

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Council Teleconference  
Thursday, 18 May 2017**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-18may17-en.mp3>

And the Adobe recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p8ubbtz6a9l/>

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

Date: 18 May 2017

Coordinated Universal Time: 12:00 UTC:

<https://tinyurl.com/ml6mx9f>

05:00 Los Angeles; 08:00 Washington; 13:00 London; 15:00 Istanbul; 22:00 Hobart

**List of attendees:**

**NCA – Non Voting** – Erika Mann

**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, Paul McGrady, Heather Forrest

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Martin Silva Valent, Stephanie Perrin, Stefania Milan (on but sent Proxy due to sound quality – Proxy Stephanie Perrin), Edward Morris, Marilia Maciel, Rafik Dammak

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

**Guest Presenter**

Thomas Rickert – Co-Chair of the CCWG-Accountability WS2

**ICANN Staff**

Markus Kummer – ICANN Board Member

David Olive -Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional Headquarters- Istanbul – absent - sent apologies

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  
Nathalie Peregrine - Specialist, SO/AC  
Terri Agnew - Secretariat Services Coordinator, GNSO  
Sara Caplis - Manager, Meetings Technical Services, IT Infrastructure

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Ivy). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody. And welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 18th of May, 2017. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it?  
Thank you ever so much.

James Bladel.

James Bladel: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rubens Kuhl.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: ...your note in the chat, Rubens. Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Darcy Southwell.

Darcy Southwell: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Valerie Tan.

Valerie Tan: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Phil Corwin.

Phil Corwin: Present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rafik Dammak.

Rafik Dammak: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Stephanie Perrin. I note that Stephanie is not yet in the Adobe Connect room. We'll return back to her later. And Stefania Milan, I believe you are on audio but you have given your proxy to Stephanie Perrin in case of technical issues...

Stefania Milan: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Okay.

Stefania Milan: Yes, I'm here but I'm in transit so I might disappear at some point.

Nathalie Peregrine: All right, noted. Thank you very much. Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Here, Nathalie. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Tony Harris.

Tony Harris: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Ed Morris.

Ed Morris: Here, Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Martin Silva Valent. And I notice Martin is just joining the Adobe Connect room now. Welcome, Martin. Marilia Maciel – is not on the call yet, we'll follow up with her. Julf Helsingius.

Julf Helsingius: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I believe Cheryl was on the bridge with us. We'll call her back. Ben Fuller.

Ben Fuller: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Erika Mann.

Erika Mann: Yes, I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. And I'd like to note that we also have on the call with us Thomas Rickert and Markus Kummer. From staff we, David Olive sends his apologies for today's call. And we also have with us Mary Wong, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Amr Elsadr, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Terri Agnew, Sara Caplis for technical support and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. And good morning and welcome, everyone, to the GNSO Council call for the 18th of May. As per our standard protocol, does anyone have any updates to their status as a councilor or their statements of interest? If so please raise your hand.

Okay seeing none we'll move on then to our agenda. The agenda was circulated on our Council list and appears in the Adobe chat room there. Does anyone have any updates or amendments or additions to our agenda or any item they'd like to include in AOB? If so, raise your hand. Keith, go ahead.

Keith Drazek: Yes, hi James. Thanks very much. Keith Drazek. For AOB I'd just like to suggest that we chat briefly about sort of the upcoming work of the Standing Selection Committee as it relates to – I think it's a number of appointments that the GNSO Council will need to make. You know, one I think is moving the representative to the empowered community from (unintelligible) oh sorry, getting some feedback there. The rep to the empowered community from interim to permanent status. And I think there's a couple of others, maybe ATRT 3, I may be missing one or two, but I think that's something that we need to cover. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Keith. We will note that for AOB and just to point out that I did ask Susan Kawaguchi to give us a brief update on the SSC, which I believe held a call earlier this week. And I think, Susan, if you don't mind, we'll put you on the spot for an update later on in our call.

Okay, great. Thank you for that. And thank you, Keith. Any other updates to our agenda? Okay, seeing none, then we'll move into our – we'll just note the minutes from previous Council meeting. Those were posted for the April 6 meeting for the meeting that occurred in Copenhagen, and then the meeting that we conducted in late April was posted on the 8th of May. Those meetings are on our mailing list – those meeting minutes are on our mailing list if anyone has any updates, please, you know, take the chance to review those and then respond.

And then finally, just to note, that we – in the interim, since our last call, we conducted an electronic ballot on the motion to initiate a policy amendment process of protections for Red Cross and Red Crescent names. And hopefully everyone had no troubles casting – accessing their ballot and casting their votes.

The results of that, and I can certainly turn it over to Nathalie for an in depth discussion, but the results of that was that the motion did carry. It was not unanimous; I believe we had a couple of abstentions, including a statement from I believe the IPC. So just noting that that motion was passed and that topic does come up again later in our agenda for the call today, item Number 7 where we discuss next steps.

Okay, then moving onto our review of projects and open action items. And if I could ask staff to pull up that list and while we're doing that, Keith just noting your hand is still up. I'm assuming that's an old hand from before.

Keith Drazek: Yes, old hand. Sorry.

James Bladel: No worries. Thanks. Gave us something to talk about and stall for time while staff loaded the spreadsheet. Okay, here we go. Thank you for putting that up. We have a couple of open action items including several that appear in our agenda for today, the ICANN 59 schedule – the GNSO schedule for the upcoming policy forum in Johannesburg, we have the Section 16 amendment for Red Cross and Red Crescent names, we have a couple of completed items here. We filled our slate of liaisons so thank you to all of those who volunteered during our last meeting. And we had submitted our comments on the fiscal year '18 upcoming strategic plan and budget.

We have a couple of in progress items with regard to the CCWG on Internet governance, which is being discussed later today. Our response to the GAC communiqué is up for a vote. We have finalization of the GNSO nominees for the RDS team. I can provide an update on that.

We've – we selected our slate but the SOs and ACs are still trying to work out a time to meet and finalize the overall slate of members for that review team. And so far that meeting has not occurred and there were a number of challenges to holding that meeting this week, so I believe that that is now targeted for next week. I will certainly update the Council once we have – once we have some additional updates.

Then moving on to the next items here, we have the EC which Keith and Susan will – which Keith mentioned, Susan will provide an update, we have thick Whois implementation. I'm not sure – I'll probably have to circle back to staff on what we need to do there. We definitely have this ongoing issue with IGOs and INGOs which we'll discuss later on. And PDP improvements, and actually I thought that was one complete but I would defer to Marika on what remaining actions items are required on PDP improvements. I think this is mainly just a ongoing process and continuous improvements to our operating and our management of the PDPs.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you James. This is Marika. On the PDP improvements, and that allows me at the same time to give you an update on some of the other work, what we're doing, because as a result of the work of the drafting team, we're now in the process, or we're hoping that we're close to at least finalizing some of the outstanding questions that staff still had before we're able to make some of the recommended changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures and Bylaws as a result of the recommendations of that group.

And in conjunction with that, there are a number of other items that need updating in the GNSO Operating Procedures, one of which relates to the PDP improvement, which is this notion of the integration of the proposed PDP charter as part of a preliminary issue report. So that is one of the outstanding items on that one. And we also had an action item as staff to develop a draft guidelines for the use and application of face to face facilitated PDP working group meetings, but we may need to have a separate conversation around that as that pilot or that project that has been set aside for that hasn't really been used anymore as we have now moved toward having those meetings within the ICANN meeting.

So the question is, is that still needed or will that now be taken over by the work that will take place in relation to the guidelines for travel support as part of the new pilot for PDP working group chairs and leadership.

If I can also take advantage, and move back to the previous item, which you noted that the thick Whois item, that's still on the list here. This is still an outstanding item which I think the Council started discussing before the meeting in Copenhagen and I think that item there is that there's I believe it was – if I'm not mistaken I think Keith and Susan or possibly Erika that indicated that they wanted to have another look at that request that was originally drafted by Erika to see whether or not that needed to be adapted and brought back to the Council.

So I think the question is, is that still an item that the Council needs to deal with or is willing to take up, although I note I think there have been separate conversations as well on obtaining input especially on new EU data protection legislations. But I see Keith has his hand up so I'm sure he'll be responding to that. Thank you.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Marika. And well before I go to Keith I'll just note that every opportunity we've raised to discuss this particular topic seems to kill our agenda. But Keith, if you have any updates or specific actions related to that, please go ahead.

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks James. I think rather than killing our agenda maybe I'll propose killing this topic and I'll certainly want to hear from Susan and Erika on that. And I think Stephanie had volunteered as well at one point to contribute. But the topic that we raised in Copenhagen was – and even before – was the GNSO Council you know, wanting to or suggesting that the GNSO Council ask for an updated legal memo from ICANN on the issue of the GDPR.

But I think that's been overtaken by events now that the Contracted Party House because we made no progress previously at the Council level, the Contracted Party House – the chairs of the Registries and Registrar Stakeholder Group took it upon themselves to send that request to ICANN staff. ICANN has that. We've been told they're working on it. So I think we can put a line through this one unless anybody objects. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Keith, for that update and for refreshing our memory. I do remember in Copenhagen there was some discussion of whether the Council was the appropriate body to raise this request. And I do note that this was – this was raised with the GDD and during the GDD Summit, the staff reported that they are working on this. I guess my open question, and I see Erika with her hand up, is what does that do with the memo that was written by Erika? Is that something that we want to salvage for a different effort before we strike this

from our action list? And I'll go to Erika for that question and any other thoughts she has.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. I have actually not thought about it what we should do with it. So give me a little bit of time and I will send a follow up email concerning this topic. But I think the top – I agree, first of all I support what Keith said so I fully support him. Second, the memo is still valid. The issue becomes even more hotly debated within our own communities. I have seen many threats and different community mailing list or Facebook list so the topic is still debated.

And I think it will be – continued to be important that ICANN prepares the legal memo. I'm very very doubtful that without a legal – a clear legal memo, a solution will be found that is legally really viable. So give me time so just to go back and maybe we need to check and Marika maybe can do this best just to check where the memo is – are they doing something with the strat plan internally to send us – to send us a legal notice as soon as possible so just that we get the details right. Thanks so much, James. Back to you.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Erika. Very helpful. And before I go to Marika I think that it sounds like the general take on this is that this item probably needs to come off of the Council's plate in this list of our to-do items and then just move to some of these other areas where they are you know, the work is continuing and the discussions are ongoing but it's just not necessarily something that needs to be on our to-do list. But, Marika, go ahead. You'll have the last word on this.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just wanted to note, and I also put it in the chat that if I recall well I think one of the original objectives was as well that a memo would like that would inform the RDS PDP Working Group in its deliberations but that group has already separately started looking for legal guidance or input to help with responses to a set of questions that they prepared originally for their session with Data Protection Commissioners, but that also goes to

the question indeed of what is the impact of the new legislation with regards to the work or the questions that they're looking at.

So they seem to already, you know, are moving along their own path. And as Keith noted, I think the Contracted Party House has taken the initiative with regards to what they need or what they want to discuss so indeed it does seem that at the moment at the Council level it may not be necessary to further pursue this.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you Marika. And Erika, is that an old hand or – okay new hand. Go ahead, Erika.

Erika Mann: Yes, I'm obviously a bit concerned about what Marika just said. So you have to keep in mind that these commissioners, which we invited it's – they are national commissioners. They have a say about the European landscape as well but they have their own political agenda, why they want to become so relevant in our environment. So I would urge us a little bit be careful. I don't mind we do this, but we have to be careful and a bit prudent. That's one of the reason why a legal memo from an outside counsel is so important because don't forget, this legislation, which will be implemented, has so many open agendas still.

So whatever they see as an opportunity to gain power they will take. So it is super important to have an independent legal opinion from a Council really done for our environment. And I would be – I would be really caution us just to follow – to give them too many questions which they then will reply upon because this may be in legal terms in the future if we ever have even a legal case coming up, might be not a very clever idea.

James Bladel: Thank you, Erika, that's noted. And before we go to Susan I just want to note that we are still discussing our action items. I think we have very clear indications that while this is an important subject, it probably needs to come off of our list of action items. I'm just trying to pull our conversation back onto

the road here a little bit and not dive too much into the substance here. But Susan, we'll give you the last word and then we'll just need to move on to our consent agenda. Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, James. Susan Kawaguchi for the record. And I agree, Erika, what we're doing beyond the DPAs is reaching out to ccTLDs to see if they will give us some insight on how they are handling that. But also we're sort of want to make sure that we ask for that legal analysis at the right time for the working group. And in the leadership team, didn't feel like now was exactly the right time but would be happy to see the Council and/or the CPH do this so...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: But I'm sure there'll be another legal request coming from us – from the working group.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Susan. Good exchange, folks. And again, I just want to emphasize that we're not abandoning this work, it is important, we're just moving it to other avenues where it can perhaps pick up a little bit of speed so thank you for that.

Let's then shift our focus to the project list which is the list of all the ongoing PDPs and IRTs. And I just want to report that Council chairs have had separate meetings with the leadership of each of the PDPs to discuss their – to get an update on their status to discuss their immediate deliverables, their timeline for completing their work and any challenges or barriers or resource constraints that they've encountered. I think those went fairly well and we did have some follow up action items and some takeaways.

But we have since that occurred a couple weeks ago, we have shifted to a discussion now with the leadership of the implementation review teams, the IRTs. And while scheduling all of those has been a challenge, we do note that

we've met with a couple of them and we have a couple more on deck for later this week and early next.

So that is ongoing and I think that is meant to just ensure that these folks have an opportunity to raise their hands if they need any assistance or help from Council because otherwise if they don't meet with us or make a formal presentation in Johannesburg, then they would be out to sea, effectively, from Copenhagen to Abu Dhabi, and that's a long time to kind of be out there on your own. So we wanted to take that initiative. I think that's been fairly well received.

I think the advice or guidance that we have provided where appropriate was also taken on board and that any concerns or even just issues that were flagged for Council have also been received by us and we're taking a look at what we can do to help some of these PDP leaders facilitate their work.

So with that, let's just kind of skim through this list fairly quickly and note that we have some active working groups here including a couple of PDPs, the GNSO Standing Selection Committee, which we'll get an update from Susan briefly at the end of our call, we have the CCWGs including the CCWG on Internet Governance, which is on our agenda, the CCWGs I believe on Accountability Work Stream 2, we have a discussion about the charter and budget extension on our agenda, and the others I think are fairly familiar to this group.

We have two that are waiting on a Board vote including the IGO INGO Red Cross issue and the Geo Regions Review. And then we have several PDPs that are in an implementation phase including the Review Working Group, the revised Bylaws Drafting Team, the Privacy Proxy Translation Transliteration IRTP-C has an open item associated with it and thick Whois is also kind of hanging out there. And if you scroll down I think there's one more which is the implementation of IGOs and INGOs.

So that's currently what we have as far as active working groups, active cross community groups with GNSO participation and PDPs and IRTs. So any questions or comments on these groups or any questions or comments relating to our discussions with the chairs?

Okay seeing an empty queue –oh, I'm sorry, I jumped the gun there, Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. It's Michele for the record. No just very briefly, I think it's a good idea that there is this continuous back and forth between the GNSO Council and the PDP working groups. I think at times it can be quite easy for – be a little bit disjointed and impossible breakdown in communication between the Council and the various PDPs so this is a – is definitely a positive move. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. And I think that, you know, if that catches on it may be something that we could do – see as a fixture going forward just as a part of the GNSO's management of those PDPs to check in periodically with the leaders and take a more – take a more assertive posture in that. So that's – I think that is something that we could look at going forward.

Okay, let's then move on if there are no other comments, let's move onto Agenda Item Number 3 which is our consent agenda. And we have two items on the consent agenda, and I will wait just a moment while we put away this document and get our agenda back down from the shelf here, if I could ask staff to pull that up? So here that is loading now.

The consent agenda, which is normally empty, has two items. The first is the acknowledgement of the selection from the Non Contracted Party House of Matthew Shears for Seat Number 14 on the Board. And that Mathew would be seated at the end – I believe it's the end or let's say at the end of or during the annual general meeting in Abu Dhabi, which would be the conclusion of Markus's term.

And that was an interesting exercise as Mary can probably weigh in, in that because of the new bylaws the empowered community must ratify or confirm or designate the members of the Board. And so there was a discussion on the empowered community of whether or not that needed to take the form of a formal vote or a discussion or indeed whether other communities – other SOs and ACs would have the ability to weigh in on the selection of Board members of another SO and AC. And this is all just kind of, you know, feeling the empowered community's finding its legs, doing some of these operations for the first time.

The good news is, I think, that all agreed that when a community, an SO or AC, makes a designation or sorry, makes a nomination for the Board of Directors using its own internal selection processes, that the empowered community administration should simply – as a formality – should simply make that designation and relay that to the Board. And I can report that that is currently occurring not only for the GNSO Seat 14 but I also I believe for the – for another seat, I think for the ALAC.

So with that in mind, just a note here that we are making that designation for Matthew Shears. And then the second item is – we had some discussion on the list that the CCWG Work Stream 2 has requested that their charter, which was originally scheduled to conclude at the end of this fiscal year, which is I believe, the end of June, they're asking – they're noting that their work will not be complete at that time, they're asking for an extension not only of their charter but of the unused portion of the allocated budget.

They would like to see that carried over from fiscal year '17 to fiscal year '18. And that is a request that they have prepared and they've asked all the SOs and ACs and chartering organizations to weigh in on that. And this motion in the consent agenda is to in fact lend the GNSO support to that request. So, sorry, I'm – I'm actually in a hotel room trying not to wake my neighbors, Paul.

Okay so that's what I have on the consent agenda. Does anyone have any comments or questions on the consent agenda that they'd like to discuss? We'll open the queue. The queue is empty so I'm assuming that means that everyone is ready to go ahead and proceed with a vote.

So if that's – if there are no objections, I recommend that we just go to a vote by acclamation. Okay, Nathalie, if you would do the honors, please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, James. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion please say "aye"?

(Group): Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Stephanie Perrin, proxy for Stefania Milan, would you please express your vote, say aye.

Stephanie Perrin: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. James, we have no abstention, no objection, the motion passes.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. And we'll note that for the record. Okay, staff and the Council leadership will follow up on those two items. Agenda Item Number 4 is another vote, and this one is a formal motion on the review of the GAC communiqué. And this is the – I'll wait for staff to load that motion. But just to note that this motion was withdrawn from our meeting in April and therefore needed to be resubmitted. However, in the interim, we gave a copy of our draft response to the Board so that they would have it in time to discuss with their conversation with the GAC.

So I'll just go ahead and read the resolve clauses of this motion, which was made by me and seconded by Michele. It is, Resolved, the GNSO Council

adopts the GNSO review of the Copenhagen GAC communiqué, and there's the link, and requests that the GNSO Council Chair communicate the GNSO review of the GAC – Copenhagen GAC communiqué to the ICANN Board.

Resolve 2, the GNSO Council requests that the Council Chair also inform the GAC Chair of the communication between the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board.

That's the motion that we have before us. And hopefully you've had an opportunity to review the final draft language of the response to the Copenhagen communiqué. And with that, I will open the queue for discussion. Phil, you're up first.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you, James. Phil for the record. I support the motion, I just wanted to note, and I published an article two days ago that I copied Council members on with the link that in the meeting that the Board had with the GAC two days after receipt of our draft comment on the communiqué, the Board nonetheless agreed to engage in discussions with individual GAC members on the two-character issue which is of some concern to me, and I think of others. And I just wanted to note that I think that makes adopting this comment on the communiqué even more important and with follow up action dialogue with the Board on that and other issues. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. And thanks for sharing your blog posts with the Council list. It is something that I think we very clearly took a strong position on in our communiqué. Paul.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady for the record. So I want to ask a clarifying question to Phil. So they have – has the Board officially taken the position that they therefore must engage with individual countries or was it less formal than that? And I ask because I do think that in the event the Board goes down this road, that we should consider some sort of action that is more than just resident in a response to a GAC communiqué, I think that this is – if the GAC can

essentially force the Board to engage in bilateral negotiations with individual countries over whatever topic they want, that is the end of predictability and I think it is outside the scope of the bylaws that came out of the accountability review; it was supposed to be more accountability, not less.

So I guess I'm trying to understand, are we at that point yet where we have the formal crisis or is this still an informal crisis? Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Paul, what alerted me to this, now I – we sent the data – the letter we sent to the Board conveying the draft views on the communiqué was April 25; the call between the Board and the GAC was on the 27th. I note Donna's comment in the chat that her understanding is our response was not timely enough for the Board to be able to consider it. I'm not sure why because it was sent two days before that call.

But the specific action that was taken, and just let me get to this right now, and in my article, the full text from the notes of the Board GAC call of April 27 are Item Number 4 in the appendix to the article. And I'll just read it so you know exactly what it says, which is all I know about.

The Board indicated that the ICANN organization would consult with interested GAC members on this issue. The staff lead is David Olive. The Board sees this as the beginning of a dialogue to identify issues and possible solutions. David Olive, supported by Olof Nordling, will work with GAC leadership to determine how to identify interested GAC members and whether to have bilateral or group discussions. Several GAC members suggested a group discussion with interested members would be more efficient and production.

And I'll skip some of this. David Olive committed to having as many discussions as possible before ICANN 59 subject to availability of relevant people. And then it goes on to note the – about a dozen or so countries that are interested in participating in any discussion. So it appears that they have

you know, said yes and that they're committed to some process of some indeterminate length in engaging with these GAC members who raised such a fuss about Board's implementation of the two-character issue last November after taking all the relevant GAC advice into account.

So that's all I know what's in the notes which I found as I was researching the article. I went back to the GAC Website and to look at the official text of the communiqué and noted that these notes had been posted. So that's it, that's all I know. But they are engaging in discussions and it's not clear how long they will take or what the expected outcome is or how it might affect what the Board has already done last November.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. I note that we have Paul and Donna in the queue. And I think I have some ideas on what we can – what we can do (unintelligible) follow up to get you some of those answers. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady again for the record. So I – James, you and I are probably heading the same way because I think we do need to have an answer, I guess, from the Board of whether or not they are engaging in the bilateral discussions that the faulty GAC advice called for along with its obligation to reach agreement which was also in the faulty GAC advice or if the Board's just being nice and talking to various countries, which of course it has every right to talk to various countries about whatever it wants to talk to various countries about. So I think we need to find a way to get an answer to that question. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. My understanding is that the Board hasn't officially responded to the GAC advice yet. That goes through another process, so the idea behind the conversation they had with the GAC was to understand – was to make sure that they understand the elements of the

GAC communiqué that might be a bit sketchy for the Board, so that's kind of an exploratory dialogue I suppose.

The Board has agreed to those conversations. And David Olive will facilitate those. There is a kind of secondary question in there that I think Mark Carvell asked during that call. So there's two elements to the GAC advice; one is about the process that the Board follows when it agreed to the resolution in Hyderabad, and the second part is so it's individual discussions with governments about the you know, the use of the two characters at the second level.

So I think – I don't know that the Board has actually responded on that first issue related to process. And I guess that will come out in the final communiqué. I'd just like to suggest that before we, you know, get too strident on our concerns about the GAC going outside the bounds of what's in the bylaws, perhaps it might be a good idea that we actually have a conversation with the GAC around this. I don't know whether we've got anything on the agenda for our discussion in Johannesburg.

But maybe it's worth having a conversation with the GAC so that at least we can be informed about what their position is and how they see the, you know, the manner in which they're provided advice is actually consensus advice. So I think that would be a helpful conversation for us to have before we get, you know, too strident in the manner in which we think they are within or without the bylaws.

You know, understanding that corralling the thoughts of 140 governments is a difficult thing to do and that the communiqué itself is a vehicle that allows the GAC to reach a position that is acceptable to everybody and it's probably better than having, you know, those countries that feel disenfranchised with the two character thing coming out separately from the GAC.

So we need to understand that it's a delicate balance that, you know, particularly Thomas as the Chair of the GAC, that they're trying to manage within the GAC itself and what comes out in the communiqué. So I think we should be a little bit sensitive to that and perhaps if we have a conversation with the GAC we might get a better understanding of you know, how they came to the views that this was consensus advice they could put in the communiqué as such. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna. And I think your intervention just further reinforces the idea that we have some gaps in our knowledge that we need to get closed and I would like to point out that we have a call scheduled between the GNSO leadership and the GAC leadership next week on the 23rd of May in preparation for discussions in Johannesburg so we can certainly table this item then and understand a little bit more about what their intentions are on this topic. But I'll go to Paul.

Paul McGrady: Hi, Paul McGrady here again for the record. So I think talking to the GAC is well and good but they're not the ones making the decision here; the Board is making the decision about whether or not they're going to engage in bilateral discussions and before – to reach an agreement or not. In other words, are they going to, you know, are they going to comply with this GAC advice or not? And the way that it was written unfortunately even though we were told it wouldn't be written this way, is that unless there's a supermajority vote saying no, then the GAC advice sticks.

So it would be great if we could you know, wait around to Johannesburg and ask a bit about what's going on. But unfortunately, coming out of the same accountability review mechanism that brought us the supermajority Board vote to ignore GAC advice, also brought us a 15-day, I believe, window to file a request for reconsideration for staff or a Board action. And so we really don't have until Johannesburg if we're going to take advantage of some of the basic accountability mechanisms that were baked into the new bylaws. So I

think this is on a completely different timeframe than what I'm hearing from others on this call.

And just as long as, you know, as long as we're all aware that if we drag our feet to Johannesburg we're foreclosing accountability mechanisms. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. And just to note, you know, my comment there was that we were going to meet with the GAC next week. We can certainly schedule a Board meeting – or discussion with some of the appropriate folks from the Board to understand when their decision is expected on this sooner than the meeting in Johannesburg. And my understanding is the 15-day clock doesn't start until the Board actually makes some sort of formal decision, so we can get a better sense on when that can be expected and what the ETA on that decision is and that we can decide accordingly.

But I think that – I think that we need to follow up with both groups. I think we need to, you know, put a marker down with the GAC that we would like to discuss this with them not only in Johannesburg but we'd also like to raise this with the Board and understand what their decision process will be.

And I think we're all certainly agreed that the language in our response to the communiqué is fairly clear that we have concerns on this. And Donna's point is noted that we are sympathetic or sensitive to some of the challenges but that doesn't necessarily clear a path to rewriting the rulebook.

So okay, the queue is clear. Does anyone else want to weigh in on this topic before we move to a adoption of our response? And I think our response on this topic is fairly clear. And thanks to everyone who contributed to the drafting of that language and the drafting of the language on other topics as well.

Okay, if there are no objections then I'd like to go ahead and move to a vote. And I'd like to move to a – I'd like to conduct a vote by acclamation so that we

can get this resolved fairly quickly. Nathalie, if you would do the honors please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, James. 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.

Stephanie Perrin: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Stephanie Perrin, proxy for Stefania Milan, please express your vote and say "aye."

Stephanie Perrin: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Stephanie. With no abstention, no objection, the motion passes. Over to you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie, and thank you, councilors. And with regard to our conversation, if note Resolve Number 1, when we communicate this to the Board support staff, we will also make that request that we would like to better understand their process and timeline for a decision on the communiqué in particular the two-letter string issue – two character string issue, sorry. So we will incorporate that into our response when we send them this letter.

Okay, I see there's a lot of stuff going on in the chat here from Phil, and I apologize that I'm not able to read and speak at the same time. So hopefully someone is keeping up with that and, Phil, feel free to raise your hand if you'd like to get that on the record in some other way.

But otherwise we'll move on then to Agenda Item Number 5, which is a discussion of CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 which is the – an update on the status and the timeline for delivery of a final report. Work Stream 2, as you'll recall, is finalizing its work but it is not going to be complete until the end of – or until beyond the end of this fiscal year so they're asking for an extension of their charter and an extension of their budget.

They're also, I believe, has been a change at leadership level with Mathieu stepping down as the ccNSO cochair and so we're looking for an update on all of those headlines and more from one of our favorite CCWG cochairs, Thomas Rickert, who has joined us. Thomas, if you are on the line and able to speak I will turn it over to you and – for a brief update on this CCWG. Thomas, go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks. Thanks very much, James. I'm on the audio and I'm able to speak and thanks so much for this kind introduction. Maybe to start with the (unintelligible) leadership level, as you well know, we started this whole CCWG work with three cochairs being Mathieu Weil representing the ccNSO; Leon Sanchez representing ALAC; and myself representing the GNSO. And we had two changes over time. The first of one is that Leon Sanchez will take a Board seat that the upcoming AGM so I guess that's great news and well deserved for Leon. But that also means that he cannot continue being a cochair until the work of the CCWG Work Stream 2 is done.

So we do not yet know who's going to replace him, if any. But we do know that he plans to work on this team for as long as he can but as soon as he's going to be conflicted and certainly he will be stepping down.

The other change is that Mathieu Weill left. He left quite – at quite short notice. He now has a very important position with the Ministry of Economic Affairs in France. If I'm not mistaken, I can't tell the exact title but he's responsible for everything digital, heading a big team of (unintelligible) and I think that was a great opportunity for him. But that meant that he had to give

up his CCWG and ICANN an AfNIC related duties in a matter of a couple of days.

But we are glad to be able to announce to you that Jordan Carter has taken over since he was recently appointed by the CCWG – excuse me, by the ccNSO as cochair. And I guess that this was an excellent pick particularly because Jordan Carter has been instrumental in the success during Work Stream 1. He was rapporteur at the time and so he knows how we work, he knows all the processes, he knows the subject matter.

And we already had an initial leadership call and it looks very promising. I guess we're having an excellent team. And I – it's with pleasure that I see Cheryl who's also in the leadership team ticking this green. So welcome to Jordan, should he ever hear about this presentation to the GNSO Council.

So I'm not going to make this too long but I wanted to share a few thoughts and a little bit of information with you because as you know, we have not managed to be as far in our work on Work Stream 2 as we would have hoped to be. I think that part of that is due to the fact that we had a slower start than we originally anticipated and that itself may be the reason – may be caused by people being exhausted after this Herculean task getting Work Stream 1 done.

So we started a little bit late or at least a substantive work in a few of the sub teams started a little later than anticipated. Also, I guess, that in certain areas, the discussions turned out to be more complex than originally anticipated. And what we've now done, and the GNSO Council knows this perfectly well, is that we've asked for more time.

And James, you mentioned during the introduction that we were asking for more budget, but actually at this point in time we're asking for more time to get the work done. We have not exhausted the budget that has been allocated to our task – to our group. So we are quite confident that if the

extension goes smoothly that we will be able to complete our work by June 2018.

But this really requires the whole community and the ICANN Board to work together in a very collegial manner and work very hard and on time on various aspects of what we need to do. So the issue was that – and just responding to James’s comment in the chat, that we had a mechanism with work done with the PCST to ask for additional funds, but we did not have any process defined to carry forward budget that has not been exhausted in one financial year to the new financial year.

So I guess that’s the good news, but we will not ask for more money; we will – at least at this point in time, we cannot see the need for asking for more money. We’re asking for more time. And it is critical that we get the job done within the new project plan that we’ve been working on because it is very uncertain that we will get another extension. And therefore, you know, we should all work hard to get the job done by June 2018.

To get that done, all sub teams need to be done by ICANN 61 in March ’18 so that we have the remaining time for getting the work completed and everything put together. I will speak to that in a little bit more detail.

So in order to be done by ICANN 61 all sub teams need to have a draft ready by ICANN 60 which is November ’17. And if we have two public comment periods per sub team, i.e. per special interest topic, let’s say, in Work Stream 1, then we need to have a first draft ready by ICANN 59. And that will require us to have a few public comment periods or at least one public comment period run over the summer. So we apologize up front that we might need to do that or we will definitely need to do that so that the CCWG plenary can have revised drafts that have undergone public comment periods by ICANN 60.

So that's the challenge that we're working against. And what I've asked our great staff to upload in the Adobe room is the dashboard which I hope all of you read on a monthly basis. And I guess that this document really takes transparency about our work to the next level. I think this is more or less unprecedented. Some of you will have noticed that this document has 20 slides. Don't be afraid, I'm not going to go through all of them. But just very briefly I'm going to speak to three of them.

This is the original timeline that we had envisaged and you can see the report date between – around May. And given the status of where we are, it is impossible for us to get ready in the originally envisaged timeframe. So that will change, we have a new project plan that is actually going to June 2018.

So where are we with the individual sub teams? I'm not going to speak to detail, but you can take a closer look at the document if you are interested in more detail. Please do look at the completion status and the status where you see the green marks or the green marks with the red circle inside it or the yellow marks. And that shows you whether the individual sub teams' work is on track, which is true for five of the topics that we're working on.

And then we have two that are on track with the revised schedule, i.e. the schedule that runs until June 2018. And we have two that are behind schedule, but as you can see in the agenda for the bottom line of the slide, recovery – we're just waiting for a few things to happen and then we will be able to put those back on track so that we can delivery on time.

Last slide I'm going to use here is a quick overview of where we are in terms of readings in the CCWG plenary. We are working on the basis of the documents being prepared in the subgroups that are led by rapporteurs. And then when the sub teams think that their work is good to go for plenary adoption, then there are two readings in the CCWG plenary. And that requires us to have two subsequent meetings in the plenary and that also takes some time to get the documents adopted.

Reason for that is that we agreed at the very beginning of the CCWG work that we would never take important decisions in one meeting so that we can, you know, you can't game the system just by waiting for, you know, certain folks that might be causing issues to skip a meeting and then you take a decision then. So we want to make sure that everyone gets a chance to make his or her voice heard.

And so you can see with the ticks that we have conducted first and second readings on six out of the 10 topics that we're working on and we have closed public comment periods on three of them. Three public comment periods are still open. And for the remainder documents have not yet been adopted.

So this is where we are in broad terms. Let me just spend another minute or two on the process that's going to start afterwards. And you can expect...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

James Bladel: I'm sorry, I don't mean to interrupt, I just wanted to see if this was a good point for you to take any questions that might be coming up while you have this information on the screen before we move onto the next phase or if you'd just like to catch all the questions at the end?

Thomas Rickert: I'm perfectly okay with pausing for a moment and seeing whether there are questions.

James Bladel: Okay. Councilors, any questions or we can have Thomas move into his – okay, sorry, sorry for the interruption, Thomas. Please continue.

Thomas Rickert: No worries, I think it was good of you to remind me of inviting councilors to ask questions. I want to spend the last one or two minutes of my quick update to sort of give you a heads up that we will send a letter to chartering organizations and the Board after we've been able to discuss the adoption process further with the CCWG plenary.

Because as you can see, we have quite a number of sub teams working on individual parts of the whole accountability task. And these get ready one after the other. There's no way for us to be able to present the whole document which is likely going to be a book, to the chartering organizations in one go and then ask you to comment and approve in a matter of days or even weeks which is why you should note that you will get the individual chunks. We ask the chartering organizations to comment on the individual chunks whether you're happy with those.

And then at the end we plan to do only another public comment period as well as a consultation with the chartering organizations and the Board to ask whether you spot inconsistencies between the individual work packages, once we put them together. And this is important because we will likely limit digesting comments or incorporating comments that speak to inconsistencies and not those that speak to issues that could have been brought up earlier.

Because if people reserve sort of the right to speak to substance on a subtopic that has been closed like a year back, you know, that would basically make the whole project plan and the whole planning impossible for us. So expect us to come up with such an approach. We will also encourage the Board to agree to such approach so that as we will have a sequence of getting the individual chunks ready, then getting the whole package ready with inconsistency check and then once this is done then the chartering organizations will get the whole package for approval and the Board will get it for approval as well.

So I think I should stop here. I hope that I haven't taken too much of your time. And I'm happy to take more questions if there are any.

James Bladel: Thank you, Thomas. I'll ask if the councilors have any questions. I have one small one so I'll put myself in the queue, but anyone else with a question? Okay, looks like you might be getting off easy today, Thomas. And I think that's probably a result of folks wanting some more time to digest this information and review the slides offline. So I'll ask my question and then – oh I'm sorry, go ahead, Erika. Erika, if you're speaking we can't hear you.

Erika Mann: Can you hear me now?

James Bladel: Yes, please proceed.

Erika Mann: Sorry for this. I just have a tiny one, Thomas. I was wondering where are we on the jurisdiction? I follow it sometimes, and but I'm not totally sure. Is the process totally over and what is the process ahead of us?

Thomas Rickert: Erika, I suggest that I provide a quick written update, a few lines, to be circulated on the Council list. What I can say is that...

Erika Mann: This would be fine.

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: That's fine, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: ...jurisdiction team, but I would assume that most folks on the Council are interested in getting maybe an update on a more granular level so I will provide that in writing.

Erika Mann: Perfect. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Thomas. Paul.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, James. Paul McGrady for the record. So I did my best not to make a comment but Erika's comment on jurisdiction just made me do it. So I've done my best to participate on that particular group. Frankly, the reason why, in my opinion why it has none of the checkboxes – checkmarks boxed or whatever this chart is – is because it's essentially been allowed to run in circles where they get close to settling the issue about whether or not ICANN is going to be moved to a different jurisdiction and then that same topic allows itself to be worked back in and back in around and around and around.

And I know that there's been requests that the leadership of the CCWG give guidance on whether or not that topic is something that's going to be, you know, that should just be, you know, move off that topic again also with the Board who have expressed their you know, complete befuddlement, I guess, that they – that that topic is still being discussed.

I guess my question for Thomas is will the CCWG give more concrete guidance on that topic and any of the other topics that are holding back these last four groups from getting done or we will be here in another year asking for another year? Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Paul. That's a good question actually. And rest assured that I do not plan to spend the rest of my life on CCWG accountability matters. So I think we owe it to the community and those outside who are waiting for us to get ready to actually get ready. But I guess that it was John Berard at the time who used the phrase that the work in the multistakeholder model is so messy and loud, maybe he was using slightly different words, but you get the idea.

And the reason why sort of we let or we allowed the discussions in the jurisdiction group to linger on maybe longer than some of you would have hoped is that this was a particularly sensitive topic. And closing off or ending

such debate too early will surely be perceived as you know, suppressing certain views by those who criticize the process anyway.

So I agree that particularly when you're in the working group or in the sub team you want to get this done faster but I think experience shows that whenever you have challenging topics the group is meandering and maybe moving in circles for the initial phase and then it gets constructed and stalls consensus. And my hope is that this pattern will repeat for the jurisdiction sub team as well.

James Bladel: Thank you, Thomas. And thank you, Paul, for that question about the jurisdiction sub team. Next up we have Stephanie and then myself and then we'll close off this topic. Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. But Thomas made a remark about how with respect to issues of substance, if you didn't raise it a year ago now is not the time. And I'm just wondering how you're going to deal, in the unlikely event that a truly novel issue of substance is raised, for instance in a comment, what are you going to do with that? Just not going to make it into the final report? Are you going to park it in a – for future study? What's the plan? I'm totally in sympathy with that, I'm not criticizing it, but just wondering. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Stephanie. And that's a great question. And we had a discussion along the same lines when we prepared for the upcoming plenary call. It is certainly possible that those who read the documents later will find something that was an oversight by the community previously during public comment periods.

And I think we will have to leave it to the CCWG whether it refuses its final consensus on the package because of such a newly introduced topic. This will not be a decision for the CCWG leadership but it will be a decision for the CCWG plenary.

I would say that we need to have a quite firm view on process for transparency reasons at the outset, so that people do know that we will not allow folks to be quote, unquote, lazy early, not reading sub teams' work products early and not participating in public comment periods for the individual packages when they become ready. But then only chiming in in the very last minute and making it impossible for us to conclude.

So I think we need to be – to try to get agreement that some discipline by all parts of the community and the Board is needed on this. And if there are things that do not – that are not, let's say, system critical for the whole accountability architecture, one route would be to archive those comments and pass them on to be digested and incorporated into one of the periodic reviews that we have prescribed in our bylaws.

James Bladel: Thank you, Thomas. Thank you, Stephanie, for your question. I have a quick question, Thomas, and it's regarding the budget. If you have an unallocated portion of the budget, allocated to – or an unused portion of your allocation, that we're going to be carrying forward into the next fiscal year, if I recall from the PST, a big chunk of that budget was staff support. And if the group continues its work for the entirety of fiscal year 2018 but only has an unused portion of staff support being carried forward, is there a real danger in your opinion, that when we get to the end of fiscal year 2018 this period next year, that Work Stream 2 will be over budget because it will have consumed an extra year of staff support that was not part of the original PST projection?

Thomas Rickert: I should say, James, we have at the time, done cost estimates to reach out to the chartering organizations and ask for your approval. We are now working on a detailed budget but according to our estimate so far we should be fine. You know, we have not used the budget to go out and ask for legal advice so we have not spend a lot on various sub categories that we have budgeted for, so we should be okay. But the issue is that we really need to make sure that procedurally and substantively we get ready by the end of this first extension

because I think we will lose credibility and also may not even get a second extension at all.

And we've already discussed that if sub teams can't deliver in time, if let's say there is not sufficient community input to get the work done, then this may also be a sign of the community not being efficiently interested in getting the work on a certain topic done. And then we might need to accept that as an outcome of our work or partial outcome of our work as well. But again, the idea is not to go beyond June 2018 and the intention is not to go over budget.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Thomas. And thank you for addressing that question. Stephanie, is that a new hand? I'm going to assume that Stephanie that's an old hand. And it just went down. Okay thank you.

Okay, well thank you very much Thomas, for your update and for addressing those questions. I think you've given councilors quite a bit to discuss and to consider. For the Council, the next steps here are that we will take these slides, circulate to the list as well as a link to their – to where they can be reached on the web here and then we will have a broader time to discuss these.

I do think, however, we need to proceed on discussing on our list whether or not to grant GNSO approval to the request for an extension. And in an effort to streamline that process and get a response to the CCWG in a timely manner, I don't know that we necessarily need to move that to a formal motion, we can certainly just discuss on our list and reach a point of non objection. And I'll work with staff to draft a response back to the CCWG on this point.

But again, thank you Thomas, thanks for all who not only contributed to – to our discussion today but who are participating and following the work of Work Stream 2 and driving it towards a completion as soon as possible.

Okay then we are just about 45 minutes remaining in our call. We have a few more agenda items to go through so let's keep this – let's keep the train moving and move to Agenda Item Number 6, which is the discussion of the updated charter for the CCWG on Internet Governance.

Thank you to I believe Donna and Rafik and a couple of other folks who were exchanging some views on the list on this topic. And I think, you know, I'd be happy to open the discussion – open the queue for discussion but I think that at a certain point here we probably should target Johannesburg for a discussion on what we need to do to either extend, renew, modify or withdraw GNSO support as a chartering organization for the CCWG. And I think that a decision point is in our near future, not necessarily on today's call, but it is something that we should be driving this topic towards a resolution.

So with that I would just open the queue to anyone who would like to weigh in on this particular topic. I know there was some discussion on the list and anyone else who would like to add to that, this is the opportunity. And here's Donna's not as well which I think was the most recent post.

I don't see a rush of hands. In the interim, Donna, would – if I would put you on the spot would you like to walk us through any of your issues here or would you just like to move this comment – this conversation to the list?

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. I'm happy to, you know, just briefly go over some of the comments that I made on the charter. You know, if I start at the end of the comments that I've made reading through the charter I recognize that there is a need for some kind of monitoring of the external threats to ICANN and perhaps that is more – it's more – sorry, trying to get my words together here. It's possibly more important now that we're in a new environment.

So I think what I concluded is that I – it seems to me that there's a need for some kind of strategy to develop on, you know, how ICANN...

James Bladel: Did we lose Donna?

Erika Mann: Looks like it.

James Bladel: Oh no. Sorry, Donna, I don't know if you can hear us but we've lost your audio. Okay, while we wait for Donna to return, we'll go to Rafik next. And then we have Michele and Keith after that. But, Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Hear me?

James Bladel: Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, so okay first thanks for Donna the comments and the email and the document. I have to share that with the working group for elaborated comment and those if we can respond and make amendment to the charter based on that.

But what I want to say kind of (unintelligible) that I'm hear many times that there is an issue about that maybe the cross community working group is not the appropriate. I may (unintelligible) but still I cannot see what is proposed (unintelligible). I can see that...

James Bladel: I'm sorry, Rafik, could I ask you to speak up just a little bit? A lot of folks are having difficulty hearing so if there's any possibility you could get a closer to your microphone?

Rafik Dammak: I am using the phone so that's as much as close I can speak. But I can speak more louder. Is it better now?

James Bladel: Perfect, thank you. Yes, a little bit, yes, that's good. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: I'm sorry, I have sore throat the last two days so I will try my best. So okay I acknowledge the concerns I am seeing now in the chat and also from the

comments shared by Donna. I am happy to share those with the working group so we can work more elaborated and see how we can amend the charter further.

However, with regarding to the structure, I'm still kind of bothered to see what is the best option. I can see there is proposal to have a discussion group, okay, maybe why not. The thing is why we wanted to keep the cross community working group is that it gives a certain space for the whole community to participate. I understand that the discussion group was kind of a vehicle that used by – maybe I'm mistaken. This is only by GNSO. So are we asking here so introducing here that we use that to extend it to include the other parts of the community?

On the other hand, is how the GNSO will kind of propose this to the other chartering organization. I didn't hear any other I mean, any issue or concern from the other groups so just thinking here it sound that only a part of the GNSO having concerns. So how we can accommodate that and also working groups, the other chartering organizations so.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Rafik. Before we go on to the queue, Michele, I just want to see if Donna's reconnected? No? Okay, we'll continue to try to reach Donna and we'll go to Michele and we'll try her after Michele.

Donna Austin: James, can you hear me?

James Bladel: Michele, go ahead. Oh, Donna, yes, I can hear you. You're very faint. Any possibility you can increase the Donna volume?

Donna Austin: Can you hear me any better now?

James Bladel: Yes, please proceed.

Donna Austin: Okay, so Rafik, unfortunately I didn't hear what you – what your comments were, very inconvenient to lose audio at that time. I guess the essence of my comments is that I appreciate that there's a need for some kind of strategy or, you know, program that would assist ICANN in responding to, you know, external threats to the model or the, you know, their mission or mandate particularly in post-transition environment. But I'm not sure that the CCWG is the best vehicle to do that.

It became evident as I was – it was quite helpful that the charter was done alongside the proposed charter for the CCWG that are begin developed because it became evident going through that that the – perhaps the CCWG is trying to fit itself within a mechanism that doesn't really suit it because I don't think the way that the charter was laid out indicated that it was the CCWG format is fit for purpose.

So I think, you know, if you can't agree that there's another – a better way to do this, the charter does require greater specificity. You know, there's a lot of Internet governance related meetings that happen throughout the year. I think most people are aware of when they happen. It would be really helpful if that information can be provided in the charter.

You talk about developing papers more information about what those topics might look like. I'm sure you have some indication of that. I think that would be really helpful as well. So and I am a little bit concerned that you would – that the intent is that the CCWG would kind of liaise with the Board and ICANN engagement team. I think there should be a stronger strategy among the three groups moving forward because I'm concerned about overlap, duplication and also I don't know that the CCWG should be the authoritative voice in any of these forum. I think it still with ICANN the organization to be that. So I guess that's the essence of the comments that I made. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna. And just noting that we have a fairly healthy queue on this and we're running a little short on time so I would like to go through the remainder of the queue, which is Michele, Keith and Darcy, and then – oh looks like no more Keith. So Michele and Darcy and then I would like to close this topic and ask that we move the discussion to the list so that we can move on through our agenda and that we will continue to discuss the CCWG IG charter in Johannesburg.

Next up is Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. Wholeheartedly agree with everything that Donna said. I mean, the – one of the issues I see with this is that it's – that sure, there needs to be discussion but whether this particular method of hosting that discussion is the most appropriate is quite debatable. And I would almost say no it isn't. I also am concerned as well that, you know, by putting – framing it as CCWG it suggests a couple things. First off that it has its output – no matter what that might be, is somehow endorsed by the rest of the community when realistically speaking it won't be.

And also I would wonder as well if this is going to be used by some people as a source of funding to attend ICANN – to attend various events around the globe, which again I would have huge issues with. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. And I just note that Darcy had to drop the call because she has a conflict here at the bottom of the hour so she's put her comments in the chat and I will just go ahead and read those into the record here, and then we can close the comments which is that, "Apologies, I have to drop this call due to a conflict. Regarding the CCWG IG charter, I agree with Donna's comments and the areas where she has – where she identified vague or unclear items in the charter. It's important that the CCWG have a work plan and that its work is transparent and regularly reported on," and everything just scrolled, "regularly reported on in detail."

“I share Donna’s concern regarding how the CCWG intends to act as a voice for the community and we also still have a case where we don’t have a defined beginning, middle and end for the CCWG, that seems contradictory to the intended usage of a CCWG.”

Rafik has responded to Michele’s comments that – regarding funding that no one is funded to attend these events. And I can see Rafik, you raised your hand but we are closing the topic. I would ask that councilors please continue this discussion on the list as we need to move towards a resolution of whether to extend or amend, modify or withdraw GNSO support as a chartering organization for the CCWG.

With that I’m going to go ahead and close the queue. Rafik, I see your hand but we do need to move on so if I could encourage you to take that to the list, I see you’ve got a nice exchange going with Michele there and that’s encouraged. But also we just – we need to address Item Number 7 which is a discussion on – which I also believe will take some time – it’s a discussion on the vote to initiate Section 16 process for amending the GNSO recommendations relating to the Red Cross Red Crescent protections.

If you recall from our last meeting, we had a motion. We took it to an electronic ballot. The motion was adopted, not unanimously but it was adopted. And we therefore now have a follow up action to work with staff to reconvene the PDP to address the questions that were outlined in our motion, specifically on Red Cross protections.

Thomas Rickert is here on the call from our previous update. He was the chair or cochair, I can’t remember, sorry, several years ago, of that original PDP and has agreed to take a leadership position again in the reconvened and expedited resurrection of that work. And Council has I think given some fairly clear and narrow guidance to this group that it should not be reopening the entirety of its recommendations but specifically subjecting I believe a

single recommendation or perhaps two recommendations to a fairly narrow question of review.

And so I think that we at this stage we can discuss Council next steps and whether councilors have any other questions for staff on the process that will be used on Thomas, on, you know, I think we've been talking with staff for example on what we can expect in terms of reinitiating participation. I think a lot of the original participants of this PDP are still very active in the ICANN community so we expect that we should be – we should be covered there as far as membership.

I think there is an open question of should this group limit itself to those who participated in the previous PDP or should it be open to new members or perhaps replacement members for those original folks who no longer want to get the band back together and all those kinds of nuts and bolts details that will be necessary and then of course what kind of a time frame we can expect this group to bring some of its findings back to council for our consideration.

And just a reminder that council will again subject any amendments resulting from this, if there are any, to a council vote. It's not a foregone conclusion that this working group will come up with a different answer or that that answer will be acceptable to council and all the stakeholder groups and constituencies in the GNSO.

So that's just kind of an overview of where we are and next steps ahead. Glad that you were able to stick around Thomas. I see that your hand is up, and then we would certainly open a queue for any other councilors that have questions or comments or thoughts on this process. So Thomas go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much James, and I'm sorry that council has to listen to my voice again only two agenda items later, but rest assured that I will not speak after this seventh agenda item.

James you mentioned you wanted to bring the band back together. And since you made reference to a musical movie, I will respond to the question whether there has been one or more multiple chairs at the time. It was me, myself, and I chairing the IG-INGO PDP at the time.

And since we saw the debate going on about this Article 16 of our operating procedures and whether or not to reopen the PDP, I would really like to share a quick chat with you.

And that is that we should not be afraid of reopening. And reopening a PDP is nothing to be ashamed about. I'm not sure whether this has been made sufficiently clear but at the time we did the PDP with the group of people with the community input with the facts that we had at the time. And things might change.

And we have this provision in the operating principles or in the PDP manual specifically for those circumstances where things change and GNSO Council resolutions need to be revisited.

When we concluded the PDP in November 2013 that was a point in time when the GAC had not yet specified and further clarified the wishes with respect to the names that we're discussing right now.

And I know that this subject is discussed very controversially in the community. It always has been. Some like it, some don't. I think for us as chairs of the policy development for the generic names spaces, we should be passionate about process. We should not be passionate about outcome. And this is the way I see this.

You know, certainly I would have hoped that my work on this topic was concluded in November 2013, but now since new facts came up since the discussion is still going on, so be it. Let's get this job done. Nothing to be ashamed of.

Again, I will do this with pride and pleasure and I'm happy to take on this task to get this limited scope work done as quickly as possible. And let's not speculate about the outcome because we do not know. That will be for the group to be discussed once we reconvene.

So James, Council, thanks so much for giving me the floor. I just wanted to get this out there because sometimes I get the impression that people think, "Okay, if we need to reopen this, then maybe work hasn't been done as diligently as it should have been."

And I'm confident that at the time we did everything we could with the information we had, so I have no process issues at the time. And I think we're now going to follow that we have for our work and then the result will be hopefully one that will be perceived by the community and beyond as reasonable outcome to this question.

James Bladel: Thank you Thomas and thank you very graciously for agreeing to take on this work once again. You know, it's just - what is the mafia saying from The Godfather? Just when you thought you were out, they pulled you back in. So we appreciate you coming back into service, coming out of retirement for this.

I just want to note and emphasize a couple things that you mentioned which was absolutely there is no presumption of what the outcome will be. The process is there to revisit. There is certainly no - not intended to be an indictment or criticism of the previous PDP's work.

I think understanding that the participation and the information that was at hand may have changed in the intervening almost four years, so it's certain that - so it's certainly not something that you can beat up a previous PDP using the benefit of hindsight.

This is in fact as we've always said an opportunity and a process to double check that the recommendations are still sound and/or make modifications to them if they are deemed necessary by the working group. So thank you for that.

And again thank you for taking this on. So councilors, any questions for Thomas or for staff? (Unintelligible) going to get this started. We are I think very keenly interested in giving this sort of a very narrow remit when we reconstitute and reconvene this working group and getting them off the ground so that we can get something back to council as quickly and expeditiously as possible. Any thoughts or comments?

Okay, well the queue is clear and I expect that we will be hearing quite a bit more discussion around this both on our list and in the weeks and months ahead. So thanks again Thomas.

We now move then to agenda item number 8, which is an update from the MSSSI, multi-stakeholder strategy and strategic initiatives. Interesting that we have an acronym where two S's both refer to strategy. But it involves an update on some of the various reviews, the ATRT and RDS reviews which are currently being stood up, the CCTRT which is I believe just concluding a public comment period, and SSRT too.

I just want to point out that Margie Milam was scheduled to present on this from ICANN staff. I think she has indicated that in the interest of time that she will be presenting her update via e-mail for council to review.

I would ask that when that comes that counselors please review it thoroughly and then come prepared to our next meeting which - you know, prepared to discuss and raise any questions regarding these strategic initiatives. But thank you to staff for preparing that as an offline update. And Thomas has left the call, so thank you.

Okay, then we move on to agenda item number 9, which is a council discussion on our planning activities for ICANN 59 in Johannesburg. I'm pleased to report that we're fairly well down the road to -- at least from the GNSO side -- of developing the schedule for the upcoming meeting in Johannesburg.

And I'm wondering if staff has the block schedule handy, if that is something that we can load into the Adobe room at this time so folks can take a look.

And first off I should probably say that while I'm introducing this topic, you know, once again a lot of the heavy lifting was done by the vice chairs and Donna in particular, so thank you for that Donna.

So here's a quick look not only at the GNSO schedule but also you can see where we've blocked out the cross-community sessions in the afternoon of each day. And I don't know if staff or Donna would like to highlight anything that remains an open issue or what our path forward to posting this particular schedule.

But I think that this is pretty much finalized and then we would take that to the other SOs and ACs incorporated into the overall master calendar. And I think that is scheduled to be published here in the next week or so. And I think that the only thing that we would need to work on then next would be how to allocate our sessions for day one on Monday.

If you see the GNSO sessions in green, that would be from 9:00 until about 3:00 and how we would establish the agenda for those working sessions. So that's still an open task as well. But at this point any thoughts from Donna or from staff or comments or questions from the council?

Donna Austin: James, it's Donna. I don't have anything in particular that I wanted to add to people, but I guess if there is anything that seems to be glaringly bad or

glaringly good as people look through this agenda, it would be a good time to let us know. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Donna. I think glaringly good is that we are this far down the road with still over a month to go. And while that may be cutting it close for some, it's certainly better than Helsinki and Hyderabad which means we are getting better at this. We are learning.

And so it is a little bit further. It is almost a fully baked schedule here about a month out, so that's I think a marked improvement over the last couple of attempts at this. So I think that's kudos to you and all the folks who have worked on this.

Are we in a position where this can be circulated to the council list or published? And that question's really to Donna or to staff. Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: James I don't see any reason why we couldn't. I'm just going to ask Ben and Cheryl because they're on the call. I - Cheryl, this is probably closer related to the ALAC then potentially what it is for the ccNSO.

I suspect that some of the PDP working group sessions that we've allocated time for may cross over into ALAC sessions. So I expect that we may get some disgruntlement for want of a better (word) from some members of ALAC as a result of that. But hopefully we'll get some kind of - a pass card only because we're focusing heavily on trying to get the PDP work done during the four days that we have.

Ben I'm not sure that it's so much of an issue for the ccNSO but I just think that once we see our agenda overlaid with everybody else's, at the moment conflicts don't look so bad. But when the rest of the agenda gets overlaid with the GNSO one then I think we might see some conflicts arise which may cause some angst among people. Thanks James.

James Bladel: Thanks Donna. Cheryl do you have a response?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I do. Thanks very much and thanks for the question Donna. Cheryl for the record. I don't think you'll get much disgruntlement Donna because based on the last schedule that we had available to date – although the (granular) one is very important – the ALAC's been working extremely hard to arrange its agenda to minimize clashes.

And for example one of the things I'm quite impressed with is – if our schedule stays the same within the ALAC – is that at least we have a lot of capability to get people in the room at least in the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP discussion.

So I'm hoping that, you know, we might actually manage the opposite of having concern and disgruntlement and that we might actually get more buns on the seat, so to say. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Cheryl. Both helpful and colorful of course, so thanks for that. And it is good to coordinate with the ALAC. And I think to your point in particular with the policy forum format minimizing conflicts is the goal.

Eliminating them is probably impossible but you know we continue to strive for the best possible experience for the most possible people, but recognizing that some folks are just going to be pulled in multiple directions and that's unavoidable to some extent and probably a testament to just how invaluable their contributions are that they need to be in so many different places.

So this is – okay so – and I'm just going back a little bit to Donna's point that we could publish this or we're nearing a point where we can publish this. And I just don't know if staff has any other thoughts on that and...

Okay. Okay, any other thoughts or comments on the schedule before we close this agenda item? I would say keep an eye on this. We are getting to a

point where this is finalized. Keep an eye on this and watch this space for further development. I'm sorry, Phil go ahead. Phil?

Philip Corwin: Yes James I did want to comment on Johannesburg and meetings generally. It's not on the schedule. Is this an appropriate time?

James Bladel: Yes Phil, go ahead.

Philip Corwin: Yes it's just an operational concern. I don't know if other counselors are dealing with this, but up through last year for support of travelers, ICANN constituency travel, they would send you a notice saying you're approved for these dates.

If you plan to either arrive early or leave several days later, you would advise them and they would book those hotel rooms and just advise the hotel which nights they were paying for and which nights you'd be responsible for personally.

Starting with Copenhagen they have a new policy – I'm not sure the reason – where they will only book the nights of approved travel and you're supposed to book your own additional nights once you're advised of the hotel. Now that worked fine with Copenhagen. They gave lots of advance notice of the hotel I was booked into.

But for Johannesburg, I booked my air travel about six weeks ago, advised them immediately, got - you know, asked for those dates and got a response back, "Well you'll have to book those." And this is to come in one day early to partake in the accountability sessions. That's the only extra night I was requesting.

A month went by. You know, they said we're waiting to hear from meetings. We'll advise you as soon as we know where you're staying. A month went

by. I e-mailed them this week saying hey it's been a month. And I got basically the same response back. We're still waiting on meetings.

So I would hope that we could convey to the meeting staff and travel staff that if this is the new policy, that we have to book our own additional nights around the official nights, that we really need sufficient advance notice to make sure, one, that we have a hotel room – that can be difficult in some cities on short notice – and, two, that is the same hotel we'll be staying at otherwise because if I go to South Africa and they book me in a different hotel than the one for the official days, it means in the middle of the accountability sessions I'd have to check out of one hotel and check into another in the middle of the day.

So that's it. I don't know if others are facing that but I think we need to get a message about giving as much advance notice of the hotel as they picked for us as possible. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Phil. And I noted that your comment has raised some responses both in the chat and some other folks have raised their hands. So it looks like you've got some agreement here. I think that we can certainly capture this and convey it to meeting planning staff and say look, you know, we kind of have to have one or the other here.

Either help us book the unpaid nights or give us enough notice so that we can do it ourselves but you can't just spring it on people in the last minute so that we're scrambling for a place to stay in some faraway city. And I think your concerns are valid, and we'll relay those to the meeting planning staff.

I have Carlos and then I have a quick couple of items for planning that I would like to raise. But Carlos go ahead.

(Carlos): Yes thank you. I'm not reacting to Phil, James, just to the planning and the comments you made. There is an expectation from side of the GAC if there

is going to be a continued opportunity to have these – how do you call them – managed sessions on IGOs, INGOs. The late schedule in Copenhagen made it very difficult for people to participate.

So there is a request - there is a question from the side of the GAC if we are going to keep having these late night negotiating meetings. Thank you very much.

James Bladel: Thank you (Carlos). I put myself in the queue because there's just a couple of items I'd like to just kind of send to council and say that if we're going to raise some questions or concerns with planning staff, one item is that some of the registrars who have - are local to Johannesburg have very helpfully noted that the venue is in a new development area, a new business park, and is a very, you know...

It's easy to get around, and it's safe, but there are some parts of Johannesburg you probably want to avoid, particularly after dark when you might encounter some - you know, some folks who might want to relieve of your wallet and phone.

And so in the past I note that we have had from meeting planning staff, we've had some - you know, some briefings on safety and security, and I think that that might be something that we could get something helpful from them on that.

And then on another point – and I'm looking for support from counselors and from your stakeholder groups and constituencies – I've also floated the idea that for ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi that ICANN consider or at least look into the feasibility of getting a shuttle bus from the Dubai airport to the venue in Abu Dhabi.

My understanding it's about an hour and a half, you know, maybe less drive on the highway there. But the airport situation would open up significantly

more routes and cheaper fares and give folks a lot more options than the Abu Dhabi airport. So that's just a couple of items that I raised with ICANN planning staff.

And if they come up in the course of your discussions with your SGs and C's, I would definitely appreciate some support from other elements in the GNSO on that. Okay.

So then let's see, the next item we have is AOB. We have about six minutes left. We have two items for AOB. The first one is an update as promised from Susan on the recent meeting of the standing selection committee and its work to select a GNSO representative for the empowered community but also its work generally I think for ATRT3 and some of the other upcoming review teams.

So Susan if you're in a position to take it away, and if you have any materials that need to be loaded, I would ask staff to switch out this (PDS). Go ahead Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks James. Susan Kawaguchi for the record. The SSC met this past Monday to discuss the empowered community role for the representative from the GNSO Council. And as you all remember in Copenhagen we were tasked with - by the council to create a criteria and so we needed to develop the criteria - woops, seems to be moving on me...

...and then have this criteria and plan process to the council before the June meeting. And so we're aiming to have that in by June 19. We had a good discussion. We definitely have some variations on what the standing committee members think should be involved in the role, what the role comprises.

And this is some general information about the empowered community. But this is - staff put this slide together for us. You know, basically it's more of a

communication role. It's not a decision-making role. And - but the representative chosen would have to be fully immersed in the council work to receive and send EC notifications.

The moderating the community forums led to a little discussion so we're looking into that a little bit more exactly what - or the community forums - would - you know, what that really means and then also community remediation if there's - you know, we allege the board or someone alleges the board is failed to comply.

So we have some basic information and we're working on that right now. As you know we did pick the - or I had recused myself because I was a candidate but we did pick the candidates for the RDS. And then we're looking forward to the ATRT. I don't think that the application period has closed on that yet. And I could be wrong, but...

So right now we're working on all of this. If you have input or comments or concerns that would be really good to hear - you know, to hear the council's viewpoint on how, you know, this - the criteria and the processes should be created. I think that's it unless you have a question.

James Bladel: Great, thank you Susan. Really appreciate that update and your work on the SSC. And in particular I'm glad to hear the emphasis on the SSC that the GNSO representative is more of a mouthpiece for the GNSO and for the council and not necessarily a decisional participant. That's an important distinction and I'm glad to see that that's being taken on board.

And I can report that the EC in just about everything it does, EC administration is sort of feeling its way in terms of how it notifies the board of new board members and how it convenes a community forum to discuss things like the budget. And all of those things are being invented as we go. So thank you for that update. And I see (Carlos). Is that a new hand (Carlos)?

(Carlos): No James, it's not new. I'm sorry.

James Bladel: That's okay. I thought it might be because it was up for a while, so - but thank you for that and thank you Susan.

We have one other item AOB that I think was raised by Darcy who unfortunately had to drop the call. I'm happy to raise it or Michele as well but if you - Michele would you like to tee this one up? We have about two minutes.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James. Michele for the record. I assume you're referring to the PPSAI?

James Bladel: Well sort of. This is the interrelation between IRTPC and PPSAI and the instructions that we (unintelligible) from the board a couple of meetings ago.

Michele Neylon: Okay I was prepared to give an update on the proxy privacy accreditation group overall, not specifically on the IRTPC thing, so your call.

James Bladel: Okay, I'll just take it away in the interest of time because we're up against the top of the hour.

If you recall we had some discussions about how to implement - fully implement the new transfer policy. The IRTPC change of registrant transfer policy was running into conflict with the privacy proxy services.

And a request on behalf of registrars was sent to the board. We also had some discussions with other stakeholder groups and constituencies to kind of flesh out how we wanted to send a note to the board.

The board responded by doing two things. One was giving kind of an immediate waiver of this particular part of enforcement of the new policy for

transfers but also asking registrars and I believe, you know, the GNSO generally, to convene a discussion group to lay out some possible solutions to resolving this conflict.

I don't know where we stand on that, and I think that was one of the reasons why Darcy wanted to raise this issue is it's just kind of floating out there. And I think that we need to figure out what we need to do in terms of immediate next steps. So I guess putting it on the council agenda for visibility and awareness but if there's no...

And I'm presuming and trying to remember our conversations within the registrars but if there's no objections, I think we can ask the registrar stakeholder group to work with staff to put together, you know, kind of a cross – I don't want to say cross-community but let's say a group – consisting of a variety of stakeholders from the GNSO to just kind of lay out the problem and discuss some ideas and come back with some proposals on how this can be implemented to avoid this conflict.

And that's just my effort to kind of get this thing out of the quicksand and get it moving again. So that's all we had associated with the particular item question. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Hi this is Paul McGrady. So I guess I would like to understand procedurally how that works. So is the item that was – the board suspended enforcement on – is that implementation of policy? And if it is implementation of policy, is the way to modify policy that a member of the groups within the GNSO community find to be problematic convening an informal small group? Is that how we do it?

That doesn't sound like that's how we usually do it. So - but if it's not policy I guess that's okay but I just - doesn't seem like that's - I don't think that's what we're talking about.

So James can you shed some clarity? Is it an implementation of a policy that we're concerned about? And so are we looking to change the policy or is it the implementation that we're concerned about and do we undo the work of an IRT by having an informal group? Wouldn't this go back to the group that gave us this in the first place? I guess I don't know. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes Paul, good questions. And I'll try to fumble my way through it here a little bit is that this is purely an implementation question. The policy was somewhat ambiguous on this. There were some discussions in the implementation team.

We went forward with one part of it and then immediately flagged some of these operational challenges with implementing the policy as written. And in fact a lot of the folks who participated in the implementation IRT which is fairly small have said, you know, we probably - if we had known we were going to encounter this, we probably would have had different thoughts about it so can we take another look at this?

I wouldn't - and I'm trying to be - you know, trying to be as removed from this as possible but I think that this is something that is not tweaking or poking at any recommendations that came out of a PDP. This is just simply a - you know, kind of nuts and bolts operation of how we actually implement this policy.

But I think that we did have some concerns with a number of groups including the IPC and discussed how we can address those. And I think that the appropriate mechanism would be to reconvene the IRT that came up with this in the first place and ask them to take another look.

The challenge there of course is that the IRT was a very, very sparse group. I mean, it was like a couple of registrars and one other person. So maybe we need to see if we can beef that up a little bit and get some broader participation. And I hope that answers your question. Paul go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Yes thanks James. I think maybe if you could just flesh out the plan a little bit more on the list so that I know what I'm taking back to my folks I'd appreciate it. There are people who have, you know, strong interest in this topic and understand the history far better than I do. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes. Absolutely will do and I think that on the last time we were working through that I think Steve Metalitz was very involved in this as well. So we can certainly make sure we get him involved in that and anyone else that's interested.

Okay. So we'll take that away as an action item. I think my primary objective and intent in raising it today was to kind of get it out of the limbo and get it back on council's radar. And it seems like we've done that.

So we are six minutes over our time. We have reached the end of our agenda. Does anyone have any other items for AOB or any other topics to raise by council? Okay, seeing none and no hands raised, I would say thank you for sticking with us for a couple of minutes over time.

Thank you very much for participating in this work and for May. And our next meeting I believe is in Johannesburg but until then please watch for updates and developments on the list as a number of substantive items I think will be moving to e-mail for continued work and resolution. So thank you very much and we can stop the recording.

Woman: Thanks everyone. Bye.

END