

**Transcription ICANN62 Panama
GNSO Working Session Part 2
Monday, 25 June 2018 13:30 EST**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Heather Forrest: So let's go ahead and get started with our next session. This is the GNSO Council's Working Session Opportunity to Discuss Motions on the Agenda on Wednesday. Can I have a thumbs up from our tech team? It looks like things are ready to go. Fab. Thanks very much. Excellent.

So this is our opportunity to discuss the motions that are before us on Wednesday. I've had the computer wheel of death, so I would love to say I have the agenda directly in front of me. Could we perhaps turn to the next slide? There we go. Fabulous.

So the first motion on the agenda relates to the Customer Standing Committee amended charter. You would have seen Donna's email to the list earlier today raising some concerns. Donna, you're the lead on the motion. I'm happy to turn it over to you.

Donna Austin: Yes thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. So it wasn't actually an email to the full council list, it was just a heads up. But it seems that the chair of the ccNSO has some concerns with some of the language that we have in the charter. I

haven't had a chance to address it yet or the chairs to the charter review team hasn't had an opportunity to discuss it yet so I'm just not sure what we're going to do about it, because it's not - if I read it correctly, we received public comments that supported the language that was included and now (Katrina) seems to have an issue with what's been included.

So the charter review team will need to try to find some time this week to review it. Hopefully we can sort it out without any modifications to the charter but if we have to modify it, then I may need to pull this motion. Thanks,
Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. And apologies for misstating the email. Donna, what does that do to us in terms of timing? Like there is a timeline for this review effort, and how does this - does it then bleed into the IFR or no?

Donna Austin: I don't think it will. If we can, you know, if it takes us another month to sort this out then that's not going to be a problem for the IFR. It's a separate conversation about the overlap between the - affecting this review that's required under the charter and IANA function review. We started work on that so it's not going to impact that.

Heather Forrest: That's super helpful, Donna. Thank you. Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Okay Rafik speaking. Sorry, Donna, just maybe to clarify, so there was this concern from the ccNSO?

Donna Austin: So, Rafik, my understanding it's a concern from the chair of the ccNSO at this point in time but I don't know whether it's with the ccNSO itself or as a whole.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So, yes I'm just trying to think what kind of scenario we'll have. So we're going to have the meeting with the ccNSO in - Wednesday and maybe that will be brought up. But if there is this kind of issue, do we need kind of to defer the motion or - so this is the likely scenario, okay, and then...

Donna Austin: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: But then if we defer, do you think it will be enough time for the review team to work on this issue? Okay, thanks.

Heather Forrest: Any further questions or comments in relation to the motion to approve the CSC amended charter? It looks like we're in a watch-and-wait position at this particular point in time. Yes. All right. Thanks very much and thanks, Donna, very much for your update.

So the next motion here is the completion of the final report of the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protections Mechanisms PDP. This is, if you like, a motion not relating to the final report but preparing for the final report. So this group has been as the - what you see here as the results clauses. The whereas clauses were quite carefully drafted to give the full picture of the path of progress of this working group and the fact that it's been at its work for quite some time now.

The group has had difficulty and has been working towards since ICANN 60 refining its final recommendations and capturing those in its final report. It's had some difficulty in doing that. There have been concerns around the mechanisms used to determine consensus. Those were raised right around the time of ICANN 60. It carried us through the end of 2017, resulted in an appeal filed just before the end of 2017, and very recently there's been another appeal filed in relation to again the process of developing consensus.

So this group, following our strategic planning session, was advised that it - we were keen to see this work wind up, we the council were keen to see this work wind up by midyear. Midyear by logical references means now, means June, and we had said we were aiming we were aiming if - for this meeting to have that finished up, ICANN 62.

It appears that the group needs a bit more time with the filing of that latest Section 3.7 appeal. It seemed that the group felt it was under very significant pressure to meet the June deadline. The document deadline of course for this meeting was about a week ago, and it needed a bit more time. And this is something that Rafik, Donna, and I have discussed with the now current chair of the PDP, Petter Rindforth, and with Susan Kawaguchi, who was here and has stepped out.

Susan has served extraordinarily ably as the liaison to this PDP and has been working very closely with Petter, and prior to that with Petter and Phil, to get the group to a point of being able to submit its final report with its recommendations. And, albeit reluctantly, we agreed that it seemed that in light of the current appeal and the necessity to get as best a final report as we can in terms of capturing the views of all parties, all members of the PDP, that some degree of delay was helpful, that it might help in not exacerbating the matter.

So hence this motion that's on the table before us is an effort to encourage that group to finalize its efforts between now and July. This is fairly unprecedented that Council would take a step to in essence try and commit a group to a timeline, but in view of the fact that this group has been working on developing its final recommendations since sort of quarter four of last year of 2017, we feel that it's an important thing that the group begin to wind up its efforts, particularly as we're about to turn our minds to the EPDP and we need to be very careful with efficient and effective use of resources.

So hence that's the motion in front of you. I have put the motion in myself in view of the fact that the Section 3.7 appeals process involves as a first step discussion with the chair or co-chairs of the PDP and, following that, referring the matter to the GNSO chair. And so I have opted to put in this motion as a matter of dealing sort of proactively with the current 3.7 appeal.

Any questions on this one? In view of the fact that it's all going to plan we will see this final report in time for our document deadline for July and we will be voting on this at our July meeting. Comments, questions? What I suggest that we do if we can when an opportunity arises is to allow Susan a chance to say a few words here. I know she would want to and she might add some more recent context, given her direct involvement with the PDP.

No questions at this point? Please.

Marie Patullo: Heather, this is Marie Patullo. Simply to say that Susan had to go to the Whois RDF session, so that's why she's not here, but I know that she'd very much appreciate the ability to make the comments you suggest. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much, Marie Patullo. That's very helpful. All right we'll leave this one for now, provide Susan with an opportunity to give her input when she's able to do that, and let's move then to the placeholder motion.

The placeholder motion of course presumes that we're at a point of being able to vote on a charter and an initiation request. As I said when we filed the motion on - just prior to the document deadline, if we didn't have the placeholder motion on the agenda we wouldn't be in a position to then vote on it were we able to do so, so hence it's clearly marked as a placeholder.

We've just had this discussion this morning with the board. We have this afternoon's HIT, much thanks to Donna's excellent efforts in working with the Whois 2 review team to shift their HITs, and then of course we have all day tomorrow. I thought it was very interesting that Cherine was going to quite closely follow what we did over the next two days. Comments, questions?

We obviously don't have a charter initiation request in front of us to even parse through language. We have a session built in today's - this afternoon's discussions to talk about the HIT, the high interest topic session. We have

leads on each one of those topics. Keith has submitted a fabulous set of documents there for that group to consider. Keith, thank you.

Each of our leads we'll catch up with them. And we also have an hour scheduled after that Nathalie found for us magically in the schedule. Immediately after the session, we have an hour to catch up with the leads as a group and prepare, not only for the HIT but for Tuesday, so we can use that time accordingly. Anyone want to make any points on this motion or should we park it for now and come back to it after we've had a chance to survive the HIT? Donna?

Donna Austin: I just wonder if we should have a conversation about what happens if we can't approve this motion because - and maybe it's a little bit premature to have that now but I think that at some point we're going to have to have a pretty frank conversation about whether we think we can do this, you know, on Wednesday and if we can't what's our next steps and are we going to try to keep our self to a timeline, because it's going to be pretty important that we wrap up this work so we can get to the next steps. So maybe it might be helpful to have a conversation on that.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. By way of context, I'm - and then we'll call on Michele, by of context, the July meeting falls somewhat early in our schedule. It's the 19th of July, which makes document deadline the 9th of July, so by way of context. Michele followed by Keith.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Madam Chair. And Donna's question I think is a very important one. Okay so let's deal with realities. If the temporary spec is not dealt via an EPDP, come May 25, 2019 there will be no policy and no contractual obligations covering everything that was in the temporary spec, essentially. It's just - it goes - you end up in pretty much a void.

So we need to get this EPDP going pretty quickly. So I think we - the issue will be around how we might then need to, depending on what happens with

the scoping exercise and how much disagreement there is, we might need to look at splitting the motion up in some way so that we are able to initiate an EPDP even if, and I don't know how the hell this works within the boundaries of stuff that lawyers worry about it, to deal with the non-contentious parts of the temp spec that we agree as a whole have to be dealt with.

But we definitely need - we can't have no EPDP start by the end of this meeting because if we do, if we let that slide, even pushing back the timelines by two or three weeks, we're completely - I don't even know - what that would look like. It's just an absolute mess in terms of timelines.

Heather Forrest: So I have Keith, Donna, and Marika.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Heather, and I should probably know the answer to this question, but is it possible for us as a council to pass a resolution or approve a motion during an extraordinary session? Okay, so there is the possibility of having an extraordinary session, but that's clearly impacted by the document deadline. So thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Keith. So there indeed is a procedure around that and that's why I mentioned the, you know, we leave here on, what is it, the 29th or 30th, given the document deadline for the regular meeting is a week and two days after that, I suppose that factors into our discussion. But yes, it is certainly possible procedurally to hold an extraordinary meeting and to vote on a motion at that meeting. It - Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. To follow up with what Michele was kind of getting at I think, I wonder if there's a possibility of can we half this charter in sections? And what I'm thinking here is if we could come - if we could reach agreement on the composition of the work track or work team, maybe we could go forward with that. Because we know there's a pretty significant lead time that the different groups will have to go through to seek nominations and have people sign up for the effort.

So I wonder if there's some way that if we can't agree all of the motion, is there a way that maybe we could agree the composition, how we feel about leadership, and maybe scope is the piece that we address later of the other bits, but just a possible way that we can try to speed this up a little bit.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. I have Marika and Paul.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Heather. This is Marika. I just want to also note that in the operating procedures you also have the ability to vote outside of a meeting, so should there not be a need to have further conversations but you just want to have a vote, there are provisions in the operating procedures for that, and that I think has a seven-day notification period for that vote can take place. And I think it has been used before.

In addition, the initiation request does include a requirement on the scoping. So it may be difficult there to adopt something and then adopt something new, so that may be challenging from a procedural perspective. Similarly if you do it in the charter, you can do that but basically then every time it would probably be a charter modification.

An alternative path you may want to consider as well indeed of course is if you have a draft charter and there are certain elements where you already agree on and you have agreed on the team composition, you could ask the team to already start convening and start working based on that, you know, the parts where, you know, there's at least agreement that those will not change.

I know that's not ideal but it may avoid having to adopt several motions and having several meetings to do that while you do provide a path for the group to start deliberating on the issues where it's clear that those need to be addressed and you have further time to think about, you know, other aspects that - where they fit or how they may need to be incorporated.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Marika. That's helpful. Paul and then I'm going to put myself in the queue with a question after Paul.

Paul McGrady: So - Paul McGrady for the record. I like the idea of busting up, let the procedural stuff go ahead of the substantive stuff, if we need to, only if we need to, right? And so for example on the leadership issue, there was no stomach for appointing leadership. We threw that out on the council list and everybody that responded basically said let's have this EPDP do that the usual way. So that's an example of something that I don't think will end up being very controversial.

There may be other stuff. Team composition is always controversial, but maybe we can, you know, dig up some of our old arguments and move quickly through that stuff. What I'm not for is busting up the substantive stuff, right? I think that has to be dealt with altogether and so as long as we do it that way, I don't see a problem with that.

The other thing I think in terms of dealing with Michele's concern that we don't get up the starting block right away is I do think that we all need to consider whether we can agree, at least in principle, not to pre-litigate this, to leave the deliberations to the actual EPDP working group rather than us arguing about it so that we end up doing a lot of the substantive work up front and having the charter reflect that.

So I just think in terms of if we're going to get out of the gate anytime in the next six months, we have to sort of, you know, focus on launching the group and not have that work being done here before the group is even formed.
Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Paul. Stephanie, over to you.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. Yes, I just wanted to bring up this whole issue of starting procurement processes. We have so little time. Personally I would like some data collection, some stats, some information gathered, and that means consulting, but more importantly, and I think we could probably agree on this rather swiftly, I think any veteran of the RDS group would agree that we need some kind of dispute resolution and we need to get going, that tender bit.

Because if it takes six weeks to two months then we're well on our way before we get somebody into the room to help us out with this stuff. So - plus I want to make sure we nail down the money for it as we're scoping this. Obviously we can't even think about budget until we figure out size of the group but we could at least come up with some of those fixed costs. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Stephanie. That's very helpful. To the point about budget, I'll just say something very quickly. You're exactly right. Any time I've been approached, you know, casually in the hallway by a board member and asked about budget, you know, no but really what are these budget concerns, the comment always comes back well how many, how many is the group. And so this is a chicken and egg thing and we have to then - we have to deal with that.

A question to pose to everyone is, and I think Stephanie's helped to steer us in that direction, is what at a minimum do we want to achieve while we're here in Panama? And, Stephanie, your comment about kicking off this process of having a facilitator or a dispute resolution person or whatever, that seems to me like it's a possibility to go on the list. And I see nodding around the table.

In view of this discussion that we're having now about the charter, and Marika's provided some very helpful information about options in terms of if we can't vote on the motion, you know, what procedurally does that mean,

you know, what else do we want to put on the list of things at a minimum, things we want to get done here in Panama?

Because I think if we identify our objectives, we can work fairly constructively towards them, as opposed to this motion is kind of the whole package. And I think we're recognizing that we might - there's a risk that we're not going to get, you know, a real risk that we're not going to get the whole package done this week.

So that's fine. What parts of the package do we want to get done this week? Stephanie, we make note of your suggestion. What else is there? Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Well just to add that -- Stephanie Perrin for the record -- Göran said that they had talked to - they had looked at ccTLD practices. Could we have a comprehensive study of that? I mean this isn't like rocket science. We should be able to gather that data rather quickly. I'd like to see it on a chart. I'd like to see whether they have consulted their DBAs.

I'd like to see whether they've had any complaints filed and successfully taken against them, just to know which practices are working where and what they do and why data elements they're looking and, you know, what the law enforcement experience has been because the ones that I've talked to all admittedly (unintelligible).

The other thing that - there's only so many nagging, nasty things you can say to the CEO when he's here, but I would just like to remind everyone that if we don't accommodate all the other data protection laws that are now being brought into alignment with the GDPR, we are asking for a perpetual nightmare as opposed to just an episodic one.

So I think we - I had said to the EWG many years ago that we needed binding corporate rules, which normally harmonized at a fairly high level so you don't get called out on a random country at any time, this is what we

need. So we need to look at some of the other ccTLDs, you know, Korea, Japan, New Zealand, and see what they're doing. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Stephanie. Other thoughts on where we want to end up this week?
Michele followed by Rubens.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I think one of the things we really do need to nail down very clearly is membership, as in both who can be a member and how many, because I'm hearing that certain groups have been pushing and being quite vocal about wanting large numbers of members and it's pretty damn clear from experience in other initiatives that if the group is over a certain size, we are not going to succeed. It is going to fail. And we can throw as much money as you like at facilitators and conflict resolution and everything else but it will not work.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. You - I heard leadership but I think you meant composition.

Michele Neylon: I said membership. My Irish accent at times. I'm sorry, Madam Chair.

Heather Forrest: All good, Michele, all good. So Rubens and Donna and Susan.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, Registry Stakeholder Group. In order to pass this motion quickly one of our options for scoping would simply to adopt the temp spec as the scope, so everything that's in the temp spec is the scope of the work group and if somehow somehow the group finds something that's not there that is relevant, they can always ask us to amend the charter and then possibly the scope.

But well no matter how many - how much time we devote to deciding the scope, it should look very similar to the temp spec. So it we should probably just start with saying that's the scope. It's just easier and faster to do that.
Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Rubens. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. To Michele's point about composition, I think if we can start with some principles, so, you know, the working group needs to be small. Based on previous experience, also understanding that this is a very short-term compressed effort that we're trying to deal with, I think budget comes into what we need to be cognizant that we can't possibly support travel for 100 people to come together for a week to try to work on this effort. So, you know, I think that's another consider.

We should think about, you know, members versus liaisons or members versus observers, or however we want to, you know, deal with that, but maybe if we can leave the numbers aside for the moment but agree on some principles about composition, that might be helpful. I think we also should keep in mind too that the GAC we're pretty certain is going to want representation on this effort.

We need to be mindful of the fact that they are participating in the Work Track 5 so - of the subsequent procedures so they have some experience now, and they're probably setting their expectations based on that experience. So we're going to be - have to be pretty clear I think in our messaging when we talk to the GNSO - when we talk to the GAC that this somewhat of a different beast but we're, you know, I don't know whether we're going to be accommodating it or not. We haven't had that discussion. But maybe if we can just kind of talk in principles for the time being and that might get us to the next step. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. I think that discussion with the GAC is quite necessary.
Thank you. Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi for the record. So I agree this should not be a hundred or even anywhere close to that but I'm also very confident it should not be 15. Do I need to get closer? Okay. Because there's so many different elements in this and issues that we need to address that subgroups will become really

important, and making subgroups out of 10 to 15 people is very difficult. So. And also, you know, the community is pretty overworked so there's only so much you can think - I mean there's only so much time you can spend on this.

So if you have one representative from each, you know, constituency or, you know, three from a stakeholder group for example, that puts a big burden on that one person, at least in the CSG. So, you know, and I would like to see alternates. So I think there's a happy medium there somewhere. You know, right now I'm on the review team and, you know, we have ten members and it's working but, you know, we broke up into different subgroups and, you know, we're pretty much on everything. So, you know.

And then the reality is you get a certain amount of workers and a certain of drafters and a certain amount of commenters and we can't - that doesn't work - won't work in this. Everybody has to draft, work, comment, edit, be in there absolutely full speed to get this done, in my opinion.

And then to Rubens' point about the starting with the temp spec, that should be our scope, if it's agreed that every item in the annex is part of the temp spec, you know, I would look to explore that and see if we could just flesh that out a little bit and rely on that as scope. But if we are saying the annexes are not part of the temp spec then we - there's an issue there for at least the BC.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. I have Paul and Donna.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady. So a couple things. One, yes, I think that the size should be as nimble as possible, as small as possible and still get the job done. So it's get the job done in the way that Susan is describing but also get the job done to make sure that everybody has a voice at the table and that people aren't silenced because of our arbitrary house constructions that, you know, came down years and years ago that nobody's happy with.

And so we need to make sure that we actually have representation around the table for everybody. I think that's important. And I take Susan's point about making sure that it's large enough to get the actual work done.

The other thing is just on the issue of scope and annex and all that. Yes that's going to be a big discussion. We shouldn't make sure that we have that. But I had sort of more of a procedural question about this particular moment in time around the table, which is is this our last motion that we are going to talk about? Okay.

So would - instead of hopping from topic to topic to topic around the charter, is next up that we actually start to look at the charter? Because I'm kind of wondering like how far are we really going to get if, you know, Michele raises this point, I raise that point, you know, whatever and we just move around and not really dig into the issues of, you know, how the team's put together, like let's deal with that and then let's deal with leadership and then let's deal with scope rather than doing scope, leadership, size. It just seems like - it feels like ping-pong to me. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Paul, very much. And, Donna, Just before I turn to you I'll just highlight. So what we have next is, Paul, on the agenda, everyone, on the agenda tomorrow is really all day sessions that will take each of these topics for which we have leads and work through them. So, yes, we will certainly unpack that tomorrow at length over the course of 9 am to 3 pm. So absolutely envisioned. Thomas, welcome. We'll - yes?

Thomas Rickert: Hi everyone. I'm not trying to sneak into the council. I've no seat here, but just one comment as food for thought. When ICANN had its webinar, one of the earlier webinars on GDPR, (Katherine) (unintelligible) from the European Commission confirmed in the chat the commission, and I think also the Article 29 group at the time, would be willing discuss once there is something to discuss.

I guess that the issue so far with the Article 29 group and the kind of feedback that was received from them was that, you know, they didn't get enough information to really form a view on what was okay and what not. You know, a good example is the discussion around retention periods where ICANN was seeking advice on how long can you retain data without substantiating why it should be two years and not six months or five years, right?

And I think that probably the EPDP if managed properly could be an opportunity for such discussion. If you package things and if you write up certain work packaged within the EPDP, maybe a structured way of exchanging thoughts with the data protection board could be initiating to get some feedback in order to avoid a train crash at the end of the day, whereby - where the community puts a lot of effort in getting something together just to learn that the European Data Protection board doesn't like it, you know.

So maybe, you know, it's for you to come up with the charter but maybe some sort of structured feedback loop could be a good way in order to make sure that everything's compliant.

Paul McGrady: I think that was Thomas' way of volunteering. Thank you, Thomas.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Thomas. And apologies. I have Donna and Erika. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. So my other response to Susan about the scope should be everything within the annex. So I think there's a strong expectation from the GAC that that will be the case because I think the last four of those seven items that are in the annex actually relate to GAC advice, so that's where I think they have a strong interest and I want to see that incorporated.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. I just wanted to comment briefly on what Thomas said. This is really actually a point which goes beyond the resolution but I think because he mentioned it I'd just like to make a short comment. I believe once we have

something ready, a concrete proposal to the group, the idea is not a bad one, but I would recommend to broaden it and to invite all - it should be a debate with specific voices which have the understanding in the GAC.

Because just to have the GDPR, the European group of data protection officers invited and to comment on it, I believe it's not really helpful because you see already responses coming from many different parts of the world, particularly the US, but many other who are looking into this topic and are saying stop it, be careful, you can't practically make a single law which applies only to one specific country a global norm.

So I think we have to be super careful here, but the idea to have an exchange afterwards but with all the parties which are part of the ICANN ecosystem involved from data protection background I think it's a good idea actually to do it. But it's not really related to your point.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Erika. That's helpful and helpful also to acknowledge it's related but separate. Yes. Keith, please.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Heather. So just to follow up on an earlier discussion or exchange about the relationship between scope and membership, I think they're actually interrelated and it's not necessarily that you put the scope first or then the membership or the membership and the scope first, I think the composition of the team is going to be in part influenced or dictated by the scope.

For example, and I think we all need tomorrow to be prepared to discuss the pros and cons of both of these, and I think there's reasonable arguments on both sides, but if we take Rubens' point about focusing on the temporary specification itself in the expedited PDP that is governed by or that requires completion at the end of the 12 months, now 11 months, and take everything that's in the annex and put that in a parallel PDP with a similar deadline, that allows you to move forward on the temp spec, make some decisions rather

quickly on the temp spec itself potentially, and avoid running up against that deadline while having a parallel effort focused on everything else. Okay?

The alternative is that it's all in one EPDP, right, and there are I'm sure arguments for that. But I think we need to be prepared to come and have that conversation as to why we think one is better than the other, make our cases for, you know, the most efficient and effective way forward, and to basically figure this out in short order.

Because I think if you break it up into bite-sized chunks in let's say two parallel EPDPs, you could probably have two smaller teams. If it's all going to be in one EPDP it's going to necessarily need to be bigger. And I want to ask people to think about this. We essentially by Barcelona, you know, if you consider the need for implementation and, you know, the approval processes and the public comments, we need to have essentially some decisions made by Barcelona to be able to avoid a crisis come May 25 of next year as it relates to the temporary specification itself.

Do we really think we're going to have answers on the access model, the so-called uniform access model, or anything else by Barcelona? And so, you know, based on the conversation that we had with Göran and Cherine and everybody about the uncertainty, the legal uncertainty and complexity, so I think we really need to think about as a council how are we going to be most efficient and most effective meeting deadlines and then creating the composition of the team. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Keith. So what I hear, you know, Keith, subtly in your comments and synthesizing it with others is this need to we understand that we have to work within process but we really need to make process work for us. And perhaps we're getting bound up in this idea of how many PDPs and so on.

I think, you know, across the board the comments are for work in bite-size chunks. Work is doable. Work is done by a team of a size and of a composition that is doable. Whether that takes the form of one PDP or two I wouldn't like to see us get necessarily caught up in that. The principle is bite-size chunks and how do we make that happen. Is that a fair assessment, Keith, of your comments?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Heather. In response, yes. I think that's a fair assessment in terms of the principles that we're trying to approach but I want to make sure that we're looking at this in the context of that deadline, okay? So if there's a, you know, two work streams within an EPDP, work tracks, whatever we're going to call them, where one can be concluded by the deadline and the other if necessary can continue somehow to do its important work but not hold up the other work track that's focused on the temp spec itself, then I think I support that principle. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Keith. I have Donna, Susan, and Rafik and Michele and Stephanie.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. So to Keith's point, I think I come back to the - what we're supposed to be doing here with this PDP is confirm or not the temporary specification. I think that's kind of the bounds that we're within. Everything in the annex doesn't have any substantive work on it so it's going to require more work.

I don't - personally I don't think it's possible to do that within the timeframe that we've got to confirm or not the temporary spec so I guess it's a conversation about what do we think fits within what is the temp spec we're talking about, and does the annex form part of that, is there no - and if it does, is there enough information in the annex to be able to do any substantive work? I don't think - we've got nothing really. We've just got a few ideas in there.

So that makes it a bit of a challenge. So I think I'm in agreement with you but it's still - my big concern with two parallel efforts is the resources and do we have that available to us, do we have the staff that can do those things. So it's, you know, maybe it's not parallel but maybe it's a delayed, you know, let's get through the substantive of the first effort and then kick off the other effort in six months or something. I don't know but I'm really concerned about the resourcing if we go down two at the same time.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. Susan?

Marie Patullo: This is Marie Patullo, not Susan but it's okay. If we do end up having parallel work tracks, it's absolutely essential there's good communication between them, that we really avoid duplication, we really avoid contradiction among - sorry, top of anything. Now part of this I think could go into the call for membership that we need to highlight there has to be good faith, you have to come to the table accepting you're going to have to change your position, there's going to have to be consensus building and not entrenched this is where I stand and I'm not moving.

I fully support Donna's point as well about resources but if we're going to have any form of parallel action there's got to be somebody, be it an official liaison or whatever, there has to be a heck of a lot of communication to ensure that they work in the same direction. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marie Patullo, and apologies. I have Rafik, Michele, Stephanie, Paul.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Rafik speaking. Hearing all those comments, so it's tempting to have two parallel tracks at the same time but that means that we ignore how much burden we are putting in terms of resource and bandwidth. So it's possible but how much we as different groups we can really work on two big issues at the same time.

So I think when I hear some comments like maybe we focus just on what is in the temporary spec first and then what is in the annex is kind of we are doing some triage and prioritization. If you are doing the scoping you can talk about what you will need to cover but at some level knowing you have as a constraint in terms of resource, in particular human resource and so on, you have to prioritize.

And the idea of work stream it's kind of that we know that we need to cover but we cannot cover right now, so we can do that commitment and we can organize ourselves. So maybe it should not be that sequential but we can adjust and depending on the timeline we have with the EPDP. So if I'm not mistaken, the initial report should be by Barcelona. So we can tweak that we know that maybe we can start initiating the second work stream by then. We should not like we finish all the work on EPDP to start.

So there is overlap and that we don't put really in this parallel when we know all the difficulties because there are some real constraints if we are starting in the summer, okay in the North Hemisphere, and those kind of issues that, you know, different groups will have a lot of pressure to handle. So it is my suggestion that not necessarily (unintelligible) but we can start just when we get the initial report so we know about all the dependency and the second track I mean, or team, they can handle that. So.

Heather Forrest: Thanks. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks, Heather. Michele for the record. So I was just looking at the temporary specification again just to kind of refresh my memory just in case it wasn't etched into the back of my eyes just yet. The scope of this is pretty clear in my mind. I mean you have a number of particular sections, scope, definitions, and interpretation, policy effective date, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, then you have Appendix A through G and those are the core things that we're dealing with.

These are the policies and contractual changes that we have to align ourselves with in order for domain name - the domain name things to work properly so that transfers can work properly, so that registrations can continue, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So those are the - that is what I see as being the scope. However some people seem to be completely fixated with the annex.

And the thing is if we focus or try to focus on both the core of the spec and the annex at the same time, this is going to implode. It will get nowhere and then 12 months' time you won't be able to register domain names consistently, you won't be able to transfer them, and you'll probably end up in an existential crisis where the validity of ICANN as an organization will be brought into question.

So we need to be more specific, we need to be narrow in the scope, and you know, just focus on the core of the specification. If people want to spend time, energy and effort looking at other things that are outside the core, fine, let them, but when it comes to this EPDP it has to deal with those specific items in the temporary specifications. Key ones like domain name transfers, key ones like, you know, the collection and the processing of data, those are 100% key. This is not something that can be debated; this has to happen.

But if we put it all into the one big bloody pot and there is an issue and it's too contentious and it doesn't get dealt with then the entire thing falls down like a deck of cards or I'm trying to think of an analogy but, you know, you get the idea. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. Actually Michele has killed off quite a lot of what I wanted to say. I agree. I don't see why we cannot do this sequentially. As I said in the session with Göran, I mean the fact that ICANN is late in

addressing this urgent problem does not mean that we should throw our process out the window.

I think I can say for the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group that splitting us up into subgroups where we do not have the people, sufficient people with the sort of deep expertise that we need on this, and I would gently suggest that that might apply to other groups as well, it's not going to work and it will fall into a shambles, as Michele has so well described.

I also think it's an abuse of the process to try to spring something this important, the biggest policy issue that we fought over for the last 20 years and put it on a forced march where we're not going to achieve fair results. We have to look at the fairness of the process. So there is no reason why we can't do this sequentially. I'm quite sure that the contracted parties can figure out how to give access in the meantime, even if it takes two years to come up with a process. Okay, so that's point number one.

Point number two. We need, as we scope this thing, we need to clarify what we are talking about because this proposed unified access model is an implementation, a proposed implementation. You have to disentangle the policies, the legal requirements, the requirements that are basically more or less procedural ones that are not strictly legal requirements. There's a whole lot of things that we have to parse out here. And calling these things silly names, coming up with something that is unified, it's not unified. We need to take that apart and discuss what we're talking about. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Stephanie. Paul, followed by Susan, followed by Carlos Raul Gutierrez.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady here. So one of the fun things about getting together around this table is that you get to see everybody's particular point of view, right, and where they're coming from. So from Michele's point of view the crisis is coming next May and so we need to get moving. I think Keith seems

to be sharing that view. Others have a view that, you know, these things can be either done side by side or Donna suggested six months delay if we're looking at the - an access model.

So I thought it's fair enough to share our point of view, which is your crisis may be next May 25, our crisis is right now. Right? So we don't have adequate access to find out who the bad guys are to make them stop being bad guys. Grandmas are getting phished, kids are being sold online, terrorists are having websites and email, okay?

So the - our crisis from the IPC standpoint is today. Delaying it six extra months isn't really going to be a good outcome. Treating it as if it's not an as-soon-as-possible issue, which is what the temporary specification annexes call it, an as-soon-as-possible issue, it is an as-soon-as-possible issue. So I'm all for trying to figure out how to manage the workflow but I think from an IPC point of view, I think I - you probably would not be doing my job if I didn't convey the sense of urgency that we feel about this, and so I would like for us to do a fulsome effort and deal with all of this and get it done and behind us and to show the community that the council is functional and the working groups that we set up is functional. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Paul. So I have Susan and Carlos Raul Gutierrez, and then what I suggest we do is we end it there because we have all day tomorrow to come back to EPDP discussions and I'm - we need to do a bit of prep for our sessions with the GAC and ccNSO in light of the comments that were made here and perhaps do a bit of thinking about the high interest topic. So Susan, please.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I agree with Paul and I'll try to make it quick. This is, you know, there's been talk about, you know, the sky didn't fall and - but in the work I do on a day-to-day basis this has had a tremendous implication on that work. So, you know, if you want to come sit with me and I'll show you all the things that I'm having trouble with, I'd be glad to do that with you.

But, you know, maybe in what Keith was saying earlier about rethinking how we do a PDP maybe we do one somewhat larger PDP but break it up into groups to, you know, deal with -- I don't know how we do this -- but categories of issues that are in the scope. So, you know, this group handles that category, this group handles that category. As long as it's - has representation from all the community, parts of the community in each of the - if we were to break up one larger PDP into subsets or subgroups or whatever you want to call it.

What I don't think I can support at all oh we'll start out with, you know, what some are deeming the, you know, truly important parts and we'll get to the others later. We'll do a second one after and sequentially. I don't get that. Also, Stephanie, you made a comment, something about this was implementation. I'm not viewing this EPDP as an implementation.

This - in my opinion the EPD -- I can't even say it -- the PDP, our first job is to look at this policy and go do we want to live with this for the rest of our lives, or careers involving ICANN, and if yes then we can rubberstamp it and move on, if no then we create new policy, consensus policy. And so I think that's the crucial question to ask right up front and, you know, how we get there to ask that I don't know but, you know, the access issue has been around as long as the temporary - other temporary spec.

And what we don't want to end up with is two temporary specs, in my opinion. We want this to be - we want to all work together. We need it all to intertwine and work as cleanly as possible. And I think the only way to do that is one EPDP.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. So, Stephanie, I see your flag. We - can we come back to this in the substance tomorrow or does it need to be - so we have Carlos Raul Gutierrez as the last person in the queue.

Stephanie Perrin: Hello? Hi. Stephanie. I just wanted to respond to Susan's querying my discussion of this as implementation. Basically what I'm talking about is the access model is how you implement a policy. The policy is how you, as ICANN, try to tell the contracted parties who and under what circumstances they must give third party access. So that's a policy. The mechanisms, including the implementation of RDAP, is implementation in my view.

I realize this is not something, despite that excellent working group that took place several years ago, the difference between implementation and policy it's not something that's ever been clear at ICANN, but it ought to be clear as we move forward on this. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Stephanie. Carlos Raul Gutierrez, last word on this.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes thank you. Just two questions, two requests for clarification. I understood a very clear position from Donna about the boundaries of the EPDP but then in the same language theoretically Michele said something similar. Is there any difference between the two of you of what you just said, just for clarification, that we have very clear boundaries? We're dealing only with the temporary specification? I want to be sure because that's - I didn't understand very well what Michele said.

And the second question is very much related. Has anybody from the other side, being the commission or Article whatever or DPAs, written something about the temporary specification that it's worthwhile reading between now and our next session tomorrow? Thank you very much.

Michele Neylon: Madam Chair? Thank you. Michele for the record. I'll answer your first question first. To the best of my knowledge apart from the European Data Protection Board, which is the updated replacement to Article 29, basically endorsing what Article 29 had said previously about a number of things, I'm not aware of any other communications and I'm not aware of anything specifically on the temporary specification, though if anybody knows

otherwise, please do correct me. And I'm kind of looking around the room and I'm not seeing anybody who would know shaking their head.

In terms of whether or not - whether Donna and I agree with each other, I think we do. Whether or not Mr. McGrady and I agree with each other, it's pretty clear we don't.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: I was just asking you and Donna about the boundaries and the...

Michele Neylon: No, no, Donna and I agree with each other.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: I like the way Donna express it but I'll follow you.

Michele Neylon: The other thing is I'm impressed that Paul managed to bring up a think of the children so early in the meeting. I think you should get bonus points for that one.

Paul McGrady: I would laugh if it weren't sad.

Michele Neylon: If there was no way to get to people other than Whois, I would be sad too.

Heather Forrest: All right guys, keep smiling.

Michele Neylon: Oh come on, Heather. It's the last (unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: Michele, keep smiling.

Michele Neylon: Let me go on.

Heather Forrest: Michele. Let's - actually what I would like to do. (Kaitlin), could you help us please? Could you go back two slides? So, Susan, I apologize. We had only by - oh I'm sorry. The next one. I counted too many. In our - one more. There we go.

Susan, I apologize. You were out of the room. We had an opportunity just to introduce the motion here and I gave a general sense of why the whereas clauses were so lengthy and trying to explain the background that the group has been working since sort of September last year in trying to come to final recommendations, explained your involvement in this and explained really the rationale for the motion, which was to give that extra time.

But I wanted to make sure that you an opportunity to offer your own perspective as liaison and working very closely with the group if there are any points, I don't mean to put you on the spot, but if there are any points that you'd like to make here, I'd like to give you that opportunity to do so.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you, Heather. Susan Kawaguchi for the record. First of all you can take off the second clause there. I mean this is my job as councilor to be on this - be - at as a liaison. It's been a very good learning experience and I'm hoping that I can get some feedback for other liaisons later down the road.

But I do think this PDP is - illustrates the issues that we are seeing in PDPs and that, you know, we're already working on trying to resolve. So we definitely need that one more month for the community to feel like they have had adequate time to review the draft report and agree to it or not, and then we need to move on with this issue.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Susan, and I feel strongly that second point should stay in there because I think is above and beyond the work of a liaison and, you know, to your point let's say one of the action items that we'll note on Wednesday is that you and I need to get together after this is completed to do a bit of a report on 3.7 and how that might impact things going forward. So we're not in a position yet because we have a section 3.7 appeal still outstanding, but once that winds up Susan and I will work together to provide that fuller information to the council.

Excellent, thanks. Thanks very much. Good stuff. Let's turn our minds then to the next thing on our agenda, which will advance I think it's three slides forward, there we are, preparation for our joint meeting with the GAC and the - I thought we might have had - oh, this is probably the ccNSO is on the next slide.

So our meeting is tomorrow with the GAC, 11:30 to 12:30 in the GAC room as usual. You see the items that we have here on the agenda, and I thought it might be helpful if we want to turn to (Yulf). (Yulf), you've helped us splendidly in putting this agenda together and understanding the order in which the GAC wanted to address particular topics and what they wanted to address, so happy to turn it to you to give us some context to this.

(Yulf): Well I think you're using the word understand very loosely there. Yes, I mean I definitely have a big interest of course to actually discuss what we just discussed and they have expressed some of their opinions already and I have actually shared over email some of the observations of what they've been discussing.

So the first point is definitely the big one for them it seems and that's where we're going to be spending most of our time. On the second point about - so subsequent procedures I think we also are kind of still trying to guess what they're really looking for there. As far as I understand it's really only a status report but they do have some questions that they haven't actually told us in advance what they're going to be. I tried to find out but I haven't been able to.

And yes in terms of incremental improvements, I think they will mostly be looking for ways they can provide input to the process. That's my understanding.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, (Yulf), very much. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Madam Chair. Michele for the record. Am I the only one who's slightly disturbed by the fact that they managed to get the E in EPDP wrong?

Stephanie Perrin: No, I am.

Michele Neylon: Anyway, sorry. I'm looking at the agenda item and I couldn't help but notice that they've managed to turn expedited into extended, which not only is a deep misunderstanding of what we're dealing with, it's the exact opposite of what we're dealing with.

Now does this mean -- oh God, I wish I didn't have to say this -- does this mean that they're entire frustration with the EPDP is because they misunderstood what the E stood for? And I wish I was being facetious but you all I'm - that is a genuine question. And a follow up on that, is - will we have the opportunity to put some quite pointed questions to the GAC on this? I can be way be more specific, but essentially the GAC has -- I'm going to try my best to be diplomatic about this -- but let's just say they have a tendency to bring a particular viewpoint to the table which is not entirely - which wouldn't be let's say a holistic view from government.

They tend to bring forward the view of a specific segment of government, and I can think of a four-letter acronym that would actually cover that. Whereas the other views within government that I think are very, very important and are valid and should be brought to the table yet we don't tend to see them. And I would love to have the opportunity or for one of you to have the opportunity to please put those rather pointed questions to them. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. I have Donna, (Yulf), Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Stephanie.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. (Yulf), I believe you were in a session this morning with the GAC talking about this so maybe you could just provide us with a little bit of a high level overview of what they discussed and what you think that - what questions they might have for us.

(Yulf): Thank you. Actually I was also going to respond to Michele. So to start with my sort of embarrassment of not actually noticing the extended word on your slides either, so it's not just them that got it wrong. I didn't notice it was wrong either there. In their discussions they definitely understand what the EPDP really is and in the discussions they've been using the right terminology. So in that way they do actually understand.

But we also have to remember who the members tend to be from the governments and if you actually have to get one or two people to represent the whole government of a country you do get to - you don't get the total overview of what that whole country's government in general feels, you get the ones who actually have strong issues. And in this case, the ones who have been interested in this have been the public safety people, so that's their view we're going to hear.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, (Yulf). Carlos Raul Gutierrez has deferred to Stephanie. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin speaking. And I hate to be difficult, it's not in my nature, but I note that the five individuals that have been proposed by the GAC as members of this group there isn't a constitutional expert in that group.

Michele Neylon: Where's the five listed?

Stephanie Perrin: It was on the slides this morning that were distributed and I think (Yulf) you sent them along, did you not?

Unlike the European Data Protection director did that not rest on a charter right when it was introduced, although the charter arrived in 2000 were not ratified in 2009, the GDPR rests on a fundamental charter right. And when any of these cases go to court - is Thomas still around because he'd know what I'm driving at here? Yes. When any of these cases go to court, the court

will presumably examine also particularly in its respective law enforcement access, the charter rights of the individuals concerned here.

And I think it's something that we need to be cognizant of as we design our access model. Now I'd love to see some money to bring in an expert on this to advise on this. Again, that's smaller research money that we need for the expedited PDP but I wonder if there's any appetite at all to point that out to the GAC, because many of their members are well aware that they've had court decisions in their own jurisdictions, we certainly have one in my own called (Spencer), that has made the provision of this data much more difficult for them and it is not appropriate for them to come to ICANN and ask for things that they cannot get in their own national jurisdictions. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Stephanie. Carlos Raul Gutierrez?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes on this famous slide this morning where they already announced the composition of the group on the GAC side, I'm wondering if the discussion of this issue should take place with the GAC plenary or not. It might be very inefficient to bring it to the plenary but it might be tactically very smart. I don't know. It might explode on the side of the GAC.

Is there any official communication that the group of five has been conformed, five or four, I don't know, and they are going to be the official liaison or maybe participants in the EPDP? I think that needs clarification. And the other procedural issue, as (Yulf) just said, I mean do we want to meet with the usual suspects or bring these discussions with a broader representation of governments and maybe ccTLD managers, et cetera?

I think it's very dangerous to walk into the big meeting of the GAC with that issue at this point of time unless we really want to delay everything. Thank you.

(Yulf): My understanding is that list of five is only the people who are interested in kind of forming a working group to address this but it's no way their official candidates for the membership or anything at this point.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin. So I think in respect, you know, the council can't dictate which representatives from the Registry Stakeholder Group end up on this working group. We can't dictate to the GAC who they'd put forward either. So I think we've had a conversation on the list that we have agreed that it would be helpful to have some level setting once the work team in place with, you know, following up on (Ayden)'s original suggestion about some form of training.

I think we've agreed that maybe a level set is helpful but, you know, I don't think that Council can dictate that and I would not like to see the council go down that path of asking direct question either.

Heather Forrest: Erika?

Erika Mann: I wonder - it's Erika Mann. I wonder if one could do something else. Because I mean it's such a key topic and if in this case the GAC is not representing and talking about policies which are implemented in their home country but they generalize and come up with scenarios which are potentially good on an international level to reach an agreement but this is actually not a fora for government to reach government to reach international agreements. This would be somewhere else. It would be either a particular section of the World Trade Organization which does it or somewhere else, but definitely not in ICANN.

So I wonder if one could request for the negotiating group maybe two things which one would need, because the GAC is so, in this situation, so important and so relevant that they can't just have loose opinions. So the ones which are negotiating probably should be based on a mandate they have from their

government, and if they can't do it they have to send somebody who would have the mandate.

I know it's not a typical ICANN procedure but this is so important here. I wonder how it can be done otherwise. And the second would be -- and this is maybe even more complicated -- they would have to - they'd somehow have to document opinions which are going against their justified - from their own government-justified positions. So when they then go back to the GAC, they would have to document opposing opinions and they would have to be transparent as well.

Now these opposing opinions would have to be ideally mandated by government opinion as well from home. Now that maybe goes too far and we have never tested such a model. But I wonder if we could think about something, achieving some like this because otherwise you can't negotiate with somebody who in this particular case from a GAC who is not basing their model on approved government positions at least from their own country.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Erika. To close this off, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, just in terms of a specific question that you asked has there been any official communication from the GAC on membership, official communication, no. I will say that Manal did raise it with me at dinner last night and my response to her was the GNSO hasn't yet determined what it wants to do in terms of composition. So, you know, any discussion of parity and so on we don't even begin to know what that looks like, and she's aware of that now. So.

Can I suggest we use the last ten minutes that we have in this session to turn to preparation for our meeting with the ccNSO? We have a number of items on the agenda here, some of which have already been raised in fact in this working session. The first item you see there in chunks, and the first item here relates to the Customer Standing Committee. And here we'll turn to Philippe and Donna. Anything that we need to think about in preparation for that session?

Donna Austin: I think only what we discussed in terms of the - (Katrina)'s concerns about the charter itself. So I don't know where that's going to go. I'll try to have a conversation with (Bob). I think - yes I don't know where that's going to go. But I think in terms of managing upcoming reviews, we do have a meeting this week with two other folks from the ccNSO so that's in hand.

And the CSC members and liaisons are elected so that's something to flag I think with the Standing Selection Committee that that's coming around again and are going to have to be cognizant of whatever processes were put in place last time and think about timing for that moving forward.

Heather Forrest: Philippe, very happy to turn to you. Nothing to add here, all right. (Unintelligible) as well reviews, current status reviews, draft operating agendas. So a chance for Donna and I to update you on the discussions that took place yesterday in the SO/AC chairs workshop on reviews. ICANN Org very keen to have community input on that short and long-term options, or those short-term and long-term options papers.

I think I'll get this wrong, but in any event it won't matter for reasons I'll shortly explain. I think the deadline on the short-terms papers was, short-term options paper, was something like the 9th and the options, longer-term options was something like the 19th. In any event, what I asked for in view of the fact that our time this week is largely focused on the EPDP is a bit more time to provide some substantive response on short and long-term options.

And I think short-term options is less of a concern to us with the removal of the RDS Whois 2 Review Team from that short-term paper. That seemed to be the critical factor there. Long-term options in terms of specific reviews is something that I think Council wants to have a think about, but frankly we don't really have the space to do that this week.

We've asked Org for more time and (Teresa) very kindly on the spot said end of July would be acceptable for that. So that has bought us a bit of time. And initially Donna you raised your hand for kind of shepherding that one. If that's okay to keep you in that role, that would be brilliant. So that takes us through that item.

Could we go over the page to the next slide please? The IG engagement group proposed charter in discussing this as a leadership team, this is really an opportunity just to follow up on a concern that had been raised by the ccNSO. We don't have any particular points to raise here. Rafik, have I missed anything that needs to be said?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Heather. My understanding that the ccNSO they send their question to the CCWG IG to respond and they are working on that now. So we can maybe hear from them what - also how they want to proceed, it's just they - the question are clarified and the charter amended on that matter, so maybe then we can resume the discussion on our side. So.

Heather Forrest: Fantastic. Thanks, Rafik. And thanks also to Tatiana for minding that effort for us. One the question of emojis in TLDs, so we actually have this on our agenda for the council meeting on Wednesday. We have Patrik Fältström of the SSAC coming in to brief us on the work that has been done by the small group of councilors and in liaising with the SSAC with their views on that, which is really all we'll be able to provide by way of update to them. We'll have some update from them as to their work in this area.

Work Stream 2 expected next steps is an obvious for this topic, timely, and GNSO ccNSO as decisional participants I know that the ccNSO announced yesterday in the SO/AC chairs workshop that they are progressing quite steadily in terms of their documentation for empowered community actions, how to handle a rejection action and so on. They're ahead of us in that effort. So I think that will largely put us in listening mode. Any input, questions, comments on our agenda with the ccNSO? Philippe, please.

Philippe Fouquart: Thanks. Philippe Fouquart. On a different point related to what we discussed earlier on the EPDP, just food for thought, but there a reference from Keith and it was Stephanie I think as to reusing experience from ccTLD operators. I was wondering whether maybe some of the ccNSO members would have that experience? Maybe that's something that we bring up either during the meeting or in the corridors tomorrow. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: An opportunity to piggyback. We should do it. Yes I think that's an excellent idea, Philippe. Thank you. So I have Marika then Susan.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Heather. This is Marika. On the one before last bullet item on the ccNSO and GNSO as decisional participants, I'm going to use this opportunity as a reminder that Julie Hedlund has sent out a message already awhile back followed by another reminder on the proposed next steps from a GNSO Council perspective to dealing with some of the outstanding items which mainly related to development of templates, as well as some of the processes or procedures that for example relate to submission of petitions and who is eligible and those kind of things.

So if you have a moment, please look at that. I think staff has suggested that, you know, at least we'll already go ahead and start developing those templates, but what we also suggested was maybe reviving the original bylaws drafting team as a kind of soundboard to work with staff, especially on some of those processes and procedures to work through that before they - those go back to the council for consideration.

Heather Forrest: Great, Marika. Thank you very much for that reminder. Search your inboxes for that email from Julie Hedlund. Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Just a real quick point about you're talking about requesting information for the ccTLDs. RDS Working Group did that over - a little over a year ago.

Obviously it isn't their experience today but it would probably be easy to pull on that and then refresh it, get up to date info.

Heather Forrest: Great suggestion, Susan. Thank you very much. We have three minutes left in this session. It's not probably helpful to get into a lengthy discussion but I believe the next slide will say something to us about preparing for the HIT, the high interest topics. So you'll remember that we were successful in shifting the Whois 2 Review Team, shifting our time spot for theirs in terms of the high interest topic and we're extraordinarily grateful to them for doing so.

We have the high interest topic today at 5 pm. What we have really in the high interest topic is an opportunity to gather community input, broader community, not just the GNSO community, but broader community input on all of the things that we've been discussing today in terms of what will find its way into the charter initiation request for the EPDP.

We've been asked over and over and over again when is the opportunity for the community to provide input. The specific objective in moving that up from Thursday was to enable that input to happen before the council meets on Wednesday, but so much the better that we have the opportunity for that feedback before we even meet for our all-day session tomorrow.

So what we have in the schedule is anyone who is a lead on one of those topics in the discussions on Tuesday, based on what we did in last the council meeting, we had our volunteers -- and do we have a list of our volunteers? I'm not sure if we do, but there's your topics. So, Keith, I believe you were scope and team - you're composition. Scope is Susan. Team leadership is Paul. Decision-making methodologies Rubens. Awesome. This is cool. Status reporting is Stephanie, and problem - oh I got it wrong. Darcy. Sorry, Darcy. Problem issue resolution is our champion of dispute resolution, Stephanie Perrin. Very good.

So what we have is we booked a smaller room with time for an hour now just to get some preparation for the HIT. The HIT will essentially be a dry run for our all-day discussion tomorrow as well. So those folks who are leads we're happy to work with you on the slides and just make sure that we're very happy with the slides and have any last minute tinkering that we want to do.

So with that, any further comments? Paul? It's starting now, starting now. And that's just for the leads on those topics. If you're not a lead on one of those topics then we - you're released into the wilderness. Hello, ICANN meeting. Any final comments, questions before we end our working session? Obviously all of these things that we've discussed to be continued. Oh nothing. Excellent. Thank you very much. Thank you very much to our tech team. Thank you to the staff, and this will end our GNSO working session. Thank you very much.

END