the reason why we want to communicate this to the Board, and I think maybe that overarching topic is something that doesn't belong in the communiqué but maybe belongs in part of a, you know, bilateral or multilateral discussion between us and the Board because the model is pretty clear that that's our job, that's – we're responsible for doing.

So I got a queue forming here. I'm assuming that's an old hand after Heather so I will go to Phil, and then Jeff and Avri. Phil, go ahead.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thanks, James. Phil for the record. Briefly, the reason – and I tried to take a measured approach and not an emotional approach on this. The reason I went into some detail is because our response is going to the Board and I thought it might be useful to – and frankly if we're contemplating a session with the Board at Johannesburg to discuss the elements of the final report from this working group, I think it might be beneficial to remind the Board at this point that we've, you know, really given the working group has given very extensive consideration to IGO and GAC input.

The fact that we haven't given them what they requested is not to be – should not, you know, lead to the conclusion that we ignored the input, we just didn't find it compelling or supported by law and policy considerations.

So far as noting – and I just – I assumed that this was, you know, I have no pride of authorship on this other than I would object to something being put in that was not factually correct. This is going to be the Council's message, not

the message from me or from the working group. And it's up to Council to say – to put it in the way they want.

I did – the reason I put in the sentence that Donna was concerned was being too confrontational about the decision by IGOs to not become members of the working group that was really in response to the GAC calling on the Board to ensure that the final recommendations adequately reflect the input and expertise provided by the IGOs and in that context, I thought it was useful to reiterate that the IGOs despite numerous outreach efforts by the working group, chose not to be official members, their participation was highly sporadic.

And when IGOs – when counsel for IGOs met with the working group, they made clear that they were meeting in a personal capacity and not as official representatives of their organization. So it was in response to the text from the GAC and it's a little hard to understand why they're surprised by the report they got in Johannesburg because there was nothing different in that than the initial report which was put out for public comment in January. But it's up to the Council to decide on the final language of this response. I've just provided something – it's a suggestion to Council and Council can edit it as it wishes. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks, Phil. And it looks like Jeff and Avri are in the queue to speak to this and to potentially to the next item in the response. Before we get there, though, I just – I wanted to note, you know, I think this response we've heard has been – we've heard feedback from Board members that this response from the GNSO to the GAC communiqué is valuable because it's usually fairly narrow and it is also fairly timely because they are, as we noted in early August, they're going to be meeting with the GAC to discuss the communiqué.

The only concern I have, and it's more of just a precedent-setting concern is that we don't want – I don't want, and maybe I'm alone on this, the – this

response to become sort of a catch-all for our disagreements of differences of positions between us and the GAC because then I think just I think it loses its value, I think it loses its punch. So if we're going to focus on IGOs, if we're going to focus on geo names, then let's keep it as narrow as possible so such that it is useful.

But if we want to take on some of these bigger issues then I think that should probably move to another vehicle like either, you know, a direct consultation with the Board or the GAC or other letters or something like that because it probably has now – those topics and the legitimacy of the PDP and the role of governments and all that other stuff starts to eclipse the purpose of this response. So that's just my, you know, my two cents on this.

But next up we have the cochairs in order for the SubPro PDP so next up we'll go with Jeff and then Avri and then I think just for both of them I just want to note that Heather has asked a specific question on the tone, if you could incorporate that into your interventions that would be great. Thanks. Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, James. Hopefully you guys can hear me okay. And actually, James, I was going to quote you based on what you sent to the registries, which is almost – which is similar to what you said just now but I think you said it really well in the – in your email that you sent earlier, which was that you said over the last year we've had two bits of valuable feedback from the Board on the responses to the communiqué, first that these letters are extremely helpful in shaping their interactions with the GAC on matters that impact or conflict with GNSO policy development; and secondly, that the maximum benefit of the responses have it ready for the Board in time for their post-ICANN meeting with the GAC.

And this is, you know, I think that was really well stated. It doesn't say that it only has to be for advice, but anything that is of import and impact with our policy development process, I think you said it, really, really well.

On the geographic issue, in particular, I'm not sure how many people were able to attend the first part of the second session on geo names, but it became pretty clear during that session that there are a number of GAC members that feel that geographic names or the issue of geographic names at the top level, possibly even at the second level, but certainly at the top level, is actually not really an issue for the GNSO or at least not for the GNSO exclusively.

And what they did during that session, and which was reflected in the communiqué, is refer to a bit of advice that they gave in 2010 where they basically said that all country and territory names should be decided through essentially the ccNSO policy development process. Now many of us missed that advice in 2010 because either we were concentrating on other things or we just, you know, weren't – we thought it was mostly related to actually those names listed in the Guidebook or that were going to be listed in the Guidebook.

But since then, the GAC has greatly expanded their view of geographic names and in fact, are tying it all back to that 2010 advice when the GNSO had no vehicle to really respond to that advice. So even though it's technically not – it's not on the section that's called this is consensus advice, this is actually – this is actually referring to that advice. They don't have to give it as consensus advice again because they already gave it once.

So I think it was a decision and probably a smart one to do from the GAC to not put it in the consensus advice because then they didn't have to have a vote of their own members and it was a lot quicker. So to put aside the notion, this is – we are responding to GAC advice albeit seven years later but this happens to be the time when they're bringing it up.

The other thing I want to mention is if you look at the language I drafted, which I sent around yesterday and I know it's short notice, but frankly, you

know, we're just a week and a half out from the meeting, it basically just reiterates the history in the first sentence, and then goes into really a positive tone on something that we'll talk about towards the end of the meeting in any other business, which is this Work Track 5, and really encourages participation from the community including the GAC, in that SubPro PDP to ensure multistakeholder bottom up solution to this issue.

Really the goal of this is to avoid the issues that happened with the IGO INGO or having the GAC come in last minute or at the end of the process but really to get in early engagement. The Board will be discussing this issue, as far as I know, with the GAC on the August meeting, it's the first week of August. In addition, Avri and I are going to send out invitations for the GAC to participate next week and we're going to send it to all the SOs and ACs invitations.

So time is of the essence for this. Putting it in the GAC – the response to the GAC communiqué is actually the best place to ensure that they read it and that the Board reads it before they get on the phone with GAC in early August.

I'll defer the rest of it to Avri but I really feel this is of fundamental importance, especially if you were there during that session when – and a lot of people already went home, but if you didn't listen, listen to the first 90 minutes of that session and you will hear a number of vocal governments talk about how this is not within the scope of the GNSO. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks, Jeff. And I have Avri and Paul in the queue next. And I'm also noting that there's a pretty interesting exchange occurring in the chat regarding potential path forward, which is kind of aligned with the conversation I'm having with staff about some of our options as well. So we'll get on that here though once the queue – once everyone's had an opportunity to speak. So Avri, you're up next.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. This is Avri speaking. Yes, I'm not going to repeat obviously what Jeff said. Though I do want to say that reiterating that a reminder of advice is indeed (unintelligible) so I think it does fit within the template, perhaps a little bit of a squeeze, but it does fit.

I think when we're looking at the tone, I think that both what's there on the IGO and what Jeff has accepted, are both the positive things that the GNSO is doing to try and accommodate the – whether it was the IGOs in one case, or the GAC in another place. And so I think that in terms of tone we're doing it right.

I think that the juxtaposition of the two sort of alludes to the bigger issue, the grenade in the kettle of fish, and I was wondering does that become sushi, but still, alludes to that but does not actually put it on on the table, is not in your face about it. But it's just basically two issues, perhaps even aligned somewhere that talks about – if the other one is stuck in – that talks about, you know, at the end that the GNSO is striving to include the voices, to include the concerns and move forward with its work is the tone that's really worth taking.

And so that's why I would really recommend that we do and, you know, I don't know whether I'm talking as a temporary alternate now or talking as a cochair, but basically recommend that both of these elements be in there, be in there in their positive sense and – but make sure that the topic is on the table for this initial conversation. And I think Jeff expressed, you know, the content part of it quite well. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Avri. Appreciate that. And whether you're speaking as a cochair or a temporary alternate, I think it doesn't matter, we just – we just value your contributions regardless. Paul, you're up next.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady for the record. So the language on the last paragraph regarding geo terms seems to have disappeared and we're looking at the

communiqué now instead – at least I am on the screen. But I do think there are a couple little tweaks to it that I like to see made. First, I think we do need to make it clear – more clear, that the geographic terms issues for new gTLDs is essentially it's an issue that GNSO has primacy on and is within our remit.

The way that this is written now it kind of says well, part of our charter for the SubPro PDP, but it's not just that it happens to accidentally be part of the charter, it's that we have to remind the Board that this is in fact, you know, our space. And so I'd like for us to beef it up some way there.

And then secondly, I think we should make – when it says you know, the – the last sentence, the GNSO Council encourages participation from the community, I think we should, you know, we should remind them that we had these series of mediated discussions and say the GNSO Council you know, is happy that there was such robust participation at the mediated sessions in Johannesburg, and continues to encourage participation from the community, and go ahead and finish out the sentence.

But maybe we need to remind them that we're going overboard to bring the GAC and other members of the community into this even though it is a GNSO process. But I do think maybe we just a bit stronger in making it clear that this is in fact our process. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. And noting that we captured those changes for the recording and transcript. But would you mind also if you have a moment just kind of putting those thoughts in the chat if you haven't already done so just so we don't lose those because I think they were some good adds there.

Okay, next up I have Donna and then Jeff again, and then we're probably going to have figure out where we want to go with this and I can kind of – I'll put myself into the chat and – into the queue and we can talk a little bit about our options for potentially removing this issue from a vote for today, but still

getting this finalized before the Board meets with the GAC in early August. So I'll just go ahead and put my hand here to – as a placeholder for that and we'll go to Donna. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. Just a question for Jeff and perhaps all of the Council here, but in relation to what the GAC has provided here, there's a section that says that the GAC considers that any further process of policy review and development, should, A, continue to allow all stakeholder groups to participate equally, take into account the history and rationale of the arrangements currently in place and apply an evidence-based policy approach.

I think what, you know, the suggestion the Work Track 5 is, I think is consistent with what the GAC has identified in this. And perhaps it might be helpful if we actually tied work track, you know, the reference to Work Track 5 back to that saying that it is consistent with, you know, what the GAC is requesting. You know, that might be helpful, I think.

And then the other question I had, and maybe I know the answer to this, but, you know, there's a number of GAC documents that are cited here, and it's only one specific area that has been called out, I think, Jeff, but it's not referenced in the response. And I just wonder you know why is that the case? I guess it's based on, you know, the discussion and the concerns that were raised during the cross community discussion.

And I would note that while they were some GAC members that, you know, really pressed the point that perhaps (unintelligible) wasn't the right place to discuss some of the geographic names topics, there were some other GAC representatives that were not on the same page. So I don't know that we can assume that there's any GAC opinion or, you know, formal GAC opinion out there that wants to take this out of where it currently sits at the moment. So I guess to some extent we just need to be aware of that and be careful that

we're not overstating anything here or making any undue assumptions.

Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna. And, yes, good point to ensure that we're not responding to only one element of the GAC, maybe one vocal element of the GAC, when they're not necessarily monolithic in this position. So next up is Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. I just want to actually say Donna and I, on the first point, that she said are actually thinking alike. Avri and I had actually already discussed our invitation letter will contain – was planning on containing that exact language from the GAC communiqué. So I don't know if needs – I don't if it needs to go in the GNSO response or just in our invite letter that we're talking about with any other business.

But certainly I think that language is very helpful for the Work Track 5 and we'll use in that way. I didn't want to make this section too long and make it, you know, pretty much straight to the point.

On Paul's suggestion of primacy, although I agree with him, I think that that might be viewed, as Rubens says in the chat, as adversarial. And I was trying to create a positive encouraging tone in here. Even though I share the view that we are – we the GNSO – are the primary body to deal with policy development of gTLDs, I just think we're kind of poking their eye if we put that in there, not that I disagree with that language, I just think as far as tone I think it's important that we try to look as accommodating as possible.

But if they refuse to participate we can say hey, we did everything you asked for and you guys still didn't participate which is I think a position we want to be in. And on why only this aspect, a lot of the other elements of the advice all – like the ones before 2010 lead up to this particular piece of advice in 2010 and the ones after 2010 are a little bit more detailed on the treatment of geographic names in general.

The reason I pulled this one out and not the others is because this is the only one that refers to the process by which the decision on what to do about this issue is talked about, and that's where it talks about this being done with the ccNSO and not the GNSO. And again, we want to keep it short, to the point and not address every single point because this is the most important one.  
Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Jeff. Paul, go ahead. And then I'm going to close the queue and we need to kind of get moving. Go ahead, Paul.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Thank you, Paul McGrady. So just in response to what Jeff said, you know, I guess at some point we have to have a reason to exist and not go out of business. And, you know, developing policy related to generic top level domain names seems to be fitting within our remit. I don't think it'll be controversial or confrontational for us to remind the Board that we do exist and have a reason to do it.

I am concerned about not asserting the primacy if we are going to keep this other language that has been suggested, it seems to imply that if the ccNSO had gone forward with its PDP that this would have fallen within there and that the only reason why we're in charge of it now is because it happens to fit a charter. I think we need to decide if we're not going to remind everybody about the primacy then we need to do some cleanup on this other language to not make it sound as if it's historic accident that this is on the GNSO plate.  
Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. And thanks to Jeff and for everyone who – and Avri and Donna and Heather and everyone who weighed in on this. So here's where I think we're going, and if you haven't been following the chat, then this will seem like a spoiler. But we do have an opportunity to spend a little bit more time on this topic, and when I say topic, I mean, the GNSO response to the GAC Joberg communiqué.

The Board is – I don't know, Marika or Emily, if you have any idea when this is going to be occurring, but I've heard that they're tentatively scheduled for the first two weeks of August to meet with the GAC and to discuss the communiqué. So we have a little bit of time. We don't want to cut it too close because I believe last time we sent an abbreviated letter and even that was a little too close and wasn't considered by a number of the Board members in time for that meeting.

So here's kind of where I think we can go. If we can get some folks to work on these – this document, which is – and I think we have a couple of to do items here, one is to, you know, revisit the IGO language, I'm certain that everything that is here is factual, correct and thorough, but maybe look if there's any way we can pare it down so that we're not overloading the Board with too much detail here. And then we can kind of point the way forward for the ICANN 60 and set the stage for that, I think that would be valuable for the first item.

For the second item, I think, you know, noting the concerns that were raised by Jeff and Avri and others, noting that Paul's point about, you know, not leaving primacy implied because it's mentioned in our charter but actually to explicitly call out the remit of the GNSO as laid out by the bylaws, and to do that, you know, as Rubens noted, in a way that doesn't come across as adversarial. A little bit of diplomatic writing will be required there. But I think it is possible.

If we can do – put together a team that tackles those two issues on this draft and then brings that back to Council in a timely manner that we can consider this for an electronic vote, we do have another meeting scheduled one week from today on the 20th, but there's, you know, I'd say a better than average shot that that meeting will be canceled if there are no petitions to blow up the budget.

So in that case we would instead just move this to the list and conduct an electronic ballot and that would still give us enough time to get this finalized and submitted to the Board with maybe a week, maybe a little more to spare before they meet with the GAC. So that's kind of the proposed path forward here to kind of get us out of the woods.

And I can imagine some folks are going to be volunteering – and I see Paul is volunteering and I imagine Phil and Jeff, you're going to definitely be on the hook for that, if you can. And if we can get – I'll put my name in there as well and so anyone else who's interested in volunteering please throw your name in the chat and I would just ask staff if they can capture those folks and we'll take that away as an action item.

But just to note the folks that are volunteering, we, you know, you've heard the concerns, you've heard the constraints that we're trying to operate under and you know that the window to deliver some finalized language is very tight so please keep all that in mind as you raise your hand. And then we will presume that that will move to an electronic ballot sometime between now and the end of the month. Okay?

So thank you and some volunteers are still trickling in so thank you everyone who worked on this, thank you everyone who contributed to the discussion and the – raised their thoughts and concerns today and for those of you who are volunteering to get this turned around in the next week, thank you and buckle up, we're going to need to move fairly quickly.

Okay, great. So then let's move to the next item, which is also a – also a vote, which is the next steps in relation to the charter for the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance. Just as a time check, we've got about 45 minutes left in our call.

The motion was submitted by Keith and is part of our discussions ongoing since Hyderabad and then again in Copenhagen and in Johannesburg. So

Keith, I'd be happy to second the motion so we can continue with our discussions. But if you don't mind, I could put you on the spot and you could read the motion into the record or be happy to do so for you, just let me know.

Keith Drazek: Thanks. I appreciate the offer of the second, I'll happily accept. Can everybody hear me?

James Bladel: Five by five.

Keith Drazek: Okay great. Thanks. So I think because this is the first time we've considered the motion, I probably need to read the whole thing, including the whereas clauses, try to do it quickly unless James, you think that we don't have time for that?

James Bladel: No, go ahead, Keith. Please...

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: All right, thanks. Okay so this is, as James said, this is the discussion around the future of the CCWG IG and ideally a motion that creates a structure and a process for allowing the GNSO as a chartering organization to work with the other chartering organizations to find an appropriate successor structure.

As you'll see from some of the resolved and whereas clauses, I think some very constructive discussion that took place in Johannesburg among the group itself during its face to face meeting and also on the sideline various individuals who have been involved – a recognition that the CCWG may not be either the required or even an appropriate structure and that we ought to try to find something that allows the group to continue its work without interruption. So let me go ahead and start reading.

So whereas, Clause Number 1, "The GNSO Council adopted the charter for a Cross Community Working Group to discuss Internet governance issues

affecting ICANN and make recommendations to the chartering organizations on these issues on 15 October 2014, and as such became a Chartering Organization.”

Whereas 2, “The GNSO Council adopted the "Uniform Framework of Principles and Recommendations for Cross Community Working Groups" the CCWG Framework, in October 2016. The CCWG Framework details the lifecycle of a CCWG including initiation, operation, decision-making, and closure, and the GNSO Council has observed that the CCWG-IG, whose formation predated the adoption of the CCWG Framework, does not follow this lifecycle or some of the principles outlined in the CCWG Framework.”

Whereas 3, “The GNSO Council recognizes the importance of a continued discussion of the topic of Internet governance within an ICANN context, and the continued participation by the GNSO in this discussion.”

Whereas 4, “The GNSO Council has shared its concerns with the ccNSO Council and representatives of other SO/ACs on the current scope of the CCWG-IG and the appropriate vehicle through which ICANN SO/ACs may continue to participate in Internet governance discussions within the ICANN context.”

Whereas 5, “During its meeting on 7 November 2016, the GNSO Council confirmed it would continue to participate as a Chartering Organization for the CCWG-IG. However, this participation was conditioned upon a comprehensive review of the CCWG-IG Charter by the CCWG-IG, in accordance with the CCWG Framework, including the possibility that another vehicle may be more suitable for cross community discussions on the topic of Internet governance.”

Whereas 6, “On 11 March 2017, the CCWG-IG submitted a revised charter to the GNSO Council for its consideration.”

Whereas 7, “The GNSO Council reviewed the charter and discussed it during a number of meetings as well as in its meetings with the ccNSO Council. These discussions highlighted remaining concerns over the group’s compliance with the CCWG Framework as well as its accountability vis-à-vis the Chartering Organizations.”

Whereas 8, “During ICANN 59 in Johannesburg, the CCWG-IG held a face-to-face meeting that included members of the ICANN Board’s Internet Governance Committee. There was discussion about the future of the group, challenges with the ongoing nature of Internet Governance, and the constraints imposed by the community-developed requirements for CCWG structures. Members from multiple SOs and ACs recognized the challenges and generally agreed that a CCWG is not a required vehicle for the important and legitimate work of the group, provided the group is able to continue its engagement with adequate ICANN support and resources and there is no gap between the retirement of the CCWG-IG and the establishment of its successor.”

Resolved, Number 1, “The GNSO Council expresses its gratitude to the CCWG-IG for its work in ensuring that discussions on Internet governance take place within the ICANN context.”

Resolve 2, “The GNSO Council emphasizes that it fully recognizes the importance of the continued involvement of the ICANN community in Internet governance-related activities that are appropriate to ICANN’s mission.”

Resolve 3, “The GNSO Council requests that members of the CCWG-IG and others interested parties come together to explore a framework or model that more fully addresses the concerns that have been expressed by the GNSO Council, and submit this framework or model to the GNSO Council for its consideration by ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi.”

Resolve 4, "To facilitate the work as requested under Resolved clause 3, allowing for a reasonable time to coordinate with other SOs and ACs to develop a new structure, and to ensure there is no gap between the retirement of the CCWG-IC and the establishment of its successor group, the GNSO Council shall withdraw as a Chartering Organization from the CCWG-IG effective at the conclusion of ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi."

Resolve 5, "The GNSO Council emphasizes that its planned withdrawal as a Chartering Organization from the CCWG-IG reflects solely the Council's conclusion that, based on the reports it has received from the CCWG-IG, a CCWG is not an appropriate vehicle for the CCWG-IG's work, and the GNSO Council's decision on this narrow point is not intended to prevent any GNSO community members who have been participating in the CCWG-IG from continuing to participate in the group's activities should they decide to do so." And one moment, I need to scroll here.

And Resolve 6, "The GNSO Council requests that the GNSO Secretariat communicate this decision to the CCWG-IG and the other Chartering Organizations."

James, I'll hand it back to you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Keith. Thanks for teeing up this motion and for your work in drafting it. This is part and parcel of our discussion or continuation of our discussion on how to continue this work and what the best and most effective vehicle for that work or for successor structure would be. And it sounds like this is a – one path forward.

So we'll go to the queue now. I have Avri and anyone else who would like to speak to this topic. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thank you. This is Avri speaking. And let me apologize up front for what I am about to say since I know that you want to take this (unintelligible) as quickly

as possible. But within the NCSG, we've been discussing it. We wish to offer a couple of amendments but we haven't really had time to get them fully crafted and discuss them and given the press of time today, (unintelligible) to do it. Just to let you know that the amendments have to do with the press of time to be completed by Abu Dhabi since the time is already getting short on that and wishing to talk further about the automatic nature of the GNSO's withdrawal.

So on – for the NCSG and such, I wanted to ask for a deferral on this motion so that we would have time to talk about friendly amendments and not try to do them with the press of time today. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Avri. And before I let you go, do you have any thoughts from the NCSG on what that would do – you mentioned that the – I'm thinking timeline, you mentioned that that would put the potential resolution by ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi which is Resolve 4, that that would probably be an unrealistic target. So are you thinking then the ICANN 61 or sometime at the end of the calendar year or has that not yet come up in the NCSG discussions? I'm just wondering if you have any thoughts on that.

Avri Doria: Yes. We haven't gotten specific on it and I think that was part of what we need to discuss. You know, waiting until 60 may feel long, end of the year, I would like to discuss that and I think either of those are better than 60. Discussing a friendly timeline extension and talking about the automatic, you know, the automatic nature of it were the two points. But I don't have a timeline at the moment. We had the meeting day before yesterday, one week of you know, free of ICANN after the meeting and we just got back into it this week and just haven't been able to get those amendments and discuss them with Keith and such so that they are friendly hopefully.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks, Avri. And just noting that, yes, we did move the meeting forward or backwards in time seven days so we did cut into whatever window the NCSG or any other group would have had to work on this so I think, you

know, given that unlike the previous agenda item there is no hard and fast external deadline, we, you know, we want to keep it moving, we want to preserve our momentum but we also don't want to short change everyone's opportunity to weigh in on this so I think we should give serious consideration to a deferral. Keith, you're up next.

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks James. And thanks, Avri, I appreciate the comments. And actually your point about timing was one that was also raised by a colleague in the Contracted Party House. And the suggestion was made – I don't remember if it was the Council list or it was on, you know, an ExComm list or something like that, but that possibly to allow the CCWG-IG to do some work, obviously very important work, between now and Abu Dhabi, but have the opportunity to meet in Abu Dhabi at ICANN 60 to, in a sense, finalize the work, might be an appropriate thing recognizing that there will have to be some formal decisions made by the chartering organizations, A, to withdraw; and then, B, to sign onto whatever comes next.

That possibly targeting ICANN 61 for the effective date of the motion, if you will, might be a reasonable thing. So if your suggestion today was to target ICANN 61 for the effective date of the motion, based on some other feedback that I've seen from other colleagues, I would accept that as friendly today if there was an opportunity to move this motion forward. As James has noted, both in Johannesburg and since, this has been, you know, a recurring issue for many, many months and many, well, several years now probably so if there's an opportunity to move that forward, replace ICANN 60 with 61, I would accept that as friendly.

James Bladel: Thanks, Keith. And just as a seconder I would as well, I don't know from Avri's intervention if that's – if it's that simple, but if it is, certainly that would be something to consider. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Hi, this is Avri again. Certainly that's one half. The other half was also wanting to talk about the automatic nature of the withdrawal at 61 and that it

seems that having a new thing be started, if that's what's decided, and having sort of a pending automatic withdrawal in 61 was another piece we wanted to look at, but certainly the first part, yes, that would be – to move that discussion to report on it in 60 and to meet and to, you know, get a decision in 61, but just was looking about the automatic nature. And if we could close that today that would be great, I guess.

James Bladel: Thanks, Avri. I'll throw it back to Keith but as a seconder, I think the automatic nature is actually kind of an essential element of the motion. It is part of the decision that we would be taking, we would be moving off of one structure and moving onto another structure and putting a marker down that ICANN 61, now, according to the change to ICANN 61 would be the inflection point where that would occur.

But I guess I see Paul with his hand up and we'll go to Paul and then we'll see if Keith has any thoughts on that as well. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady here. So this is not going to make me popular but we have the same problem that Avri had which is this is a shortened timeframe between the last meeting and this call, and complicating factors are Johannesburg travel back and 4th of July holiday for the folks in the US. And so I'd like to join the request for a deferral on this and so that we can go back and get you know, better instructions from the IPC on this.

We have of course been putting it out on the list but without an intervening IPC meeting to really talk through it and come to a conclusion, our position just really isn't fully baked. And I don't want to vote no just to maintain the status quo, I'd rather have, you know, solid instructions following an IPC opportunity to really talk this through. So if we can defer it I'd much prefer that to happen. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. Noted and we'll go back to Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, James. And thanks to everybody who's provided input. It sounds like we have several groups who need some additional time, which I respect, and so, James, I'm going to recommend that we defer the motion until our next meeting. I think that it's important for people to focus on this, it's a big issue, it's not something – it's not a decision that we are in any way taking rashly or trying to push through unreasonably, but to James's point in Johannesburg, this is something that's been hanging out there for quite a while, there's been some good work and some great conversations.

I think it's really critical though that the folks who are really engaged in that group start working like now with, you know, with their colleagues from other chartering organizations to begin the important work of developing the successors. I'm going to withdraw – or suggest we withdraw the motion or defer the motion until the next meeting and then, you know, I did say that I would accept today the, you know, the ICANN 61 date as a friendly amendment. I probably would again but I'll just withdraw that acceptance for the time being. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Keith. I put myself in the queue so we can just kind of move off of this. I don't know, Michele, if you had some thoughts here. I mainly just wanted to note that given the, you know, the compressed time calendar for the meeting and some of the issues that were raised by Avri and echoed by Paul that it's probably – makes sense to go ahead and defer this.

I just want to make sure we're clear, a deferral means that it will come up at the next meeting and then it has to go forward with a vote. There is only one deferral allowed per motion per topic, you know, so while a withdrawal would mean this would come up again and again, deferral means it's kind of a one and done approach.

And I actually think that's probably the right approach because – and I'm going to go ahead and make myself unpopular now as I think that, you know, we did, if you recall, we did have a lot of these same discussions in the run

up to the meeting in Hyderabad, we put together a window for Copenhagen, we had some discussions coming out of Copenhagen in order to get ready for Johannesburg.

And now kind of now we're taking beyond Abu Dhabi, so it is – I think it is important for us to at some point say, you know, here is a line, you know, in the dirt and here is where we need to make a decision because we just kind of continued to delay any decisions or actions or changes in the status quo just seems to have a fair bit of momentum on this working group. And I think that's the part that we're trying to address.

So a deferral is certainly in order and we'll go ahead and defer this then until the next meeting which I believe is scheduled for the last week of August which would then mean that the document and cutoff date to get those amendments, whether they're coming from the NCSG or if they're coming out of the IPC or any other groups, would probably fall some point in the mid August timeline probably in the – somewhere in between the 10th and 13th or 14th, something along those lines.

So I would ask everyone to please put this front and center with your stakeholder groups and constituencies and make sure that if you have amendments or additions or other language, please get that submitted to the list you know, before that next document and cutoff deadline in mid August. And because it is a deferral, and I'll check with staff on this but I'm correct, because it is a deferral it would still need to go – to be accepted as a friendly amendment by Keith and by myself and then if it's an unfriendly amendment that doesn't mean it's the end of the road, if just means we have a different process that we would have to employ to approve amendments that weren't taken as friendly. But that's our path forward and that's our target date and with that – thank you, Keith, it's the 20th.

Yes, correct, we would not be deferring this to the 20th, we would be deferring it to the August meeting, and I apologize for the lack of clarity on

that. Thanks for pointing that out, Keith. So Michele, you're up next, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. Very briefly. It will just be helpful for the record if Keith were to clarify whether he's requesting a deferral or withdrawal because he said both. And...

Keith Drazek: Yes, deferral is what I meant. Thanks, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Okay that's fine as James pointed out, there's a big difference between the two. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Yes, agreed. I misspoke and deferral was what I meant. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes, and I don't think – thanks, and I don't think you misspoke, Keith, I think we were using those terms interchangeably and Michele is correct to point out there's a very important difference. And just to note, the July 20 meeting may not happen, it's completely predicated on the idea that someone submits a petition to blow up the draft budget. Probably, you know, I don't want to handicap the odds here but I think it's probably somewhere, you know, it's towards the unlikely end of the spectrum that that even happens so it's important that we know that the meeting is likely to be canceled so the August meeting is what we're targeting.

Keith, go ahead.

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks James. And I typed this into chat but for those who are only on audio, I just wanted to note I really do think that we will be able to find acceptable language and I encourage everybody after you've had a chance to consult with your groups, to submit any suggested edits or proposed friendly amendments on the list so we can work through the issues or questions before the next meeting. It'd be great if we could sort of have it wrapped up and have everybody sort of in tentative agreement before we

actually get to the next meeting. And I'm standing by happy to receive any of those suggestions. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay great. Thanks, Keith. Thanks, everyone. Mary has also just very helpfully put in the chat that the petitions to reject the budget are due on the 15th so they're due Saturday, is that right? Okay. They're due on the 15th so if we don't receive one on the 15th then the meeting on the 20th just kind of evaporates in a puff of pixie dust or whatever, so we don't need it.

Okay, so that's our path forward for the CCWG-IG charter and successor structure. We can then move out of our vote into discussion Item Number 8. Time check we have about 21 minutes left in our call and we have three minutes and one AOB left to cover. So the first one is a possible proposed name change of the GNSO. We'll allocate some time for this and ask Paul McGrady to introduce the topic. Paul, if you are available please take the way.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, James. Paul McGrady here. Given how much we have to accomplish and how little time we have to accomplish it and given the higher priorities of the other items on the agenda, is it possible to just push this to our next call?

James Bladel: Yes, absolutely, Paul, but our next call would be in August, is that...

Paul McGrady: Yes, I think that's fine. When we look at the other items on the agenda those are more time sensitive than this.

James Bladel: Okay. Fair enough. And so we will do so, we will make sure that this is held over for our next agenda – for our next call. And thanks for your consideration on that. We'll then move to agenda Item Number 9, which is another discussion topic on the CCWG on the Use of Country and Territory Names. This CCWG has, as we mentioned in our open projects list, recently published its final report and had some recommendations. And we need to

make a determination as one of the chartering organizations of where we go with this next.

So with that I will, if you don't mind, Heather, I can turn it over to you and you can walk us through some of the potential paths in front of us on CCWG Country and Territory Names.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. Heather Forrest for the record. So with great thanks to staff for putting together this slide, I'd like to keep this fairly short and snappy. This, you might remember, was a point that I asked be raised in our Council meeting in Johannesburg. And I, at that point, expressed concern about the tenure of how this fed into broader discussions about the GNSO's remit in the context of geographic names, and you can see why, in relation to how these recommendations are actually articulated.

The challenge that we had here was that the group really was fundamentally not just unable to agree on the substance, but was unable more troublingly to agree on what the next steps are. And while I don't think that there's anything necessarily controversial in these recommendations, like there's nothing that we can't as a GNSO community, live with in these recommendations, what I am concerned about is we're essentially then signing off on the lack of agreement on what to do next.

And I will say this, that the GNSO participants in the Cross Community Working Group were very much of a view that this issue should go to Subsequent Procedures and that was a natural next home for it, the geographic names fit clearly in the Subsequent Procedures charter, and it was just a logical next step.

That logical next step was resisted pretty vigorously by the ccNSO and the GAC. So here's where we are, you see these recommendations, I think that – and as Carlos you all know, as well, is also a GNSO cochair for this working group. I think Carlos and I are very much in agreement that it's an appropriate

thing to close the Cross Community Working Group, particularly in light of the fact that we have Subsequent Procedures on foot, that we agree that the community would benefit from rather than this kind of ad hoc cafeteria style each SO AC has its own approach to how we deal with geographic names, that we all consolidate those efforts and actually the only way to come up with a consistent harmonized framework.

And that the dialogue be inclusive and of course there's significant efforts being made by Avri and Jeff in the form of those pretty innovative externally facilitated sessions in Johannesburg, to ensure that that happens. Again, the only –it's reading between the lines here as to you know, what our approval of these recommendations would mean which makes me think that I think we could approve these recommendations with a particular (unintelligible) Subsequent Procedures, so this dovetails pretty nicely into the concerns that many were making in relation to the GAC communiqué, that this is an opportunity for us.

Again, I think the tone needs to be managed right, but this is an opportunity for us to clearly put the marker down and say, you know, the GNSO is in this space and rightfully in this space and as a reminder, we're really going out of our way to ensure that that dialogue is inclusive and considering, you know, next steps for the discussion. And it's great that we have Jeff and Avri on the line to tell us about next steps.

So that's an introduction. I think we need to be careful about the timing of when we, you know, the tone and the timing when we want to put this on the agenda. We might be, you know, in a position to do that by August and that's fine. But whatever we do I think we're all in agreement based on the comments I heard in relation to the response to the communiqué that we don't want to damage or in any way jeopardize the continued progress of the PDP. So I think that needs to be of our paramount concern.

James, I'm happy to answer any questions and leave it at that.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. Appreciate your introduction of the work and also your labors on this CWG and your leadership of the GNSO folks on this. I have Keith in the queue and I'm going to put my own hand up here because I have a question, so, Keith, go ahead.

Keith Drazek: Sorry, James, old hand.

James Bladel: Oh okay, no worries, Keith. Heather, do you – and I think you touched on this at the end here, and I'm just – for clarification, do you foresee any friction or any perception, let's say, on the other SOs and ACs who participated in this CWG that the creation of Work Track 5, which I think we all agree was a reasonable and sensible approach to dealing with these issues under the umbrella of SubPro PDP, that that could be seen as the GNSO taking sort of unilateral action on this CWG?

Or is that just kind of the – you know, I'm taking to heart your note of caution there at the end that we need to proceed thoughtfully here, is that going to be seen as a, you know, kind of a turf grab on our part because it is something that we have essentially said is within the discretion of a PDP on how to organize itself. But if you feel like that's going to be seen as a unnecessarily adversarial type of (unintelligible) some of these other groups who participated in the CWG, I think it would be good to know that.

Heather Forrest: James, thanks. This is Heather. Look, I think this is a two part answer. The first part of the answer is to say that as Rubens has noted, this is, let's say, Rubens point is one that was made, and thanks to Rubens for being on the cross community working group as well, and contributing sensible comments like that in that context. You know, this is something that we pointed out fairly repeatedly in trying to secure agreement on next steps in this final report.

And really to our dismay, the fairly, you know, incontrovertible statement that the CCWG doesn't have power over the bylaws and this is going to have to

go to a PDP was met with pretty much obstinacy on the part of the GAC and the GNSO. James, I think that, you know, the only group that we're concerned about in the context of this vote on the final report is the ccNSO because it's the GNSO and the ccNSO that are the chartering organizations of these – of this work.

I feel as if the ccNSO is likely to live with this language. I think the GNSO really was the one that compromised on the way that this is articulated and this is largely the product of ccNSO drafting what you see here on the screen. But in terms of your specific question, James, about you know, how is this likely to, you know, impact on the remit question, I wonder it's not really – it's not really normal let's say, procedure, SOP, but we have Jeff on the call and Avri as well and I wonder, maybe Jeff's in a better position to answer your question about what the impact could be than I am. So if you're willing to flip it to him I think it would be useful if want, in the interest of time take it to the list we can do that. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. And we all know Jeff and Avri are really shy and probably won't want to speak up on this – oh, I'm just kidding. Jeff's in the queue. Go ahead, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. Just to say that when the GNSO Council approved the charter for the Subsequent Procedures PDP, the charter very specifically calls out that the Subsequent Procedures PDP is to consider any of the findings of the CCWG on the Use of Country and Territory Names. So it was always contemplated no matter what happened, that the output of that group would feed into the Subsequent Procedures PDP.

So I think that other than the notion that we talked about earlier about whether geographic names are truly in the scope of the GNSO, which some ccTLDs and some GAC members do not think it is, other than that, and we'll never get over that argument until we face it head on, other than that everyone else seems pretty – should be fine with just closing this group and

moving it to the Work Track 5. So I think it's generally for the most part will be accepted.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jeff. And just noting we've got some green checkmarks of agreement from Cheryl and Avri to your last statement there. And thanks for the reminder on the charter. And so if I'm understanding you correctly, it sounds like this would not necessarily be a – the creation of Work Track 5 is not necessarily seen as all that surprising of a next step since it was anticipated in the SubPro charter so that's good to know.

Donna, you're up next, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. I just confirmed this with Heather but this CCWG was kicked off before the CCWG on CCWGs completed its work. So the – when this was kicked off it might have a – it might have had a little bit different meaning to the ccNSO and the GAC at that time. And the reason for this I suspect, is because the ccNSO and the GAC worked very closely together on the fast track process to implement IDN ccTLDs. And I think I've heard Chris Disspain refer to that effort as one of the first, you know, CCWGs that actually did any work.

And that fast track was actually able to be implemented without going through any policy process. So I suspect that some of the resistance from the GAC or the ccNSO might actually relate back to that experience. So they actually have been in a position where they have undertaken essentially what was a cross community working group outside of a policy process and have that – the recommendations from that implemented through approval by the Board.

So, I mean, that's just a – I guess just a little bit of color and history as to why there might be some resistance to the ccNSO and the GAC on this because it goes back to history. And I'm very conscious that we have Ben Fuller on this call who is our ccNSO liaison. And I'm wondering if he can give us, I mean, I appreciate that, you know, Heather's been involved with this firsthand but I

just wonder whether Ben can give us any sense of discussions that are going on within the ccNSO in particular on this matter and whether he can provide any color and in terms of what those conversations are and where he thinks the ccNSO is headed. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna. And I'm just noting a couple of responses in the chat. But I don't know if Ben is – we had some audio issues earlier and I don't know if he's connected and available and willing to respond to your question about where the ccNSO's minds collectively are on this topic and where it goes from here. Ben, if you're on the line, are you able to shed any light on that topic?

Ben Fuller: Unfortunately not...

James Bladel: I'm sorry, Ben, if you're speaking, you're very, very faint.

Ben Fuller: Can you hear me, now?

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Can we try again, staff? Can we make sure we got him connected? Ben, can you try again?

Ben Fuller: Can you hear me now?

James Bladel: Very faintly but a little bit better.

Ben Fuller: Okay. I wasn't able to attend the – that session in Johannesburg because I was, you know, in a meeting with the GNSO. I think the best thing for me to do, given the question that Donna has raised, would be to go back and poll some people from that working group from the ccNSO just to get a sense of, you know, draft a report and send it to everybody on the Council.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Ben. And for those who are...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Yes, I could hear you and for those who were having difficulty hearing Ben indicated that he was not able to attend that session because he was with us and the GNSO and that he is going to go back to the participants from the ccNSO who participated on the CWG and try to get a sense of their views on where we go from here and hopefully I have accurately and faithfully conveyed that as best I could. So thank you, Ben, and thank you, Donna, for raising that question.

We have just a few minutes left in our call, we have a couple more topics. I'd like to move on but I'd like to note that this is – if it's not clear by now, this is very – this issue is very closely entangled with the SubPro discussion, the geo names discussion and also the viability and legitimacy of the PDP to address these overarching issues and how the rest of the community proceeds and participates in that process.

So in accordance and we'll look forward to additional discussions and some point a decision on this CCWG final report in the coming months. So thank you very much, Heather, for teeing that up and for walking us through that.

The next item is agenda Item Number 10, which is planning for ICANN 60. You know, we've got – staff has done a wonderful job of course and all the chairs and not only the GNSO but specifically the stakeholder groups and constituencies have been meeting with other members of the community to try and hammer this out.

I just would like to report a couple of things, one is that we're well along in the process of developing a draft schedule for ICANN 60. The second is that we have a draft schedule at least from the GNSO perspective that we'll be

circulating shortly, please take a look at that and circulate it amongst your constituencies.

The third item is that – and this one caught me off guard – is that the submission of topics for cross community discussion topics, which previously were – in a previous life were known as high interest topics, is actually due on Tuesday so that's just about – the – I'm sorry, it was Friday, sorry, the 21st, if I'm not mistaken. Terri probably will set me straight on that.

So we need to kind of make sure that everyone understands that if they have an idea or something that they'd like to get submitted for a cross community discussion session that the clock is ticking to get those submitted. So we'll circulate instructions and timelines, again, on the Council list but please make sure that that is front and center in all of your groups so that we can get those submitted as quickly as possible. Yes, Friday the 21st, thank you Terri.

And so that's really the highlights of the ICANN 60 planning process right now in that we are – we've got a skeletal framework ready to go, we'll be circulating the GNSO's slice of that to the list here very shortly, at least the current version of it. And that those cross community discussion topics are due in a fairly short order, just over a week from today. So thank you for that. And if anyone has any questions for that let's try and take it to the list.

We've got a few minutes left and I'd like to move to AOB. We have an update from the New gTLD SubPro PDP cochairs, Jeff and Avri, who have – well Avri was an alternate so she was captive, she had to stay, but Jeff, thank you for sticking it out through the entire call. I know there were some other topics that you wanted to weigh in on as well and so we're glad to hear from you on those.

But if you can give us an update on where you're going with SubPro and the topic of geo names, and I don't think it's necessary to, you know, cover the ground that we've already covered relative to the GAC advice in the

communiqué but anything else is fair game. So whichever one of you would like to speak, please just go ahead, Jeff and Avri.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff. I'll start and then Avri can weigh in. On the geo names, the most important thing as we discussed we're going to send an invite letter to the chairs of the GNSO, obviously that's you, James, to the chair of the ccNSO, the chair of the GAC and the chair of the ALAC to nominate one person to serve as a co-leader, actually there was a different term, I forgot what it was, Avri, but essentially a co-leader of this fifth work track.

Hopefully get a meeting scheduled with those co-leaders in August so that we can start work as a Work Track 5 in early September with a goal of taking about six months to provide preliminary recommendations. Now that may be a little bit after a preliminary report of the rest of the group for the Subsequent Procedures so we maybe – we may be doing two parallel things here with the full Subsequent Procedures PDP versus the geo issue, Work Track 5, but it's possible they may both be on the same track.

The most important thing is really then to have you, James, solicit volunteers for that leader and to have some process for choosing that leader. That's pretty much on the geo issue that's where we're heading.

The geo group as we discussed in Johannesburg, that Work Track 5 has a lot of freedom and flexibility in the PDP rules so it can operate pretty much as it wants to operate in terms of making its determinations of consensus and obviously everything has to be approved through the full working group and then obviously the Council.

One of the big issues that was brought up on – at that meeting was that the governments' concern that they wanted, and the ccTLDs concern that they wanted assurance that (unintelligible) wouldn't change the results of the Work Track 5. Obviously Avri and I could not provide any guarantees that that would be the case but we said it's kind of dumb for us to actually – it would

not be the smartest for the GNSO Council to have a bottom up process only to overturn it completely if the process works the way it's supposed to. But other than saying that, there's no guarantees we could provide.

That's – I know I'm trying to rush because we're way over time, so that's all I have on the geos and maybe we can do – we can just send you our newsletter on the rest of the updates on SubPro.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jeff. Appreciate that and appreciate you giving us the abbreviated highlights and also appreciate you letting us know that we're not the dumbest folks in the room, I don't know if you said it that way but that's – so just a quick question, when you say choosing a GNSO co-leader of Work Track 5, do you envision that that would come from the existing membership of the SubPro PDP Working Group or could it just be anyone, you know, or across the GNSO community or councilor, because this might sound like something that we would have to throw over to our Standing Selection Committee, I don't want to miss where it's going but it might be where this ends up. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri speaking. I think that it could be larger than our group so throwing it over to the Selection Committee may indeed – the Standing Selection Committee – may indeed be the best thing to do. If there's someone that the GNSO is more, you know, appropriate plus a lot of the people in the group are already you know, deep in the mire. I think we were thinking of calling them coordinators. And the only thing I wanted to add to what Jeff said is it's very important it seems that this group feels that they're not sort of operating under our thumb. That it was very important to them that this Work Track 5 have the ability to define its own working method.

So while Jeff and I will be helping and will be ultimately responsible, what we really want to do is help them figure that out, how to do the work. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Avri. Good to know. So just my first reaction to that is I can appreciate the need for some degree of independence or autonomy, I guess, maybe is the wrong word, but the entire PDP including Work Track 5 is still operating under its charter that was adopted by the GNSO and so if this – so long as I guess those constraints are still in effect, then I think that this is just the case of a PDP organizing its own work and its work plan, but if it starts to expand or wish to expand, the, you know, than what's covered under its existing charter, then that is a different matter and something that's going to have to come back to the Council.

So that's just something that we would have to keep in mind because we can't have a chartered working group from a work track that then, you know, that the exception then swallows the rule. But I know that you guys are veterans and glad you're on this particular topic. So thank you for that. And we will look forward to continued discussion of that newsletter, which I think is great, by the way, and also on our list as this effort gets spun up.

And also, you know, let us know if there's anything that we can do to encourage some of those other communities to make sure that they're sending, you know, a delegation or whatever to participate in Work Track 5.

That is the end of AOB. And that is the end of our agenda. We're seven minutes over time. Thank you very much to Jeff and Avri for that last bit and for attending for the entire call, thanks for everyone who stuck through the compressed cycle. We have a couple of items that didn't make it on this agenda but will show up again on our next agenda including one that will – the GAC response – the GAC communiqué that we will work on in the interim between now and the 20th.

Other than that if there are no other speakers or hands in the queue, we can adjourn for today. And I would say thank you to everyone for their work and we will be expecting some of this – these vigorous conversations to continue

on our mailing list. So with that we'll go ahead and close the call. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, James. Thanks, everyone. Bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Operator, (Daisy), if you could please stop all recordings? To everyone else, please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a lovely rest of your day.

END