

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Council Call
Thursday 29 November 2018 at 1200 UTC**

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

<https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-29nov18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p6ftoosnk6c/>

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

List of attendees:

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

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Pam Little, Michele Neylon, Darcy Southwell

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Maxim Alzoba, Keith Drazek, Rubens Kühl

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Carlos Raul Gutierrez

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo, Scott McCormick (apologies, proxy to Marie Pattullo), Philippe Fouquart (apologies, proxy to Tony Harris), Tony Harris, Paul McGrady, Flip Petillion

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Martin Silva Valent, Elsa Saade, Tatiana Tropina, Rafik Dammak, Ayden Férdeline, Arsène Tungali

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Syed Ismail Shah

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison

Julf (Johan) Helsingius– GNSO liaison to the GAC

Adebisi Oladipo – ccNSO observer (absent)

ICANN Staff

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

Marika Konings – Vice President, Policy Development Support – GNSO

Mary Wong – Vice President, Strategic Community Operations, Planning and Engagement

Julie Hedlund – Policy Director
Steve Chan – Policy Director
Berry Cobb – Policy Consultant
Emily Barabas – Policy Manager
Ariel Liang – Policy Support Specialist (apologies)
Caitlin Tubergen – Policy Senior Manager
Sara Caplis– Technical Support
Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Operations
Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator

Coordinator: Recordings are started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 29th of November, 2018. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it out? Thank you ever so much. Pam Little.

Pam Little: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Maxim Alzoba.

Maxim Alzoba: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rubens Kuhl has noted in the chat that he will be unable to speak over audio today but we do note his presence in the audio - in the AC room, sorry. Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Darcy Southwell.

Darcy Southwell: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Carlos Gutiérrez

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Here. Thank you, Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Carlos. Marie Pattullo.

Marie Pattullo: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Marie. Scott McCormick has sent his apologies and has assigned Marie Pattullo as his proxy for today. Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Philippe Fouquart has sent his apologies and has assigned his proxy to Tony Harris. Tony Harris.

Tony Harris: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rafik Dammak.

Rafik Dammak: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Rafik. Elsa Saade.

Elsa Saade: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Arsene Tungali.

Arsene Tungali: I'm here, Nathalie. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Arsene. Flip Petillion.

Flip Petillion: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Tatiana Tropina.

Tatiana Tropina: Present. Thank you, Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Martin Silva Valent.

Martin Silva Valent: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Ayden Férdeline. I don't see Ayden in the Adobe Connect room either.
We'll follow up. Syed Ismail Shah.

Syed Ismail Shah: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Cheryl. Erika Mann. I don't see her in the Adobe Connect room and we were having issues dialing out to her so I'll let you know when (unintelligible). Julf Helsingius.

Julf Helsingius: Here, Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Adebisi Oladipo. I don't see Adebisi in the Adobe Connect room either. From staff we have David Olive, Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Caitlin Tubergen, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Ariel Liang, Terri Agnew, (Sara Capla) technical support, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking for recording purposes? Thank you, Keith, and over to you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you very much, Nathalie. And hello, good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everybody for our call GNSO Council meeting of 29 November, 2018. This is our first Council meeting of the 2018-2019 Council, so I welcome you all.

We have a relatively full agenda today. It doesn't look like there are a lot of items but I think there will be some fairly in depth discussion on several of them, so I think we'll go ahead and get started. So with that we've done the roll call. And I guess I should ask if there are any updates to statements of interest; if you have any please raise your hand. Maxim, please. Maxim, if you're speaking we can't hear you. Maxim, this is Keith, for some reason we can't hear your audio. I see you typing. So I suggest that we try to work out Maxim's audio and come back to the statements of interest update. And does anybody else have any updates to statements of interest? Okay, I see no other hands.

So with that - Elsa, I see your hand, please go ahead.

Elsa Saade: Hi, Keith. Thanks. (Unintelligible) I just want to update that I updated my SOI to GNSO councilor, that's it. Thank you. Just for the sake of transparency.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much, Elsa. Much appreciated. Maxim, would you like to try again?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. Do you hear me?

Keith Drazek: Yes, we hear you now, Maxim. Go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: I'm no longer member of Standing Selection Committee. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Maxim. All right if the two of you can lower your hands now and we'll move on. So with that let's go to a review of the agenda. And if anybody

has any amendments to the agenda please prepare them as I go through this. So we will go through next the action items, review of the project list and action items, and then as we get into our substantive agenda, Item Number 3 is the consent agenda which is intended to be a five-minute period. The first is a motion to adopt the GNSO Council response to the GAC communiqué and the second is a motion for the confirmation of the GNSO representative to the empowered community Administration.

I understand that there will be - when we get to the discussion of the GAC communiqué, that the Registry Stakeholder Group has some suggested amendments so it may be that that motion is moved from the consent agenda to a discussion point, but I will leave that to Maxim or Rubens to handle when we get to that.

Next on the agenda is Item 4, Council discussion on IGO INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms, this is, you know, as many of you know, an ongoing topic of concern and consideration for the Council. It's a carryover from our previous Council and there are, you know, some considerations that we need to discuss today. There's no intention that this will result in a decision at this meeting, but it is an opportunity for us to get into an in depth discussion of the IGO INGO Access to CRP final report and recommendations and the menu of options that the Council has before us in terms of next steps of how to deal with this issue.

Item 5 on the agenda is the Council update on the EPDP on the temporary specification. And I note that we have Kurt Pritz is in the Adobe Connect room; thank you, Kurt, for joining us and Rafik as our GNSO Council liaison will give us an update on the status of the EPDP. As everybody I think knows, the initial report has been published for public comment and this is an opportunity for us to touch base and have a sync-up opportunity to understand you know, where the EPDP Working Group is in relation to the charter and what its next steps and the work ahead appear to be and where

the Council needs to be aware and if there's a need or an opportunity to focus on working methods and/or the charter itself.

Item Number 6 is a Council discussion on the ICANN reserve fund. This is a carryover from the discussion that we had at our wrap up session in Barcelona which followed on the heels of I think learning that the ICANN Board was going to pass a resolution taking a certain dollar amount from the reserve - sorry, from the auction proceeds fund and to top off the ICANN reserve fund, so this is an opportunity for the Council to discuss that.

As we left it in Barcelona, there was an expectation that if constituencies and stakeholder groups had concerns or wanted to make comment or take action in some way that it was up to the constituent parts of the GNSO at that stage. But this is an opportunity for us to compare notes at the Council level of any conversations that we've had in our stakeholder groups and constituencies.

Item 7 is a Council discussion on the IRTP policy status report and specifically the CPIF, the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework. And I believe we will have Brian Atchison with us at that point in the agenda to give an update.

And then Item 8 is any other business. And the two items that we have under any other business are an update on the Council strategic planning session and also a discussion of the permanent GNSO rep to the Fellowship Selection Committee. And I'm going to add one additional item to AOB at this point and that's just to provide the Council an update on the status of the complaint that was filed associated with the RPM PDP Working Group.

I think those of you who were in the wrap up session and the Council session recall that there was a development in Barcelona around - and prior to Barcelona about a complaint being filed in the RPM group related to the expected standards of behavior and ICANN Legal is getting involved in that. And I'll give an update on that when we get to AOB.

And so that is the proposed agenda. Does anybody have any questions, comments, suggested edits or additions? Okay. I don't see any hands so let's get back to the review of the projects list and action item list, so give me a moment here as I switch papers.

Okay, so here we have the project list in front of us. And I will focus on the items where there is sort of open or ongoing activity. So at the top we have the Council action items list, that's what we're working on now. The IRTP Policy Review Issue Scoping, again that's something that we're going to be discussing at the end of our call as it relates to the CPIX issue.

The Whois Procedure Implementation Advisory Group, that's the group that is currently on hold pending the outcome of the EPDP. The next step was essentially a call for volunteers and a chartering effort of the group but we agreed in the last Council that that would be best put on hold pending the outcome of the EPDP.

And we have four working groups that are active, the EPDP on the temp spec that we just discussed, we're getting an update on our call today. The Cross Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds, I think we all know that there is an initial report posted for public comment and that the public comment period on that has been extended until December 12. Next is the PDP - the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all TLDs - all gTLDs, sorry, and I'll give an update on that as it relates to the complaint situation and sort of the impacts on the work plan of that group later on in the call.

And then the New gTLD SubPro PDP, I think as we know there are - there's an initial report, a supplementary initial report and the initial report of Work Track 5 that are either out for public comment or will soon be. So there's a lot of work going on in the SubPro group as well.

Council deliberations, next item, Curative Rights Protections for IGO INGOs, that's something on our agenda for today. And I think as we scroll down we're getting into the areas that are open for a Board vote and/or the implementation issues. So let me pause there and I see Paul has his hand up, so Paul, over to you.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Keith. Paul McGrady for the recording. So this is an update on the RPMs PDP that's not related to the complaint. Just a heads up that the working group have in front of them the data from the survey that was done recently and the co-chairs have been discussing amongst themselves how best to process that data, analyze it, sort of look and see what it means. They had discussed the issue of reviving some sub teams that had done some prior work on some of these - on the charter questions related to the questions that ultimately ended up in the survey. Staff has raised concerns that reviving those sub teams would add significantly to the timeline.

From the report I got yesterday - I was not able to be on the call but from the report I got yesterday from Phil and Kathy there seemed to be a significant appetite within the working group to reopen those sub teams and nobody knows yet exactly how that will affect the timeline but I do think that there is general belief that this will cause the timeline to slip somewhat. So I don't know at this point if it's a matter of weeks or something else, but I did want to at least highlight the issue for the broader Council because as we all know timelines are really important here, so I don't have the full answer yet but there are updates to come. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much, Paul, that's really helpful. And I understand also back to the issue of the complaint, that there's some concern about the impact of sort of that hanging out there on the ability of the group to continue to meet and to work and to advance its work, so I think there are a couple of different components of concern about timelines there. But I really appreciate you giving us the substantive update there as it relates to the actual work of the group, so thanks for that.

Marika, I see your hand, I'm sorry if it was up for a while, I hadn't scrolled up in the Adobe chat but I see your hand now, please go ahead.

Marika Konings: No worries, Keith. Thanks. This is Marika. And I think Paul was actually in the queue before me. I just wanted to flag in relation to Item 3 here on the list of Whois Procedure Implementation Advisory Group, actually the trigger point is the publication of the initial report of the EPDP as a trigger point for the Council to, you know, whether it's already the right time to launch that call for volunteers or whether further time is needed. So as such staff suggestion would be to add this to the agenda for the December meeting so you at least can discuss now that the initial report has been published is it now the right moment to set a timeframe for when that call for volunteers should be launched or is there a further trigger point that should be considered by where you would consider again you know, when to launch that call for volunteers.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much, Marika, that's excellent clarification. And yes, we'll add that to the December agenda. And obviously it will depend a bit on, you know, the status of the initial report and we look forward to the update from Kurt and Rafik on that topic as we get into our call, so let's make a note of that and thank you for the clarification. Okay, any other comments on the projects list before we get to the action item list? All right, seeing none let's move on.

All right, thank you, we have now the action item list in front of the screen. And I'm going to go through this fairly quickly, if anybody has any comments or questions or wants clarification on anything let me know. So the first item on the list is an update on the ATRT 3, so I think as everybody knows, and thanks for everybody getting your votes in electronically, but the Council had an electronic vote over the last couple of weeks and resulted in unanimous support for the slate, the primary GNSO candidates or representatives have been identified as Wolfgang Kleinwächter, Pat Kane and Osvaldo Novoa.

And yesterday the leadership team, myself, Pam and Rafik, approved the letters to go out to those who were endorsed and those who were not endorsed as primary but who were recommended as alternates in the event the SO and AC leaders you know, need to fill slots or fill openings or find some balance in terms of expertise and geographic diversity, etcetera. So those letters have been approved by the leadership team and will go out at the - shortly after the call today. Any comments?

Okay, next item was a finalization of the schedule of GNSO Council meetings for 2019. That was done. Next item, and I assume everybody has scroll control so you can follow along as we go through this. So the next item on the list is the discussion of the strategic planning session. The leadership team has had two calls over the last several weeks including one yesterday. I'm pleased to report that as we look ahead to the strategic planning session at the end of January that we have confirmation from James Bladel who's going to join us as a co-facilitator and former GNSO Council chair to provide his input and expertise to the group.

And that we have confirmation from Becky Burr and Matthew Shears as the GNSO appointed Board members that they are interested and available in participating. We also expect to have participation from ICANN Board members including at a working lunch around the Board's own workshop that's taking place in Los Angeles at the same time and towards the end of our strategic planning session that week. So we are continuing to work on the agenda. We will circulate a version of the agenda shortly within, you know, the next several days by the end of the week or early next week for your input so input from councilors to make sure that the strategic planning session will be, you know, as productive and meaningful to all.

And I've been asked to remind everybody that if you haven't booked your travel and if you are depending upon or receiving ICANN travel support for this book your travel. This is a cost issue in terms of making sure that, you

know, we're taking advantage of fares before they go up as we get closer and this is a really important thing for you to get done if you haven't already.

Okay. Comments, questions?

All right, next item on the agenda is the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG comment period. And as I noted earlier that it has been extended to the 11th of December. And so Erika is going to speak to that I think in a bit if she has been able to join. Scrolling down, I don't see her in chat yet or in Adobe. So we'll put a marker there and come back to the Auction Proceeds public comment period.

Okay next item is the GNSO representative to the Empowered Community Administration. So this will be completed as of our consent agenda today. So, you know, the leadership met and agreed that I as the GNSO Council Chair would act as the representative to the Empowered Community Administration and that's part of our consent agenda today.

Next item is the Council liaisons. It says it's completed but I think we need to do just one more scrub so I'll ask staff to, you know, to make sure that we identify if there are any gaps and if there's anything out there hanging out there that we need to address let's make sure that we do that. I think there's one in particular where we have the Fellowship Program - and this is not technically a liaison and it's on our agenda for further discussion in AOB, but the Fellowship Program - Heather Forrest is still our GNSO temporary appointment and we just need to make a decision as to whether we would like her to continue in that role or not or if there's someone else that we want to put forward. And I'll speak to that in a little bit more detail in a moment. So comments, questions?

Okay. Next item, GNSO Council review of the GAC communiqué, that's on our agenda for today and I already spoke to that in brief. Next item is the GNSO Empowered Community Roles and Responsibilities. And, Julie, I know that - I'm not sure, is Julie on the call today?

Julie Hedlund: Yes I am. This is Julie Hedlund.

Keith Drazek: Hi, Julie, great. Thank you very much. I'm going to admit that I don't quite recall - I know we spoke about this at our coordinating meeting a couple or three weeks ago, but could you give us just a very brief update as to where we are on this and the next steps for the Council?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. And thank you very much, Keith. And yes so this is a staff action that will be completed shortly. It's going to be a call for volunteers for a drafting team, sort of a newly reconstituted drafting team to assist in the development of some guidelines or procedures relating to the Council's role in the Empowered Community. And we'll note that staff had done a significant amount of work in identifying templates for motions for various activities that fit already into the current GNSO Council procedures but there are some tasks that the Council will have that will need some additional guidance. So the Council will be seeing a call for volunteers coming out very shortly.

Keith Drazek: Excellent. Thank you very much, Julie, appreciate that. Okay. Comments or questions? Not seeing any. Okay next item that's open is again this is the temporary specification on the EPDP, so a recurring update. One of our action items from our last meeting was to consider scheduling an update call prior to the November meeting, which is today of course, on the status of the EPDP initial report.

And the leadership team decided rather than trying to schedule an intercessional call in the middle of November right in the middle of when the EPDP was actually working on finalizing its initial report that rather than being a distraction that we allow the EPDP to complete the initial report, get it published and that we deferred that update to today's meeting. So that's where we are on that; we'll have that conversation in a little bit.

Okay, next item was the termination of the RDS PDP that was done at our last meeting. Next item, PDP 3.0, the leadership team had a meeting with staff a couple weeks ago and we are working on an implementation plan that will become a significant focus of our work on the - during the strategic planning session in January. So we will be looking to share that version or an updated version of that shortly with the full Council for our feedback and input but this is essentially mapping out next steps for the Council as it relates to carrying on the excellent work that took place last year on the PDP 3.0 effort. So we'll look forward to everybody's feedback on that plan. Comments, questions, don't see any.

Next bunch of items are completed. Next item that I had a question about actually was a fix to the GDD projects from GDPR. This was an action item for us to reach out to GDD staff to ask for an update on what projects involving and affecting the GNSO have been paused or otherwise impacted by GDPR compliance. I fear that I had an action item to do something there myself, and I'm looking to anybody that might have a better recollection than I do on this one. Don't see any hands; nobody's looking to bail me out. I see Nathalie typing. So Paul, I see your hand, thank you.

Paul McGrady: So thanks, Keith. This is Paul for the recording. So I think - and Nathalie can correct me - but I think that this item came out of the update from GDD staff that related to the slowing down of the PPSAI implementation because staff believed that the questions being looked at by the EPDP on the privacy GDPR would have some effect on that and I think it sort of raised the question of whether or not there may be other projects that also might be affected by that.

In the interim, though, we did get a letter I think from the GDD staff on at least the PPSAI portion of this and I think that that might have been the initial onus for follow up was to make sure that they got us those further explanations. So I don't know that there was anything more that at least I was expecting from you, Keith. So I hope that is helpful. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much, Paul. That's a huge relief if true. So thanks for that. And I don't know if anybody on staff can, you know, confirm or, you know, sort of weigh in, and we can sort of follow up on this one afterwards if necessary but Paul, thanks very much; that's helpful context and I think you're right in the context of the so-called slowdown of the PPSAI implementation. I do recall now that that was at least part of this conversation.

So let's move on. Next item on the list was the Fellowship Program. I did want to note this is where I got an email - actually we, Rafik, Pam and I got an email from Heather on the 20th of November noting that she still is the GNSO temporary appointment to the Fellowship Program. She indicated in the email that she's more than happy to continue and in that role for a period of time; she's more than happy to become our permanent - the GNSO permanent appointment for that role for, you know, a period of a year or whatever and that more that she could, you know, apply through the Standing Selection Committee.

So, you know, basically the message was that she's more than happy to continue but wanted to note that that's an open item, so I think we probably ought to put that on our, you know, our discussion agenda. Pam, I see your hand, please.

Pam Little: Thank you, Keith. Pam Little speaking. Keith, I'm afraid this one might be different to Heather's email about the - Heather's matter is about her being on the Selection Committee, the Fellowship Selection Committee. So this action item seemed to be about the mentor program - mentoring program. So I think they're separate items. Does that make sense? This one is the call for mentoring those who have volunteered to mentor new Fellows. Does that make sense?

Keith Drazek: Yes thanks, Pam. And you may be entirely right. I was - I had made a note to comment on Heather's email because the header was Fellowship Program

and you're right, as I read the further detail it actually refers to the Fellowship Mentoring Program on this line item. So I guess the answer there is that the - this is a - this line item in our action items list is noted as completed and that there probably is a separate issue related to Heather's position that we need to address. Does that sound right? Okay.

So let's just like put a mark down and note that we have to respond to Heather and give her an indication as to our intention and, you know, more than happy to send that on - that email onto the list to the full list.

Okay, next item is GNSO 2 review. The action item here that appears to be open is the GNSO Council to disband the Review Working Group after the implementation final report has been approved by the Board of Directors. And Julie, I see your name next to this one. Can you help me out here?

Julie Hedlund: Hello. I'm sorry, I didn't realize this was an item of mine. And I also have just gotten kicked out of the Adobe Connect room. Can I circle back to you?

Keith Drazek: Sure thing, Julie, no problem. And sorry to put you on the spot there...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Now I'm seeing it here. Yes, so the GNSO Review Implementation Plan has gone to the OEC, the OEC has considered it, and my understanding is that the - it's just for the Board to sign off on this to approve this. And but I have not heard an update from MMSI as to the status of the Board approval. My understanding was it was in the works. So let me take the action item to go back and see where the status is on that item.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks very much, Julie. Much appreciated. Okay, moving on to - let's see, IFR team, this is the Council to consider selection process by which a GNSO appointed member of the IANA Functions Review will be selected.

And Council to consider how best to coordinate co-chair selection with the ccNSO which will be responsible for selecting a ccNSO co-chair.

Anybody want to help out on this one? Marika, I see your hand, thank you.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks Keith. This is Marika. As you may recall I think staff shared in Barcelona that there were some issues with the appointments or some of the appointments by some of the groups that I think the responsible staff was trying to work through. I got an update I think yesterday that that is still a work in progress. As soon as that has completed the Council is expected to receive a notification and the ask to appoint a GNSO co-chair to that group.

From what I understood from the feedback from our colleagues that is expected to happen in the New Year, so it's not something that is imminent at this stage as there are still some issues to be worked through.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Marika, so it's a work in progress still with staff and we will basically stand by pending further notice. Okay. Thank you for that. Next item, updated charter for the Cross Community Engagement Group on Internet Governance.

I know that we heard in Barcelona, if I'm not mistaken, that the ccNSO is at this time not intending to continue as a chartering organization for what used to be the CCWG IG, some of their concerns, based on a conversation I had with Katrina, ccNSO Council Chair, was that they were struggling to find contributors and participants and those to help shoulder the workload and had some concerns about potential burden on supporting staff, the development of reports, etcetera, so we've heard that the ccNSO is likely not to continue as a chartering organization.

I expect that ALAC is still interested and that we as the GNSO need to determine, you know, where we stand in terms of the chartering organization. You know, as we moved away from the CCWG structure for the reasons that

we discussed in the last Council session, I will say that my concerns were addressed and that I still see some value in the Cross Community Engagement Group on Internet Governance as an opportunity for the community and ICANN Board and ICANN staff to communicate on the broader Internet governance issues that are surrounding us.

But that's my personal opinion and it's just something that I think we need to discuss as a Council and make sure that we have a plan in place for next steps here, so we're going to need to put this on one of our future or upcoming Council meetings. Any - want to comment on that, any thoughts, clarifications? No, okay, move on. Thank you, everybody for your patience in getting through the action items list.

Next item we talked about - this is the drafting team for the charter related to the Procedure for Whois Conflicts. Marika clarified to us that the trigger for this was the publication of the initial report so we'll put this on our agenda for an upcoming call as it relates to trying to figure out when to trigger the call for the charter drafting team.

Next item, IGO INGO CRP, we've talked about this a couple of times. It's on our agenda for today for discussion. And the CPIF, Consensus Policy Implementation Framework, also on our agenda for today. And then finally there are some action items related to planning for the strategic planning session that I touched on a little bit earlier. So I think that gets us through to the end of our action items list. Any comments, any questions before we move onto the rest of our agenda?

Okay, seeing no hands, let's go back to the agenda please? I see Rubens is typing. Rubens, if you have anything to add, I know you're not on audio today, feel free to type and we'll read it out. Okay, let's - Rubens, if you have something then we'll come back to you but let's move on.

The next item on our agenda is the consent agenda. So we have two motions on the consent agenda; one is to adopt the GNSO Council response to the GAC communiqué which was sent in draft to the Board prior I believe this week so they had it in advance of their meeting with the GAC, which took place yesterday. And then the second is a motion for confirmation of the GNSO representative to the Empowered Community Administration. So let me pause and see if there is anybody who would like to weigh in on the consent agenda before we move. Okay, Paul, please go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady here. I know it's unusual to comment on consent agendas before we vote yes, and there's nothing to be done about this but I did want us to at least note the fact that we may be solidifying a little bit of inertia. Back when the empowered community concept first was introduced we were on a short timeframe and we stuck James Bladel in the role as the representative to the empowered community essentially with the idea that we would look at it later. We really didn't.

And then we stuck Heather in it because James was in it. And we really didn't give it much consideration then. And now we're asking Keith to stand in that role. Again, nothing to be done and Keith is terrific and I see no reason not to vote for this, but I just wanted us to at least all be aware that this particular role isn't necessarily an obligation of the GNSO Council Chair and as we, you know, just as we - I expect we're all going to vote yes here in just a little bit but as we're doing that we're kind of, you know, calcifying some inertia and that may be okay, but I just wanted to point it out. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Paul. This is Keith for the transcript. And, yes, that's a good point. And I'd be more than happy to have this added to our discussion agenda for the strategic planning session in January if nobody else wants to speak to it now, I mean, we could have that conversation, but I think it's worth having further discussion about. And to your point there's nothing that says that it has to be the Council chair in that particular role...

Marika Konings: Keith. Keith, this is Marika.

Keith Drazek: Yes.

Marika Konings: I actually have my hand up; I don't know if you see it on top?

Keith Drazek: Yes, I didn't, but go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes sorry. This is Marika. I just wanted to point out that actually there was work on this; this was an item that was given to the - I think it was still the SCI at that time which I think since then has been dissolved. And they actually did develop - they looked into that, they developed a procedure for that appointment and I believe that was also confirmed by the GNSO Council. That procedure is in the link I just sent you and that is the process that has been followed. And in short, the SCI recommended that leadership would come together, so the Chair and the two Vice Chairs, and that amongst them they would select the rep to the EC admin, you know, for various reasons.

And again, you know, staff is happy to look back at the SCI reasoning for putting forward that process and that is what has been used for the selection here that the leadership got together, they decided amongst themselves who would serve in that role and that triggered the motion that is on the consent agenda today.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much, Marika. That's helpful and your institutional knowledge and expertise always welcome, feel free to interrupt us at any time when we're a little bit off base, myself included. So no, that's really helpful. But again, you know, happy to have that conversation and that's probably something that's worth reviewing at our strategic planning session just so we're all up to date and, you know, sort of have the level set, so thank you.

Okay, so on the consent agenda, Maxim, are you - yes, go right ahead, thank you.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I'd like to suggest moving the first item of adoption of GNSO Council response to the GAC communiqué to main agenda. Thanks. If you need more in depth covering of reasons why I will continue.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Maxim. This is Keith. Go right ahead, why don't you please give us just a little bit of background in terms of the rationale and again, Marika or Nathalie, procedurally keep us on track here as it relates to, you know, the steps that would need to be taken to move this and to have further discussion. Thanks.

Maxim Alzoba: It's Maxim Alzoba for the record. Again. The reason is that this topic was a subject of a number of GNSO Council reviews of prior GAC communiqués like Dublin, Helsinki, Hyderabad, Panama, and we might note that GNSO Council view is - that ICANN fully implemented GAC Advice of this matter. In simple words, if GAC wants to return to this item each and every meeting it goes nowhere. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks, Maxim. And so in light of the operating procedures on this that Marika has just posted into Adobe, if any Council member requests that an item be removed from the consent agenda it must be removed unless there are some caveats there that don't apply here. So we will move this item from the consent agenda and have further conversation of it in a moment, which leaves one item on the consent agenda, which is the confirmation of the GNSO representative to the Empowered Community Administration. So, Michele, I see your hand.

Michele Neylon: Yes, this is Michele for the record. Just a question, if we cannot agree on this GAC item today, then won't we just have missed the boat completely? I mean, there's no - it'll be too late to do anything with it.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele. And to that point we have already sent a draft of the GNSO response to the Board so they would have it in time for their meeting with the GAC which took place earlier this week. So there is already a draft that was sent and of course it had all the caveats that said it was subject to, you know, final approval of the Council. And so I take your point in terms of timing that this, you know, is - you know, this is a concern that we need to try to find a way forward and so let's have that conversation here in a moment. Let's focus on what's remaining in the consent agenda now and let's go ahead and, Nathalie, if you could take us through the process for approving the remaining motion on the consent agenda.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Keith. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say, "Aye." 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.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. And I note for the record that Rubens Kuhl has written in the chat that he's in favor of the motion. Tony Harris, proxy for Philippe Fouquart, please say "Aye." Tony, you may be muted.

Tony Harris: Hello.

Nathalie Peregrine: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Hello? Tony Harris says "yes" for Philippe Fouquart. Sorry, I was on silent mode.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. And Marie Pattullo, proxy for Scott McCormick, please say, "Aye."

Marie Pattullo: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. With no abstention, no objection the motion passes.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you very much, Nathalie. Thanks everyone. So let's then move now to the next item which let's go ahead and actually address the motion that was...

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: All right. Thanks, Tony. We heard you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. And Marie Pattullo...

Keith Drazek: So I'm getting some background noise, can you all hear me?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. With no abstention, no objection...

Keith Drazek: So I'm getting a delay and an echo. Give it a moment here and we'll try to pick this up.

Nathalie Peregrine: And the motion passes.

Keith Drazek: Can we get some help with that phone line please? Thanks, Nathalie. So while we're looking into the phone situation, we'll move now to a discussion of the motion on the Council response to the GAC communiqué, and Maxim has typed into chat or put into chat some suggested language as an amendment - a proposed amendment to the draft that was sent to the Board already which effectively itemizes some of the previous GNSO Council reviews of GAC communiqué on this issue and removes - proposes to remove some of the language that indicates that the GNSO Council you know, supports GAC

Advice in terms of further conversation on this and instead draws a line that basically says that the GNSO Council believes that ICANN has fully implemented GAC Advice, period.

And so for those that were involved in the drafting of the GNSO response to the GAC Advice - or the GAC communiqué, feel free to weigh in here; feel free to have some conversation. I will note that we are 10 minutes before the top of the hour, which leaves us 70 minutes left in our call so - and there's quite a bit that we have to get to so let's be concise but let's try to have a fulsome discussion on this. Would anybody like to get in the queue? Okay, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks. Michele for the record. I think there's two things here that - and I think the two are kind of mixed together and that's possibly part of the problem or maybe in some respects there's three. First off, there's the entire Council review of the GAC communiqué as a concept and how we do that which we might need to look at. Secondly, there's one around timing which I think is - is at this stage is a bit ridiculous.

We sent - we reviewed it, we put together something and sent it through to the Board, whether it's draft or otherwise, it was sent. To now turn around and remove what we've actually done and what we've sent just seems a bit silly because it - well it renders the entire exercise completely pointless because it's already past the time of the meeting so they'll already have either used what we sent or not used it but kind of rewriting history in some respects just seems to be totally pointless.

But the overarching issue is that we - this specific topic that the GAC keep coming back to I think that's the one that we probably need to maybe draw a line in the sand. I don't know how we're going to do that exactly but I think that's what we probably need to address because the GAC gets fixated on a topic or topics and keeps coming back to it even though the GNSO and others have probably said more than once, you know, this is - has been dealt

with; this is - it's been dealt with following the particular processes. And this kind of dysfunctional situation where the GAC wants to be part of the ICANN circus and play by the ICANN rules when it suits them but doesn't when it doesn't suit them.

And I'm not sure exactly how we can deal with that unless we are a bit more forthright and to simply say, you know, the question has been asked, it has been answered; we're not going to engage in this any further and dear Board, stop playing games with it. That's just my own personal view on this. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele. And if anybody else would like to get in queue on this, please do. And, Julf, as our liaison to the GAC, certainly feel free to weigh in as well. Michele, I agree with your concern about the timing. This has been a challenge for us because of the timing of the Board GAC engagement and ideally, you know, we would be approving something at the Council level prior to sending a draft; the timing is obviously a challenge that I think we need to address, so fully on board with your concern there.

As it relates to the issue, let me just sort of - so everybody is - let me just sort of identify the issue here or try to underscore the issue. In the proposed text or the text that was included in the draft that was sent we have language that says, "While the GNSO Council is of the view that ICANN has fully implemented the GAC Advice on this subject matter," so that's good, there's then an acknowledgement that says, "some GAC members continue to feel that their concerns have not been addressed, thus the Council supports the GAC's advice regarding ICANN Board's direction for the ICANN CEO to engage with concerned governments to listen to their views and concerns and further explain the Board's decision making process."

The proposed text from Maxim is simply, "The GNSO is one," sorry - "The GNSO is of the view that ICANN has fully implemented GAC Advice on this matter." Period. So the existing language basically opens the door or leaves the door open or supports the GAC's advice directing the - having the Board

direct the ICANN CEO to continue to engage with governments on this issue, to listen to concerns and further explain the Board's decision making. And that's different than, you know, sort of a, you know, formal consultation process; it's more of a, you know, I guess it's to listen to views and further explain, right?

But sort of opening the door or leaving that open is...

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Getting a little bit of background noise on the phone; if everybody could mute your lines please? So essentially that's the distinction in the language. So I'm going to pause and see if anybody would like to get in the queue on this, if anybody has suggestions as to how to move this forward and, you know, get this thing done in a way that's acceptable to all I'd welcome that. Thanks. Pam, go ahead.

Pam Little: Thank you, Keith. Pam Little speaking. Marie has put in the chat that was also my thinking as well. Would it be acceptable or address the RySG's concerns by leaving the Council review document as (unintelligible) that draft has already been sent to the Board and the meeting between the Board and the GAC has already occurred, taken place yesterday.

Would the concern that be by supporting the GAC Advice, we're not suggesting or the Council isn't suggesting that the issue should be re-litigated or reopened the discussion between the GAC and the Board be covered in a (this) point, be highlighted in a cover letter when we now formally send the GNSO Council review to the Board rather than amending this review document, we make the point in the cover letter to - would that alleviate the RySG's concern or address the RySG's concern? Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Pam. And this is Keith for the transcript. And thanks to Marie for the suggestion. I'm looking in the chat right now, Rubens has typed - down

below, sorry, I'm scrolling, that only the stakeholder group could agree to that or not, not its councilors. And then Rafik has asked why amending aftermath, what will it achieve? And then in - Julf mentioned that, "I feel it's good to appear to listen to concerns." And, sorry, it's jumping around a bit. Rubens has responded, "Julf, that solution would require at least a deferral since the stakeholder group guidance doesn't include it."

So anyway I'm sorry for trying to track the Adobe here. And please, people, if you want to speak put your hand up and get in the queue, sometimes it's easier just to have a conversation. So I think in this particular case we're in a bit of a challenging situation because we've already sent the document in draft to the Board so they had it in time for their meeting with the GAC, which took place this week as I noted.

And so they have it, presumably they've used it in that meeting and now it's a question of do we look to clarify or to update what was sent previously following the conversation today? Michele, I see your hand. Go right ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Keith. Michele for the record. I mean, first off this is just nuts. Sorry, this is the kind of circular conversation and insanity which makes ICANN and its processes a kind of almost entertaining for outsiders looking in. That's just my personal view. In terms of a kind of more pragmatic way of dealing with this moving forward, if the exact issue that people want to articulate I mean, is that an issue that is coming from one particular stakeholder group or is that something that needs to come from the entire Council?

And if it needs to come from the entire Council then maybe a letter signed by you as chair either to the GAC and the Board or to the Board or just to the GAC or whatever might be the way to address this. But it just seems to me a bit ridiculous to go through the process of drafting this document over the course of multiple weeks which involved multiple people from multiple stakeholder groups and then at what I would consider to be the - beyond the 11th hour, I'm not sure what the exact terminology is to kind of capture that -

is to have this ridiculous situation where the document which we all had agreed on is now not agreed on. It just seems a bit farcical to me. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele. And so I note that in chat Mary has typed - Mary Wong has typed, "If it helps, the Board has indicated previously that they do find the GNSO comments useful. That said they also only formally respond to the GAC communiqué by way of a scorecard after they've - after they had their call with the GAC so there is an opportunity for the GNSO to clarify or edit even if it's not optimal and whether by way of a separate letter, etcetera."

And Paul McGrady has typed, "Technical note, if we're going to change anything the redline says GNSO is of..." Yes, there's a typo there. "And, PS, I'm not for any changes at this late date."

Marika Konings: Keith, this is Marika. I have my hand up as well.

Keith Drazek: Sorry, Marika. Thanks. I need to scroll up to see you.

Marika Konings: Yes, and I'm sorry for that. This is Marika for the record. And (unintelligible) sincere apologies but we've just been checking with staff and we've just realized that the draft may not have been sent to the Board. We're double checking because I think we're convinced that that did get sent, but we haven't been able to track that down yet. So for this conversation you may want to assume that actually the draft version has not been shared yet with the Board, that that may impact your decision here.

Just to note as well that, you know, the call that the Board has with the GAC usually focuses on clarifying questions that the Board has in relation to the GAC communiqué. Following that, the Board of course further deliberates and develops its response to the GAC communiqué, so you know, any input will still be relevant. Obviously it would have been better if it would have been received for the call and again, our sincere apologies if we did not convey

that draft. But I just wanted to put that on the record so that you're aware of the situation and it may impact your conversation on this.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Marika. So Rafik, I see your hand, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. So I think we heard now something we have to use which is (unintelligible) sure that the letter was sent or not. But what is to comment first is we have the situation and maybe we need to follow up later about this - we don't have (unintelligible) we are acting in kind of an ad hoc way with regard to our response, I mean, the review of the GAC communiqué. And we use it many times this idea of non-objection and just later on kind of we confirm, it's just a formality.

But if we find this issue it seems that maybe the - not everyone had the chance to do a proper review and to consult with the stakeholder group and constituency, do we need something more formal? Like we need a vote but then since it's depending of the date of the Board and the GAC call or the call, maybe we need to think if we - either we could always set a (unintelligible) or a special meeting and so on.

But this is more - maybe something we can discuss later. In a way we can formalize this and avoid the situation because if we have I think a vote and planning it will offer opportunity to - how we can, I mean, still it's the work done by volunteers to draft (unintelligible) maybe we can do - to try to organize better.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Rafik. This is Keith. So a question to staff, do you happen to know when the Board is intending to complete its scorecard and respond to the GAC? And I'm asking because I'm wondering if we have some additional time to consider this in between our meeting now and the meeting in December or at our meeting in December. Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Keith. Hi, everyone. This is Mary from staff. We don't know a specific date at this point although we can check. Typically there is a bit of lag time between the Board GAC clarifying call and the Board's response because obviously the Board does have to discuss what it wants to say in its scorecard. So I would say that you do have time but the sooner the better, obviously. And we can find out the dates of the next Board meetings because they would also need to approve their response to the GAC.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Mary. And then my follow up question, is there an opportunity to consider this intercessional via email approval if we need to in terms of timing, if we defer this? Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong: Hi, Keith. It's Mary again. And yes I see Marika's typing; she might be answering the question. But yes, to the extent that it is a motion of course you would need to vote on it. But there is a provision that for electronic vote that you guys just used in fact, so there are a few conditions but one of them at the Council has had the opportunity to fully discuss the matter and that there needs to be I think a seven-day advance notice of an email vote. So if need be, you could probably do that by email if not by December. But as Marika's put in chat, the next Board meeting is end of January, presumably that would be the earliest that the Board would vote on a response to the GAC. It may not even happen there but then that would likely be the earliest.

Keith Drazek: All right. Thanks, Mary. So this is Keith. In the interest of time I'm going to suggest that we not move forward with this vote today, that we have a conversation ongoing over email and potentially target the December meeting or intercessional if before and so we - I'm going to suggest that we defer this as Michele has said, and move on. We've got a lot to get to and, you know, it's unfortunate that this wasn't able to be left on the consent agenda, and I think we do need to look, to Michele's point, at, you know, sort of making sure - and Rafik's point to make sure that we try to streamline our efforts and make sure it's most effective. So any objection to deferring this motion? Okay, seeing none, deferred. Let's move on.

Okay, back to the agenda please. All right so we are now onto Item Number 4, which is Council discussion of IGO INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms. So Nathalie, if we could put up the slide that Mary and Steve prepared for us and that was circulated to the list?

And while that's being done, let me just take a moment to acknowledge the fact that this package of information that was sent last night was sent late, as I noted in my email, it's my responsibility in terms of finding time to - or not having found time to be able to get this out sooner. But I want to assure everybody that this issue is simply a topic for discussion. Today's discussion is essentially an update for this current Council on where we stand and what our possible menu of options is moving forward.

We'll make no decisions today. We will have plenty of opportunity to discuss this topic and this is frankly a bit of a delicate situation that we need to make sure that we deliberate on, make sure we, you know, gather all the facts, understand it fully as a Council before we make any decisions.

And so high level what we have here with the recommendations from the IGO INGO CRP PDP Working Group are five recommendations and there have been some concerns or questions raised about one, whether Recommendation Number 5 is in scope of the group. This was something that was mentioned by Paul at our meetings in Barcelona. And there have been other, you know, questions and concerns raised along the way. And we'll get into more of that detail after this meeting. But I want to just go through the menu of options.

So we know that in the IGO INGO CRP situation there has been GAC Advice on this topic. And coming out of Barcelona there was further GAC Advice to the Board about the possibility of facilitated discussions with the GAC and the GNSO.

And so one option that we have, and this is not mutually exclusive with other options below, is to engage in discussions with the GAC. In the communication that we received in Barcelona from the GAC Chair, she referred to the previous GNSO GAC Consultation Group recommendations about opportunities for discussion on issues where there may be differing opinions. So this is one option is for us to go ahead and respond to the GAC and engage in discussion with the GAC. Whether that's facilitated or otherwise I think is open to discussion.

The second option is to reject all five PDP recommendations. This would terminate the PDP, no policy recommendations would be sent to the Board and essentially the status quo, the current state of UDRP and URS would remain.

Third option would be to accept all five PDP recommendations which would forward all five recommendations to the Board, which happen to be in conflict with GAC Advice. And this is similar to what happened in the previous IGO INGO PDP including the Red Cross issue.

We could, as a Council, accept Recommendations 1-4 and reject Recommendation Number 5, which is the one that has been identified as potentially problematic as it relates to the scope and charter of the group. In that case the Board would receive four recommendations that would not create or change consensus policy that exists but also do not reflect GAC Advice. So let's be clear that all four - or sorry, all five of the recommendations are in conflict with GAC Advice.

Fifth option would be to send back Recommendation Number 5 or all five recommendations to the working group. This would be consistent with the PDP Manual but there could be some challenges as it relates to the working group dynamics that we can talk about in more detail and we have talked about quite extensively. And this would be likely to create a delay as it relates to interim reservations of IGO acronyms until the PDP was completed.

And then Number 6, we could consult the working group on its deliberations and on the rationale for Recommendation Number 5, including the charter scope interplay with the RPMs. Consistent with the PDP Manual, but the working group dynamics, as we've discussed, could be problematic; it could create a delay.

So from a Council perspective, as we look ahead to try to figure out how to navigate these choppy waters as it relates to the recommendations coming from the PDP working group, the fact that there is conflicting GAC Advice and let me be clear, just because there's conflicting GAC Advice isn't necessarily a rationale for us not to forward PDP working group recommendations to the Board.

I am firmly of the opinion that as Council, we are the managers and protectors of the GNSO PDP processes, and there will be times where GNSO PDP recommendations conflict with GAC Advice and so that's not something where I see as necessarily on its face a reason to not forward recommendations. My view is that if we're going to do that, however, we need to be pretty confident in the recommendations themselves.

So let me pause there. I want to make sure that this is a conversation and that there's an opportunity for questions. I know this is a tremendous amount of information especially for our new councilors. And I want to point everybody to the documentation that Mary and Steve have pulled together that was circulated yesterday and encourage everybody to read sort of the background and the context. And we will have further conversations on this but this is going to be an important topic for us to consider as a Council looking ahead to December and January and maybe beyond. So, Paul, I see your hand, go right ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Keith. Paul McGrady here. So I don't think that number 1 is useful because I don't think there's any ambiguity about what the GAC was looking

for here just that the working group came up with the opposite, right? And so I mean, I'm usually all for discussions but if I were the GAC I would be wondering what it is we're showing up to discuss.

Is there - is there a seventh alternative here where we simply - rework the charter and send it back to make it clear that, you know, what it is that we're seeking here? I think that that instead of just rejecting the PDP recommendations and terminating it, which doesn't get us anything because the status quo is what triggered the GAC Advice in the first place, you know, can we have a - can we just simply take a look at the charter, see where it's messed up, see where we got the weird result and then send it back to the working group? Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Paul. This is Keith. And I think that's probably a subset of Number 5, right, or it could be a separate line item of its own, which is to send back Recommendation 5 or all five recommendations to the working group and that could be accompanied with, you know, a re-chartering if you will, you know, or some very specific questions or some component. So I think what you've described is certainly an option as it relates to, you know, GNSO Operating Procedures, Council and PDP Operating Procedures. So let's make sure that we capture that as a possible or a potential action.

So, Carlos, I see your hand, please.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Yes, thank you, Keith. I agree with the question of Number 7. I agree that we should revise Number 5 and include the minority report why some options are not included. Focusing only on Number 5, and the charter is not enough; I really would like to work with whoever wants to discuss this and go deeper and include in the discussion why there is a minority position that was not considered in the five recommendations because this is my favorite one. And I think it's the one that can be explained to the GAC; that we need to explain to the GAC why this minority position might be a feasible option, Number 7.

And so back to Number 1, Paul, it's always good to do a little bit of diplomacy. I know Julf can do it, but we in this case this is not a fresh PDP, this is rehash of all the recommendations, Keith, so I think we don't have a third round for this so we should really try to wind it down; this is already something that should be - should have been resolved years ago and I don't think we can push - we should not push too hard. So a little bit of one and yes, let's reconsider the Option 5 including the minority positions that were not recommended. Thank you very much.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Carlos. And if anybody else would like to get in, please jump in the queue, put your hand up and feel free to weigh in. And, you know, if there's any - Mary, if you or Steve would like to weigh in on this as our subject matter experts on staff, you're more than welcome to join the conversation.

So, you know, I think - so again, we're not here to make any decisions today, this is to bring everybody up to speed. I think we have been asked by the GAC in the letter that was sent from Manal to Heather in Barcelona to have a further conversation about this. I also understand the concern that, you know, if, you know, if these recommendations are completely, you know, diametrically opposed with GAC Advice and there's very little chance of, you know, of finding sort of a common ground then we don't want to either raise expectations or waste time in having lengthy ongoing engagement.

But I'm wondering if there's an option or an opportunity to respond to that letter and to reach out with some specific questions that might help inform the Council's deliberations as we move forward? And I think you know, Carlos, what you were describing, and I think, you know, what we've talked about is, you know, trying to identify some specific questions that can help inform our deliberations and our discussion. You know, and perhaps at the same time we could do the same in terms of reaching out with some specific questions to the PDP working group and that, again, from that perspective might help

us better understand you know, the challenges that we face and, you know, sort of the path ahead.

Sorry, I'm talking a lot and getting lost in Adobe chat so let me make sure I'm capturing everything here. If anybody would like to jump in, please get in the queue and feel free to speak. Okay, Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Keith and everyone. This is Mary from staff. So on that point that you made, Keith, about possibly responding to the GAC whether you do so now or after your December meeting, I just wanted to point out that there is a second slide here that you don't have to look at today but we do include links to the transcripts of some relevant sessions in Barcelona, in particular and on the point about whether you want to consider engaging with the GAC, the link to the transcript and the relevant pages of the joint meeting that the previous Council had with the GAC.

We think that the Council might find that useful along with a paper in terms of deciding whether reaching out to the GAC and responding to their letter, which we note was sent sometime during the early part of the Barcelona meeting, so that would be over a month ago. When you want to do and what you want to say in it, we hope that this link to the transcript is helpful.

The other point that staff would like to make is a minor point in the context of this full discussion, but we think is important to make, that there is one factual error in the paper that I take full responsibility for personally. And it is in respect of one point in the appendix where we give the background. In the current draft of the paper that you have, the - it says that it was a working group member who also participates in the RPM PDP that proposed what ultimately became Recommendation 5. That is incorrect.

While that member did support Recommendation 5, he was not the one who initially proposed what became Recommendation 5. Since that is a factual error I just thought I wanted to get it on the record. Thanks, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Mary. And thanks for that clarification. And yes, no problem. And so just so everybody knows, I did and I think some other councilors and staff may have received an email - I did, I don't know if others did as well - from one of the you know, contributors to this PDP working group, George Kirikos, this morning in response to the documents that were forwarded to the Council list last night with a request to forward his email to the full Council.

I will do that after this call. And just to make sure that you know, we're considering all of the various inputs, perspectives and views as we try to figure out and navigate our path forward on this. So if anybody else has any comments or questions, feel free to jump in at this point. I'm going to make just a couple of you know, sort of wrap up comments and then we'll move onto the rest of our agenda.

So I think it's really important for us to recognize that this PDP working group has been going on its various forms for four plus years. I think this PDP working group is in some ways a poster child for one of the things that we're - we've identified or several of the things that we've identified as it relates to our PDP 3.0 efforts coming out of last year. And that we need to look ahead and learn from the situation the we're in right now as it relates to this particular group.

And I'm not judging anything. I know we've heard you know, suggestions that the group was captured; we've heard - we certainly know that there's conflicts with GAC Advice. There's been questions as to whether you know, the IGO and INGO folks participated in the group sufficiently or not; whether GAC contributed to the PDP over its time. And the fact that it went on as long as it did I think sort of ground people down in terms of their ability to continue to participate. And I think there's a lot of lessons learned here.

So I just put that marker down and say, having said all of that, we do have to make some decisions here, and these will be tough decisions. And I want to

make sure, and I'm calling on each of you as councilors, to do some homework here and to read into this to try to get up to speed and trust me, I've been having to try to do that myself because it's not something I was following very closely over the last several years. And so this is going to be a challenge for us but I think we're up to the challenge; we just need to make sure that we make the best decision possible.

We have, you know, questions of should the Council simply take recommendations, certify that the process was followed and forward them? Or should the Council in sort of an unprecedented way, you know, sort of dig into more of the substance of recommendations to determine whether they are good policy recommendations and worth forwarding in the face of conflicting GAC advice? And as I said at the beginning, you know, conflicting GAC Advice is not a reason alone not to forward recommendations that result from a PDP, but we should be, you know, darn sure that we're confident in the recommendations, you know, that we do forward in those instances in my view.

So there's a lot here, there's a lot of different perspectives and a lot of different viewpoints and we're going to have to navigate this carefully. So let me pause there. Paul, I see you've typed into chat; feel free to you know, to weigh in here if you'd like to speak, otherwise we'll draw a line under this one and, you know, continue this discussion on email and in our next Council meeting. Anyone? Going once. Going twice. All right, let's move onto our next agenda item then, which is - okay, EPDP, finally.

We actually made it for almost an hour and 26 minutes without really discussing the temporary specification. That's behind us. So with that, let me hand this portion of the call over to Rafik and to Kurt to provide us an update on the developments on the EPDP, importantly as I noted that the initial report has been posted for public comment so congratulations to you and to all the participants in the EPDP for getting to that point. It's been a tremendous amount of work, intense work and, you know, just thank you. I'll

hand it over to you. So, Kurt, you want to start and Rafik is deferring to you to begin.

Kurt Pritz: Okay great. Well thanks very much. So I think this PDP is grinding down its participants in a different way but everybody is staying the course. I have a few introductory comments and I know we're running behind a little bit and then - but I think you might want to mostly ask questions.

So as you noted, Keith, and thanks for having me join the GNSO call, so the initial report's been posted. I think, you know, there's a few points I want to make about what's notable about it. First, it starts with the first recommendation contains a list of GDPR compliant purposes for processing registration data. So I think one good outcome is that after a long time of trying, and ICANN policy development process has developed what we think is a complete list of purposes, legitimate purposes for processing registration data.

A second - so that small Recommendation 1 is lost in a big report but I think it's very important and provides a springboard into the next discussions that will follow. The second notable aspect is the data workbooks, so we recognized that in order to - in order to answer the rest of the - the remaining charter questions we really needed to understand each data element that was collected, you know, how it was processed, how it was, you know, what processing steps it went through besides collection, disclosure, how long it was retained for.

So all that was mapped out and legal bases were not only determined for each purpose but rather each processing step of each data piece. So those data workbooks I think will provide a foundation for future GDPR related work that ICANN undertakes.

A third notable aspect of this is in addition to the two policy recommendations, there's a list of 11 questions for community input. And

that's to capture input on issues where there's still significant contention within the team. So we, you know, we struggled quite a bit with, you know, whether or not to publish and whether the initial report was, you know, complete enough and realizing with the timeline requirement that we almost certainly had to publish the report right around now if we hope to meet the May 25 deadline. Nonetheless, we don't want to publish a report that's not meaningful or can be used to garner public comment in a meaningful way.

So what the report seeks to do is lay out policy recommendations but in issues where there's not agreement amongst the group point out that issue with the requisite specificity so that the community can provide opinions on that issue so that the team can feel confident that in further deliberations on those issues they can move forward towards a final report. So, you know, we wanted to not publish a report that was not completed and think we found that ground with this list of questions.

And then a fourth notable aspect that we might wind up talking about here is the comment forum. And, you know, I'm a proponent of this comment forum and I want - for the following reasons: one is I want the - we think the reasoning and rationale behind people's comment is more important than support and nonsupport. We think you know, this team, which represents every stakeholder group within ICANN and consults with their stakeholder groups, have identified, you know, nearly all of the issues and have discussed them in depth.

And so what the comment period is really looking for is fresh or different reasoning, not merely support or nonsupport. And this sort of public comment forum is intended to, you know, capture the rationale and put it right in front of the - put right in front of (unintelligible) so for commenters, they can feel comfort in knowing that their exact words are going to be put in front of the team and not, you know, not a longer comment document that's curated in some way where a well-meaning and very smart ICANN staff member decides which sentences that go in front of the team.

So the comment forum is meant to help the commenter and help the team see the comments. So and also get the comment in front of the team faster so that we have more time to deliver them. So I can wax eloquent on the comment forum but that's enough of that.

Right after this meeting, in 28 minutes, there's a webinar that will help people understand the initial report and how to comment so it'll talk about the - not the substance of the report because we can't do justice to that within, you know, 30 or 45 minutes of speaking time, but rather the structure of the report, how to navigate the comment forum, so that webinar is supposed to facilitate the reading of a sort of longish report and help people understand how it's written and why it's written the way it's written and then so they can effectively comment on it.

And then finally going forward, the support team has compiled a list of what we think are the outstanding issues that are left and then sort of a triage on them. The team members are reviewing those and seeing if there's any issues that were missed. And what we're doing right now is sliding those remaining issues into the meeting slots that will occur between now and the receipt of public comments and then after that we're formulating a set that we think we're going to send - of questions that we think we're going to send to the European Data Protection Board for clarification.

And as you know we're going to continue on with our twice a week face to face meetings and then have a - I mean, twice a week teleconferences and then a face to face meeting in January in Toronto - January in Toronto so that's going to be great. So that's a too fast update and I'd be very happy to take questions because I think the questions are more meaningful than what I have to say.

And Rafik, before I open it up to questions, Rafik's among many tasks, he's the communications chief of the effort so I want to give him an opportunity to say something unless he wants to go to questions too.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Kurt. Yes, I think you did a good summary of what we did and what we are planning so I think maybe what we can add is that the work is still continuing and as you said, about (unintelligible) that we still have those deliberation and we need really to prioritize what we can get and we need to get done for the final report and then we will have the review of the public comments. So I suppose those who could read my weekly update I'm raising that the point that we have roughly two months to finish the work and we have the winter holidays in the middle, so I think we need to focus and get the final report by the deadline which is the first of February.

And so I think GNSO Council can give us guidance here and also want to add that in term of the report we have the initial recommendation but also initial response to the charter and gating questions so that's still will be finalized with the final report of course. And with regard to the public comment, I think the format that we selected is really to help the structure for getting the input and helping the EPDP team. I know that some concern about that format but I do believe that will help a lot in term of structuring but also to have them - some consistency and ensure that we get the input from SG and C and other groups for the particular question and recommendation.

And we, other hand, maybe is not for Phase 1 but we are already thinking about the Phase 2 and we need to - we will start that discussion in the work plan but just at the leadership level. So I think that's it. I hope I didn't miss any other point but I do believe you'll get that kind of status of what we did and what we are doing currently. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Rafik. And thanks, Kurt. This is Keith again. So go ahead and open the queue. And Michele, I see your hand, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Keith. Michele for the record. And thanks to Kurt and Rafik for that update. Just for fellow councilors who may not be aware, on behalf of the CPH, the Contracted Party House, Alan Woods did send an email to the EPDP list strongly discouraging any letter being sent to the European Data Protection Board at this time. I'll put the link to that in the chat and I'll also circulate it on the Council list. I mean, I think it's pretty self-explanatory. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele. This is Keith. If anybody else...

((Crosstalk))

Kurt Pritz: Thanks, Keith. Can I respond to Michele?

Keith Drazek: Of course, Kurt. Go right ahead.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, thanks very much. Right, Michele, and so we had quite a discussion about that letter in our last meeting and it was agreed not to send the letter that was written to the Data Protection Board the way it was written. And in fact we have two calls today to discuss the letter. So in my description I wasn't intimating that we were sending the letter as currently written but rather that, you know, we're now going to work towards a different letter that can be sent that has the endorsement of the whole group.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Kurt. Thanks, Michele. Anybody else like to get in the queue? Rafik, anything else? So again, yes, Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Keith. Yes, sure. So I think the point you are raising is in the charter about the gating question, so I mean, as, you know, in term of the report, we didn't have, I mean, we didn't make any consensus (on), so I think that it will be - we need to discuss before maybe if we think that that would be enough. But, yes, as you mentioned that it's in the charter in term of having the

Council to - if there is no objection and if the - I don't recall the exact language but it's with regard to gating question that is sufficiently answered.

So yes, it should be a consensus, so that - at this level I think at this stage it's maybe not - I don't think the Council maybe need to take an action but I think your point is taken.

Keith Drazek: Yes, thank you Rafik. Yes, so I'll just sort of underscore or reiterate, I think from a Council perspective, and a process perspective, the charter laid out that once the gating questions in the charter were answered, it was then possible, or is then possible for the EPDP Working Group to sort of pivot its work and start discussing access model issues.

And, you know, so I think it's just important for us to have, you know, a pretty good signal or clear warning that when we're approaching that point so we can be prepared to, you know, consider that as far as the next step. So thank you very much and I think you even mentioned or discussed that point before even reading my note, so thank you for that, Rafik.

Darcy, I see your hand and then we probably need to draw a line under this and move on.

Darcy Southwell: Great. Thanks, Keith. This is Darcy Southwell. I'll be quick. You know, my question is really around the questions that the EPDP is going to put to the European Data Protection Board. And I'm just wondering given the timeline, we're talking about the fact that those questions haven't even been drafted, what's the expectation or is there an understanding or expectation of whether this is something the European Data Protection Board can do in a timely fashion or is willing to do? Do we have any input on that? Thanks.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, so thanks for - this is Kurt - thanks for the question, Darcy. And you're exactly right, we have little input on that. We have questions that were formed during the deliberation so in the letter that was written, that was drafted that's

not going to be sent, those questions were plucked out of the deliberations and initial report but it makes a lot of sense that they be reworded.

So in the event - and so I think two things; one is we should still pursue that in good faith that we're seeking this input. And second, once formulated those questions can be sent to others too. So we're in the process of locating outside legal counsel to give us opinions on this and some of our team members are in contact with independent experts in the community to provide that input. So once formulated we can shop those questions around. You know, it'd be best to get input from the Data Protection Board rather than, you know, rather than a law firm because legal opinions, you know, everybody has them.

But it's a long way of saying we're not certain that we'll get timely input; we should still go through this process because we think it's appropriate and it will be worthwhile to have that put in our back pocket if we receive it at any time. And second, the exercise of going through writing the questions will be helpful because we can then have a tool to go to others and ask the same questions.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Kurt. And Michele, you have the last word on this; we need to move on, 15 minutes left.

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks. And just a comment in my personal capacity, the European DPAs are not there to provide legal advice to anybody. If ICANN needs to get legal advice it gets legal advice, but using - trying to use the European Data Protection Board as a way of getting advice needs to be handled very, very carefully.

And unless members of the team are 100% confident that the questions are narrow enough in scope it would be a very bad idea to send it to them because as things stand, Article 29, which was the predecessor to the European Data Protection Board, wrote to ICANN on multiple occasions and

the tone of their letters got to the point where they were literally saying, even though some people seem to be incapable of seeing it, that we've already told you this in the past; why do you keep ignoring us? So I don't think the relationship is particularly healthy there and I'd be very careful about poking the beast.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Michele. And Kurt and...

Ayden Férdeline: Kurt, this is Ayden. Can I be added to the queue, please?

Keith Drazek: Yes, Ayden, go right ahead.

Ayden Férdeline: Hi, Keith. Sorry. And hi, everyone. I'm having difficulties with the Adobe Connect today. I will circulate this after our call but I just wanted to draw attention to some comments that Stephanie Perrin made on the EPDP call on Tuesday. And Stephanie outlined a number of reasons why she believes it would be inappropriate to the EPDP to be approaching the European Data Protection Board.

And I think her comments are worth reading and I think they could address some of the questions that Darcy asked, so I just want to put out there that I would not say that there is a consensus among the EPDP team members that we should be sending any correspondence through to the European Data Protection Board. But I will circulate on our mailing list after this call Stephanie's comments so that you can see her rationale for that. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much, Ayden. And so on that point there's some further discussion going on in chat with Rafik, Michele and myself about, you know, possibly needing some clarification from the GNSO Council as it relates to the charter because this is something that is outlined in the charter as a requirement is to send a letter to the Data Protection Board. So to the extent we need to reconsider or adjust our expectations there, let's take an action item and take that to the email list. So thank you for that.

Kurt, Rafik, thank you very much for the update. Much appreciated. Congratulations on getting to where you are and good luck with the ongoing work that you have over the coming weeks and months. And we will - and thank you, Marika, it says "should" not "must" in the charter related to the letter. Helpful detail and accuracy as always.

So with that let's move on then back to our agenda item. I'm going to - in the interest of time and because we have to vacate this AC room for another meeting at the top of the hour, I'm going to jump ahead to Brian Atchison and the discussion and an update on the IRTP Policy Status Report and the CPIF. Brian, as concise as you can be because we've gone over our time but I wanted to make sure that we got to you. Thank you. Brian, are you with us?

Brian Atchison: Hello, this - yes, yes, just getting off mute. Can you hear me okay?

Keith Drazek: I sure can. Thank you. Go ahead.

Brian Atchison: Okay, sure thing. I'll make this as quick as possible in the interest of time. My name is Dr. Brian Atchison. I'm from ICANN's Operations and Policy Research Department, that's a part of Domain Name Services and Industry Engagement, which is itself is a part of Global Domains Division. And I helped put together this IRTP Policy Status Report together with the Policy Team, Compliance and a few other teams who provided data for the report.

Now this is just a very high level overview of the Policy Status Report. I'll go over the background of why we produced it, some key findings and next steps. There's a lot more details in the report. Excuse me. I was allotted 15 minutes for this but as you know we're short on time. I don't think we'll have time for a Q&A at the end but please feel free to put any questions in the chat and my email is at the end and we can handle any questions via the email list.

So I'm just going to go ahead and jump right in. So as far as background goes, there's two mandates for this Policy Status Report. One of them came from the IRTP-D Working Group which essentially recommended that once all the recommendations were implemented the GNSO and ICANN staff should put together a panel to sort of discuss any relevant data related to transfers and discuss any possible improvements or shortcomings to the policy.

The second mandate stems from the CPIF or Consensus Policy Implementation Framework. The support and review stage, which explicitly mandates a Policy Status Report and saying essentially that Compliance and Policy staff should put together a report when there's been enough time for sort of data to accumulate and add it into the report. So that's the background of this PSR.

Now going into the IRTP itself, we essentially structured - moving down to the bottom of the slide we structured the report in terms of the three overarching goals of the IRTP, which is in short the domain name portability, transfer related abuse prevention and transfer related information provision. And you can see a few more details in those top four points of this slide. So that's how the report is broken down.

And let's go right into some findings. Again, very, very high level, so based on our data analysis, we saw that about 414,000 domain transfers occurred per year on average from the observation period that we had data available. This was 2009-2017. If you look at that whole time period you see about an average of 157 million domain registrations per year. Just for a sense of scale we essentially divided that 414,000 average by that 156 million number and you get about .25% of total registrations are represented by transfers. Or let me say that a different way, as a proportion of total domain registrations, about .25% of them are transfers, so if that makes sense.

We'll look at a chart on the next slide, and you'll see that the trend line for transfer gain, loss and (NAFT) are not acknowledged; data is relatively flat but there are quite a bit of spikes in the chart. So here's a zoomed in view of the past three years of transfers gaining, transfers losing and you can see a trend like, it's kind of light sort of towards the bottom middle of the page.

So while the trend line was fairly flat obviously there's a lot of spikes in the data. You can see right around November 2016 there's this very prominent spike which we discuss a bit in the report more in the realm of a hypothesis or speculation, but this was - this spike was just before the change of registrant lock requirement was going to be implemented via IRTP - oh I forget, I forget if it was C or D, but they were both implemented on the same day, so our speculation, our hypothesis is that folks were trying to sort of beat that lock requirement. So that's one small interesting point that the data is showing us.

I won't go over all of these numbers but you can see that 2015 saw a spike in TDRP cases but it was still relatively small. You're looking at about 60 cases out of all the transfers that are occurring. Compliance is receiving about 500 tickets per month related to transfers during that time period. And we'll see a chart on the next slide but the transfer related tickets that Compliance receives has gone down slightly. We can't really attribute any sort of driver to that yet but interesting to note.

And then a few more sort of granular numbers here about Compliance. Summing it all up it's a very small proportion of the complaints that transfer receives - or that Compliance received are related to unauthorized transfers or unauthorized change of registrant or complaints due to domain name hijacking.

Global Support Center where we also receive data from, received 229 inquiries since 2017 and that's compared to an average of about 2200 total transfer related inquiries received. So let me jump ahead here.

Here you can see the Compliance data in graphic form, so starting in 2012 and going to 2017 you can see that most notices are handled after the first receipt, so most do not go to the first inquiry or notice. So you can see that they're handled - most are handled without having to escalate the issue.

So moving ahead, here's some data on GSC, as I mentioned they receive about 200 transfer-related inquiries per year since 2015 and a few more again more granular observations from the data that I encourage you to read and of course all included in the report.

There's a few other considerations when looking at the IRTP. As you know, there's the EPDP, and Part 4P of the charter specifically addresses the transfer policy and poses a few questions. So however the EPDP answers these questions and however the community and Board choose to implement them, this all may result in policy changes but I think you all know very well what's going on in the EPDP.

There's also the RDAP or Registration Data Access Protocol, which has some impact on the transfer policy. It does allow for certain new transfer capabilities, for example you can provide auth codes for transfers within the RDAP system. And that's anticipated to be deployed in April 2019, although it's been pushed back a couple times, but that's what we're expecting now.

And final slide the next steps for this report, these steps were determined according to the support and review stage of the CPIF and also please note this - the Post Implementation Consensus Policy Review Framework, this is a draft framework that we sent to the GNSO last year but given all the EPDPs and PDPs out there the Council wasn't able to get to it so we plan on discussing this framework with the Council in 2019 and how we want to approach policy reviews in general.

But you can see the timeline here, the public comment and there's an associated survey is open until end of December. We anticipate that the

GNSO will have roughly two, three months to review the PSR. We'll update it at the beginning of next year based on the public comments and survey feedback and the Council input. We'll resubmit an updated PSR back to you on the Council and then from roughly March to June of next year the Council has, you know, obviously any option it wants to review such as initiating new policy work, requesting ICANN to address any implementation issues or consider the PSR is sufficient and take no additional action.

So I hope that all makes sense. I know I kind of rushed through it. You have my email here. I'll post it in the chat. Is there anything I could answer for you now?

Keith Drazek: Hi, Brian. This is Keith Drazek. Thank you very much for the quick overview. Sorry to put you in a bit of a time crunch there. But obviously a tremendous amount of work going on and we really appreciate your presentation. I think we need to digest it a bit and we'll circle back with any questions or follow up. Would anybody like to get in the queue briefly with a question or comment for Brian?

Seeing none, I see some folks in chat saying thank you very much, most helpful. So, Brian, thanks very much again. And we'll circle back with you if we have any follow up questions.

Brian Atchison: Sure thing, Keith. Just shoot me an email. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Much appreciated. All right, everybody, this is Keith. So we have essentially three minutes left in the call before we have to leave the room. I regret that we did not get to a discussion on the ICANN Reserve Fund. Perhaps this is something that we could take to the list and have a follow up conversation in our December meeting. I think this is something that, as we noted in Barcelona, the expectation was that if SGs or Cs wanted to raise this issue at the Council level that there's an opportunity to do that. I've seen no indication

or no email traffic that I recall anyway, on the topic so let's push Number 6 to December and we'll certainly have further conversation on the list.

I will just quickly note the item that I was going to refer to under any other business is just a very brief update on the situation with the complaint that was filed in the Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP Working Group. The update for this - for the Council at this time is that it is currently in the hands of ICANN Legal. And we are in a holding pattern until we hear from ICANN Legal as to how they intend to engage on the process or on the situation.

Just as a very brief recap, the, you know, there was a complaint filed, the target of the complaint hired counsel that raised some questions about, you know, the viability or the positioning of the expected standards of behavior and the potential for a chilling effect as it relates to participation and leadership in various PDPs.

The PDP co-chairs were on the first line for having to resolve the issue. Then it was punted to the GNSO Council in Barcelona. And then we heard from Göran in the public forum in Barcelona that ICANN - that he was directing the ICANN General Counsel's Office to weigh in. And my understanding is that the ICANN General Counsel's Office has started to have conversations with impacted parties and that they are engaged in essentially we are to stand by until further notice. So that is the update on the RPM Working Group complaint.

So with that, we are at the top of the hour. Any questions or comments on that point? I know we're losing people for the EPDP webinar. Yes, thank you, Marika. Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, Rafik and all others who are participating in that. Any other business? I will take the other any other business items to the email list for updates. Any other business before we wrap up? Going once. Going twice. Anybody on staff, anything for us? I see no hands. Thank you, everybody. Thank you very much for a great call. I'll do

a better job next time of keeping us on track and timing. So thanks all. Have a great day and we'll be in touch on email. Bye.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

Tony Harris: Bye-bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, everyone, for joining the GNSO Council meeting. This adjourns today's call. Operator, you may now stop the recordings and disconnect the lines. Have a great remainder of your days.

END