

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona
GNSO Wrap Up Meeting
Thursday, 25 October 2018 at 17:00 CEST**

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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Keith Drazek: So welcome everybody to the GNSO Council Wrap-up Session for ICANN63. We have quite a lengthy agenda. I think most of it we can get through fairly quickly, but we do have quite a few items to discuss and things to take care of. So the agenda is before us. It's also in your email. Steve sent it out about an hour ago with a few updates since then. We have today apologies from Julf, Cheryl, Scott McCormick, and I think Paul, also. Didn't Paul send his apologies? I'm not sure. And Ayden is also an apology but I think we have a pretty good group representation here so let's go ahead and get started.

Before I get into the meat of the agenda, are there any items that anybody would like to suggest for addition? Any other business that we would like to add to the agenda, or we can handle stuff in AOB at the end? Okay, Michele go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Just one thing is we're missing one Vice Chair, I believe.

Keith Drazek: So we have one Vice Chair appointed. The other has not yet been appointed.

Michele Neylon: Yes, I'm just wondering what the timeline was on that, because I believe the leadership team needs to complete in order for you to progress with certain other matters.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele. Which other matters specifically?

Michele Neylon: Well, for example, one of the items was finalizing things like the schedule for calls and whatnot. I was told that we would need both Vice Chairs before that could be finalized.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele. Yes, the reason there needs to be a wait is just so we understand what region the person is living in and the impact thereof. So it's not a question I think of needing the leadership team to be complete for the decision. It's more a matter of making sure that before we finalize the timing of the meetings, et cetera, that we understand the impact on everybody.

So I think it's an open question and maybe we can get to that in AOB, is timing for - I'm sorry, Pam, go ahead.

Pam Little: Thank you, Keith. Pam Little. Just maybe staff can help us out. In the operating procedures, is there any requirement in terms of timeline when the Vice Chair needs to be nominated or appointed? No?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I believe there isn't. I think there's a specific timing in relation to when a Chair is not elected. I think in that case there's specific timing requirements and it may refer to as soon as possible or as soon as feasible.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks. So I don't see anybody suggesting new additions to the agenda so let's get started. So the first item is the GAC communique, which was issued earlier today. I have not yet had a chance to read it but the action item for us here is to identify a drafting team. Julf has indicated his willingness to participate as our GAC GNSO Council liaison, but I need

volunteers - we need volunteers for those who would like to contribute to the drafting of our response to the GAC communique.

And important to note as always, there's some urgency about this because we need to have our response or our observations of the GAC communique to the ICANN Board prior to their regularly scheduled meeting with the GAC. So Michele, I saw your hand as a volunteer. Okay. Martin and Tonya. I think that's a pretty good group. Anybody else? Rafik. Yes, Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm not volunteering but I'm assuming that Julf would probably like to be involved as well as a liaison, so I'm volunteering him.

Keith Drazek: Yes, I did say Julf at the beginning. Thank you. No problem. Okay. So we've got Michele, Rafik, Tonya, and Martin. Okay. Thank you. Check. Number one. All right, council liaisons. The status of council liaisons, taking into account the departing councilors. And there we go, thank you. Welcome, Paul.

Paul McGrady: I apologize for being late.

Keith Drazek: Not a problem. So we have here the list of the current liaisons and the names highlighted in red are those who have departed council, and those are areas we need volunteers to replace. We don't have to make that decision today, but if anybody has a particular interest in this, feel free to raise your hand for any one of these. Elsa?

Elsa Saade: Thank you, Keith. Elsa for the record. I'd like to volunteer for the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP.

Keith Drazek: Very good.

Elsa Saade: Thank you.

Keith Drazek: So on that particular point, Donna and I were co-liaisons to this group and I think we need to decide whether it makes sense for me now as council chair to continue in that role or whether somebody else would like to step into that as well. Or if it makes sense for just one person do it. I have to admit that that PDP, the SubPro PDP has a lot of moving parts. It is rather complex. The reports are extremely long and the meetings are frequent based on the different work tracks and responsibilities. So it would be a lot for one person.

Elsa?

Elsa Saade: Thank you, Keith. I definitely agree with you that there should be two people on this one. So yes, I would love to be working with someone on this one if I were to volunteer for it.

Keith Drazek: So I'm going to suggest that some I would be happy to remain as an interim until we make a decision on a replacement for me, but I think in the interest of time and the responsibility, if somebody else would like to volunteer to be a co-liaison with Elsa on this one, I would be perfectly happy to step aside.

Paul McGrady: Is there any chance at all that I can repent and be sent back to SubPro?

Keith Drazek: We'll take that under advisement. So why don't we - because not everybody is here, why don't we take an action item to send a note to the list and ask specifically. And maybe it'll be a list, sorry, an email to the list covering all of these. But a note that I'm prepared to stay on in an interim capacity until such time someone else is ready to step in to work with Elsa? Tanya?

Tatiana Tropina: Tatiana Tropina for the record. I just thought as there's a new Council, it would be very beneficial if for some amount of time you volunteer with her and maybe share experience, and then someone steps in already knowing what is going on and (unintelligible). You know what I mean because the group is monstrous. So thank you very much that you remain interim. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Tanya. Monstrous is a good word. So yes, and happy to do that and it is a complex group. So having some continuity is probably a good thing. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Keith. This is Marika. So with that call for volunteers, we'll also include the link to the roll description document, because I think for some of those that are new may not have seen that. So you're also aware what you're signing yourself up for. And I think Susan made a really good suggestion as well. If the overlap is not possible, at least for those that take up these roles to have conversations with their predecessors. And again, if staff can facilitate that, we're happy to do so.

So I think we'll probably send this out in view of then hopefully the Council being able to confirm the new liaisons during the next Council meeting or the upcoming Council meeting.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Marika. That's perfect. So we have obviously the next one on the list - well, let's just go back to the top. Let's just run through them real quick. We've got the WHOIS procedure implementation advisory group. That one is currently on hold and so there is no action on that group. There's been no volunteers called. So that is essentially on hold. If and when that does get started, which I think is certainly an open question, I would step aside from that one and look for a replacement.

So the EPDP on the temp spec, Rafik is there and Rafik, provided you're willing to continue. Putting you on the spot. You don't have to decide right now but...

Rafik Dammak: Do I have time to think or rethink?

Keith Drazek: You have plenty of time to think. You can tell us tomorrow.

Rafik Dammak: I am happy to continue. Maybe I am going to regret it, but I'm happy to continue as a liaison.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Rafik. It's much appreciated. Paul McGrady is currently assigned to the rights protection mechanisms and all GTLDs PDP. That's something that we'll talk about a little bit more in a bit, but not much more, for reasons that we will get to. So we talked SubPro. Curative rights protections for IGOS and INGOS. This is the group whose final report we have just been discussing in the last Council meeting, where we have the final report. It's unclear at this point whether - what we're going to do with that.

We withdrew the motion related to this PDP and so I think we can have a placeholder here in that the group is not currently active. There's no need for a liaison but if we take an action to send something back to the group, then we would have to backfill this one. Okay, reconvened PDP on the Red Cross. Heather Forrest was the liaison for that one, but we passed a motion for this one this week. This is actually concluded now so I think we can take this off the list, Steve. Thank you.

GNSO Review Working Group. Rafik, your name is next to this one as well. If somebody could help me understand where this stands, this group.

Pam Little: I thought we passed - we adopted the completion final report and on sent up to the Board in one meeting or two meetings ago, right?

Keith Drazek: Okay. So this one can come off as well. Go ahead, Marika. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Keith. It's not completely off our list yet. It has been submitted to the Board and I think they need to adopt it, and then I think the Council has an action to close it. So I think for the time being, there's no problems unless Rafik minds, to leave him there as the liaison in case something would be thrown back by the Board. And I think there was some discussion as well on whether maybe that group could be a suitable vehicle for a discussion of

some of the items that Julie discussed. So that may still be a need, but at least for now they're not active. So not much to do.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Marika. Maxim, you had your hand up a moment ago. Go right ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: I have a question. I spent some time on the rights protection mechanisms, actually, a lot of including some subgroups and things like that. So my question, is it possible that I, for example, replace Paul, if he wish so, he's free to do some other group?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Maxim. So I guess we can have that conversation. We don't need to resolve that right now, but I think certainly if there's an interest...

Paul McGrady: I think we can (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: So certainly. This is an opportunity for the Council to review these, for people to adjust their participation and engagement, and we can swap people in and out if needed and if desired. So nothing is set in stone here. So thank Maxim for expressing your interest there. Why don't you and Paul sync up afterwards, have a conversation and then we can carry on.

Okay. So protection of IGO names and alt gTLDs. And my name is next to this one, and I'll be honest, I don't know exactly where this is either. Mary? Sorry, or Steve, or Marika.

Steve Chan: Sure, this is Steve. This is one where the final report was approved by the Board or by the Council and it's sitting with the Board with inconsistent recommendations with GAC advice, if that's helpful.

Keith Drazek: Got it. Thank you. So we'll leave my name there for now. If anybody's interested, feel free. Okay, Darcy, PPSAI, the privacy proxy services

accreditation issues. I know this is one that's currently paused by the ICANN Board and Staff as we understand it. Slowed. Slow rolled.

Darcy Southwell: Technically, it's slowed, which we don't know what that means yet.

Keith Drazek: But you're prepared to continue on that one? Okay. Thank you, Darcy. Okay, translation/transliteration of internationalized registration data. Rubens? Okay. Still good? Okay. Thank you. Thick who is transition. Susan's name was next to this one. The thick WHOIS transition is currently on an extension, if you will. It is currently an approved policy. There is ongoing engagement between VeriSign, ICANN staff, and the registrar stakeholder group about language amending the RRA to enable the transition to move forward. But that language is not yet agreed to and essentially pending further clarification coming out of the EPDP and GDPR related discussions.

Really, for everybody's benefit, the issue here is there is a requirement in policy for registrars in Com, and Net, and Jobs to transfer all registrant data to VeriSign registry. We are the backend provider for .jobs. And the question is does that make sense and is that even legal under current restrictions around GDPR and the uncertainty being faced by this entire community right now, and the work of the EDPD.

So we have - VeriSign has recently requested an extension -- another extension -- and that we anticipate being granted. Yes, Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. That was actually approved today I believe by the ICANN Board, by the resolution here. I think they defer compliance enforcement of the thick WHOIS transition policy to 31st of May 2019, 13 November 2019, and 31st of May 2020 respectively to allow additional time for registrars and VeriSign to reach agreement on amendments to applicable agreements to implement the policy.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Marika. Yes, that was on the consent agenda this morning if I'm not mistaken. So thank you. Is that right? Thanks. Anyway, it approved. All right. So this is one that is still active and could warrant a liaison, but I think the expectation is that in the near-term, like meaning the next year, there's not going to be much activity on this. So if there's somebody who would like to put up their hand, feel free. But again, no decisions have to be made today.

Next is the standing committee on the ICANN budget and operating plan. Heather Forrest needs to be replaced for this one. This is our internal standing committee, correct? Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: It's Michele for the record. Maybe best to leave that until Ayden is around since he's been the one kind of leading that.

Keith Drazek: That's a great point. And since this is an internal group, essentially - sorry, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Michele for the record. Do we actually need a liaison if it's an internal one?

Marika Konings: I believe Heather has actually been participating like ex-officio in her capacity as chair to maintain that link and follow the deliberations of the group. I believe that was - I don't know if the charter foresees it in that way but I know that is I think what her intent was.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Marika. Rafik, please.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I think that's the case it should be the - I think of the Chairs, it should be the Chair to be in the ex-officio and then the Vice Chair as observer.

Keith Drazek: Okay. So Rafik is suggesting that in this particular case it should likely be the Chair with the Vice Chair as an observer. So we'll take an action item to review that, and if that's the case then I will step into this role. And then

finally, the GNSO standing selection committee. This is an important one, as it relates to the obligations and responsibilities on behalf of Council, on behalf of the GNSO for appointing members, participants to various groups.

And there is actually some fairly urgent work afoot regarding ATRT3 and a couple of other things coming in the next couple of months. So this is one where we're going to need to identify somebody who's prepared to take on a fair amount of responsibility and engagement. Maxim, go ahead.'

Maxim Alzoba: I have some limited experience of 1.5 years with this committee in the leadership team actually, with Susan. So I know how it works or when it stops and which signs are to look deeper. Because as I understand, Julf was one of the liaisons and, yes, actually, think for example, ATRT3, I am a temporary replacement for Erika. Because I stepped down, I dropped my hat of co-chair there and I believe I will be able to properly deliver information about what's going on, if they're stuck, or if they might need an assistance after some report or something.

Keith Drazek: Marika?

Marika Konings: Thanks, Keith and I really appreciate Maxim's offer but I think actually the (SSC) doesn't have a formal liaison because I think it works on appointment by the different groups and Susan was listed her, but she was actually the Chair of the group. So I think it may have ended up on the list inadvertently. But we'll have a double check looking at the charter to make sure whether there is a role foreseen there.

Now, saying that, I think there is a role for the Council leadership to have an ex-officio representative and I think Rafik is in that role.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you, Marika. So Rafik is actually there in that role. So maybe we can just update this one for the time being. Flip?

Flip Petillion: Thank you, Flip Petillion. I was just wondering what kind of standing we are talking about. What does it cover apart from what you've just mentioned?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Flip. Are you referring to the standing and the standing selection committee? Yes, it's essentially -- and anybody can jump in here and help me out -- is the group that the Council has appointed, and it's not only councilors, as Maxim was saying, it's other representatives from the GNSO community who effectively are responsible for coming up with appointments for members for various community groups.

So Maxim go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Sometimes there is a need to select members of review teams and for example, it's call for volunteers, number of people responded, someone has to do the manual work like check their statements of interest, check if they're qualified, to weight how they - to understand how the best possible team could be composed out of different persons. For example, if the matter is something between registries, registrars, and something else, most probably it will be beneficial to have someone, not necessarily working in one, but with experience in those fields. So it's not the five dozens who have the same experience but five dozens who combine will create, like, dream team for the (unintelligible).

And to identify conflict some mistakes in data sent to avoid wasting effectively time of the Council on checking few characters here and there. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Maxim. This is Keith. I'm going to have a hard time remembering to say my name. This is Keith. So I saw a hand.

Emily Barabas: This is Emily just staff. I just wanted to clarify one more thing. The standing is not about legal standing, for example. It's just about the fact that it's an ongoing committee to deal with these processes. Thanks.

Man 1: You read my mind.

Keith Drazek: Okay, Maxim, follow-up.

Maxim Alzoba: Short addition. The usual style of working in this group is, like, it's like Monday and on Wednesday you have noticed, come on people, we have only just ten person or maybe 20 persons and plenty of time until the midnight of the Sunday to deliver the report. So some urgency is expected sometimes. So it has to be some kind of devotion.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Maxim. Pam, over to you.

Pam Little: Yes, just very quickly, maybe it would be helpful for Flip and the new councilors. We now have two standing committees now. One is the one on budget and operating plan, and the other one is the selection committee that would select candidates within the GNSO to go to various review teams or working groups. Does that help? Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Perfect. Thanks, Pam. This is Keith. So I think we've gone through the list here and we have quite a bit else on our agenda. So again, I think the action item now is for us to circulate this as updated through our conversation today to the broader list, make sure that other who are not here with us at the moment, who sent their apologies, have an opportunity to provide input and to volunteer if they so choose. And we look forward to trying to finalize this list at our next meeting at the end of November.

All right. Thank you. Let's move on back to the agenda. Okay, item number three is the GNSO representative to the empowered community administration confirmation. So earlier today, Nathalie sent an email to the appropriate individual, notifying that I am now appointed as the interim representative, replacing Heather, to the empowered community administration. So this is essentially if the GNSO Council, or the GNSO are ever required to participate in an accountability reform action, and probably

one of the next things that we will face in that regard is the possibility of non-approval of the ICANN budget if anybody decides that that's important. That we would need to be prepared to act and that I would be the representative at this time on an interim basis, at least, to act on behalf of the GNSO.

Any questions? Any comments? It's basically an administrative point, but just a note for the Council that that is now done. Any questions? All right, let's move on. Okay. Next item on the agenda -- this is Keith -- is a couple of public comment periods that we need to call out. The first is the PTI and IANA FY20 budget that is currently on the radar of our SCBO. Any discussion on this? Questions?

Okay. This is something that is - we're on the clock for this because the comment period is open. The next one, moving on, is the ccWG on auction proceeds. I think as everybody knows, the initial report from that group was posted for public comment prior to Barcelona, and that is something that we need to ensure that if there is something at the Council level that we would like to comment on that we have an opportunity to discuss that.

Obviously, most comments will come from our representative stakeholder groups and constituencies but if anybody identifies a comment that needs to be made by the GNSO Council, let's make sure that we flag that and identify that so we can have a conversation well before the close of the comment period. Yes, Erika. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, Keith. What I recommend, if you agree what I will do, I will review the comments made today by the board and put a short email together with the key points I would recommend the GNSO Council should focus on, just to indicate a few topics. So keep in mind the auction proceeds. We don't discuss the amount, which we receive. We discuss the mechanism and the model designed then to find a way to channel the money in the right direction and supporting the right projects. So we do something else, but nonetheless, there's a connection.

So there's two things, which I believe, which are of particular relevance. One is to ensure that there's no continuous request to use the auction proceeds in the future to replenish whatever needs to be replenished. The second is -- and I believe we have some good indication today, but I want to read the language again -- the second one is to ensure that actually the original plan to put the .rep auction proceed into the same auction proceed environment that the Board and ICANN Org sticks to this.

I have seen variation of language here. That's why I want review this all and recommend to send as quickly as possible in email. And then I believe we have to pick up the topic.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Erika. This is Keith. That sounds like a great path forward. So as Erika noted, there are there are really two parts to this discussion about the auction proceeds. One is the initial report from the ccWG that is open for public comment. And as Erika correctly noted that's a discussion and those are recommendations focused on the process by which, the mechanisms by which auction funds might be disbursed or shall be disbursed.

The second point is referencing the announcement that we heard for the first time yesterday and the decision the Board made today in its resolution to effectively transfer \$36 million from the auction proceeds fund to ICANN's operating reserve fund. So the resolution was passed this morning. It's basically done at this point and this is a bullet point on our topic for discussion today in light of that. We had some brief conversation about it yesterday at the very tail end of our formal meeting, but just wanted to put that out there.

So let me take a queue for anybody who'd like to make a statement or raise any points on this. Michele. And Paul.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Keith. Michele for the record. That wasn't me by the way. As I mentioned yesterday and I also mentioned in another fora yesterday, this

kind of movement of funds, this way that they're trying to rationalize it I find quite disturbing. I don't think it sets a particularly good precedent. I don't think it's appropriate. I don't think it's the right thing to do. I don't think it actually follows in the spirit of how those monies ended up where they ended up.

So that I think is something that simply saying that legally you can do something is not the same as this is the right thing to do. I think that's two different things. I don't know what our path forward is on this. I'm not sure if it's appropriate for Council to get involved in this, or whether it's something that our relevant stakeholder groups need to look at, or other people need to look at. I'm not sure about that.

But I don't think we can simply ignore it because the auction proceeds, ccWG has been working for two years, something like that.

Erika Mann: Even longer if you count in total time.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so for more than two years. That to me is, like, kind of pulling a large chunk of the carpet out from underneath them. Hey, here's a pile of money, but oh, wait a second, we've just sliced off a large chunk of it. I mean, look, there's a lot of nuances around the entire situation but I don't think those of us in the contracted parties house are particularly comfortable with it based on - I feel confident saying that based on the comments that we submitted. And I don't think it's something that we can just kind of let fly. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele and Paul, I'll get to you in a moment. Actually, no, let's go to Paul. Thanks. I'll come in at the end.

Paul McGrady: So first of all, one day's notice is disturbing. I mean come on, that's just ridiculous. It's dirty. Banana republic and I think looks very bad. It just sends the message that if the community had had more notice then there's a

possibility that we would have objected to it and therefore they wouldn't have got to do it. So I don't - that just is horrible.

The second thing is to remember that the depletion of the reserve fund was not for the transition. The transition costs nothing. The transition consisted of the Obama administration not signing a contract. That's free. What the depletion of the reserve fund for was for the enhancement of accountability measures because the community didn't trust the Board and Org to behave without U.S. oversight. Why in the world would we think that with one days' notice for a \$36 million transfer, right.

Lastly and importantly, every single one of these dollars are GNSO dollars, whether they are traditional registry operator dollars, or whether they're .brand dollars, right. These are GNSO dollars and we should have been given more than one days' notice to opine on this. So I - Keith, you said it's a done deal. I'm not sure. There are accountability mechanisms out there. I'm not sure whether not this is an opportunity for the empowered community to come into existence or not. I have a hard time imagining the GAC is going to care about this, which is the ultimate problem with the empowered community, which getting it to form itself is high standard.

But there are accountability mechanisms other than through the empowered community, such as IRPs and such. And so we're at a point where we just have to decide, are we rolling over on this issue? This is the first significant accountability issue since the Obama administration did not renew the contract. And so I don't think we should just walk away without at least thinking it through and deciding whether or not we want to say that there are going to be boundaries. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Paul. Flip next.

Flip Petillion: I'm very surprised -- Flip Petillion. I will get used to it one day. Flip Petillion. I am very surprised and actually, I think this calls for an examination of why

there was a gap to fill it and how the gap actually was made, and how important it got because this is a really serious amount of money.

I'm very surprised. This is an organization that is very, very taken care of processing and processing in 24 hours. It's quite surprising.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Flip. Okay. So I have Tony and then Darcy, and then Erika and Maxim. I'll put myself in the queue. Thank you.

Tony Harris: Yes, I participated in the first (unintelligible) of this working group and I think this sends quite a bad message to a large group of people that have put a lot of time into this, and effort, and all of a sudden they're faced with the prospect that everything they've been managing is subject to grabbed at any time. It doesn't - I don't think it sends a very good message to the people - the volunteers who have been putting a lot of time into this.

And also, the stated objective of these funds was precisely to be part of a program such as the working group has been doing.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Tony. Darcy?

Darcy Southwell: I'll try not to cough on everybody, or at least Michele. Darcy Southwell. I agree with everything that's been said and I think given how they did it this time with very -- no notice I should say -- a day's notice, given the work that that the ccWG has done on trying to put a plan forth, I think it's disingenuous of them just to take it without any notice and without letting that process go through.

I think we have to be very proactive here because who's to say they're not going to do it again next year and they decide that their eight year replenishment that they also approved needs to instead be we're going to take another \$36 million or whatever the number is just out willy-nilly again with no notice. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Darcy. Erika?

Erika Mann: I mean without saying something, which I can't talk about confidential, but it's not a total new topic. So it - the question whether the Board has the right to oversee these kind of auction proceeds or any other kind of financial revenues, which come to the day - as part of the overall budget, that's a long understanding, at least from ICANN legal and largely shared by the Board that they have the right to do so.

So insofar, the oversight and the sovereignty to take such kind of decision is not new. And I mean that's not a secret and it was discussed before. There were signs as well, which were given to us before and I reported about them in our ccWG auction proceeds. So there was very early meeting with (Ching) and myself, and Cherine, and at the time I don't remember the second person, where - no, it wasn't actually anybody from legal. It was somebody else from the Board but we can certainly look back to notes where there were already signs that the Board was debating this and I reported about it.

And the topic came up many time in the auction proceed working group. So it was not like it wasn't a total surprise because people were already talking about it. And the community is split. So there are some were saying that fine, even 100% of auction proceeds shall go there. So the community unfortunately is split.

So one of the reason I want to keep the auction proceed totally out of this debate, because I think it's not our role. And let's be frank, as long as we have the rest of the total amount, including the .web, the auction proceed is still a big - if it would be an investment fund, it's still a big investment fund. So I think the most important is really - I don't know who said it, but the most important is to - I'm willing to support any kind of fight you want to have, but I believe the much more important strategy is to secure the rest of the money

and in clear terms. And there needs to be a clear agreement. And a second is to ensure that we are talking about the total including the .web auction proceeds once it goes to the board.

It's not yet - I checked this morning so it's not there yet.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Erika. Very helpful context. So I have Maxim, Carlos in the queue, and then I'm going to jump in the queue and we might need to draw a line under this one. So Maxim, Carlos, and Keith.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim. Actually when I was listening to the speech about how the money are spent, et cetera, et cetera, during the meeting in the morning, what I didn't get is that the safety level is to be reached in seven or eight years. By informal logic, it means that we are not all safe during those years. So my question is was it well thought that this kind of thing happened to this kind of well thought decision or what's behind it?

Because formally, if something happens tomorrow, it's six month expirations and it doesn't feed the at least announced purpose. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Maxim. Reasonable question. Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, thank you Keith. This is Carlos for the record. I missed in this meeting this briefing we used to have from Xavier Calvez. I don't know if we have it last time. It has been canceled. So this is an element that I missed in the discussion. The other element is I guess the Board has an impeccable rationale for taking the money and I would like to agree that I haven't had time to look at that, just on the margin. Thank you very much, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Carlos and that's a great segue to some of my comments or at least one. So just a couple of observations from me. First, I think Erika is right in saying that's the ccWG auction proceeds still has important work. There's still a lot of money in that fund ,and the work needs to continue, and

we need to make sure that we focus on the comments to the extent that Council needs to comment on anything, but our perspective stakeholder groups and constituencies need to make this a priority.

And maybe in those comments there's an opportunity to weave in some of the points that Erika made about protecting the rest of the money. And so - but again it's a question of process and mechanism for the ccWG that we need to focus on and I think that comes into play there. My second observation is Paul's point about the notice; 24 hours I think caught us all by surprise, right, and probably not ideal or certainly not ideal.

But I think it's there important to note that ICANN went through a process of seeking public comment and input on the question of the reserve fund. And one of the questions that was posed was would it be appropriate or acceptable to use money from the auction proceeds to address the shortfall in the reserve fund, in the operating reserve. And so to the extent that people responded, I think, Erika I think also said that the community is split. Somebody said that. And the Board is pointing to the comments received as part justification for taking the steps that they did. They basically have said that the analysis of the comments received on the question of the operating fund, the reserve fund demonstrate that the community supports the move that they've taken today.

So, you know, if it's worth, you know, as we assess whether there is a comment to be made on that point that we need to go back and make sure that we review those comments and do our own assessments or analysis of those comments at our stakeholder group and constituency level. So respond to Flip's question or point about the gap in the reserves and how did we get there.

It's a great question and I think the answer, if I heard correctly today, is that it is essentially the amount that was removed from the reserve fund in order to fund the accountability work, as Paul mentioned, during the IANA transition.

And most of that was legal fees. It was approximately close to \$30 million in legal fees associated with the accountability work in ccWG accountability.

Now, I recognize fully that the IANA transition and the accountability work were completely separate from the new gTLD program. And so the money that was taken in from the auction proceeds was not related to the transition or accountability. But as has been noted, the funds are there and the Board has fiduciary responsibility for them.

So my recommendation for all of us on this point is to take this issue back to our stakeholder groups and our constituencies, have the conversation over the coming weeks and at our meeting in November, at the end of November that we reconvene and have a follow-on conversation about what our next steps might be.

So let me just pause there and see if anybody has reaction to that. I see Marika. Anybody else want to react or get in the queue? Okay. Marika?

Marika Konings: Thanks, Keith. This is Marika. One thing I do want to point out, and that goes more purely to the auction proceeds public comment form itself, because I think that closes, I'm looking at Erika, I think it's the 27th of November I want to say. So if there is anything urgent you want to put in through the public comment, it may be worth for some people to look at that before that time, before the Council meeting.'

And just on that note, as the GNSO is one of the chartering organizations of that effort. So that ultimate recommendations of that group will come back to you. So it would be really helpful indeed if the Council, whether it's a couple of volunteers, or whether it's being flagged maybe through stakeholder group or constituency members that are reviewing this. If there are concerns that those are put on the table now. There are a couple of questions as well in the report that the group is looking for input on.

So again, you may decide that it's not a Council matter at this stage, but I think it is important if there are issues or concerns, or specific perspectives that the Council has that you're able to provide those as input to that group.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Marika. Great points and again, just to underscore, the comment period on the auction proceeds ccWG closes prior to our next meeting. So - and I think I heard Erika say that she's prepared to go through some of the language that we've heard in the last 24 hours and to assess and come back to the group with her analysis. And so maybe if we could just tentatively say when Erika provides her ay, then we can make a little call for volunteers on the list to see who might be interested in working with Erika on some possible comments.

So Elsa, I see your hand. Anybody else? Go ahead.

Elsa Saade: Thank you, Keith. Elsa Saade for the record. If I'm not mistaken, we had talked about a meeting before our actual meeting for another purpose in the last meeting. I'm not sure. I'm looking at Marika because I think when Heather was here, we discussed a meeting earlier than the 29th of November for a second issue that I really don't have on my mind right now. But...

So maybe we could just join this topic with the other on that call for instance before our actual official call.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Elsa.

Elsa Saade: Yes, I don't remember.

Keith Drazek: Is there another call or meeting, or even a meeting of a subgroup scheduled prior to the 29th? Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. Yes, there was something we discussed, I think during our - excuse me? Thank you, Rafik. Yes, so there was

something. We're not all losing our minds collectively. Our memories possibly. Our minds, not just yet. Why is Philippe looking at me like that? Maybe he thinks I have lost my mind.

Keith Drazek: All right. Thanks everybody. So why don't we take this to the list for now. We'll see what Erika comes up with and then we'll assess next steps and if we need to schedule something for a small group or somebody to - a group to work on something, we'll do that.

And if we need to piggyback on the EPDP discussion, we'll look at that as well. So any final comments on this one? Flip, please.

Flip Petillion: Flip Petillion. Just in the common interest of everybody, before we go back to our respective constituencies, I think it would be good that we have a clear independent view on how irreversible this is or not.

Keith Drazek: Paul?

Paul McGrady: Thanks, and I've been trying to find it on the labyrinth that is the ICANN website, but the mechanism that comes immediately to mind is the IRP because I think that's that one that you apply to Board decisions. Does anybody happen to know off the top of their head what the deadline is from the decision?

Man 2: Thirty days after publication.

Paul McGrady: Right. So if we wait until our next call, we have precluded that. So again, it's, you know, we can - we don't have a lot of time to debate whether or not we're going to let this go and I think the range could be everything from congratulations, you guys found \$36 million, to a nasty letter, to an IRP complaint. I don't know what the stomach is around the table for that. But if we wait until the next call, options will be foreclosed. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Paul. Michele?

Michele Neylon: I don't want to belabor this. Michele for the record. I think we need to take this back to our respective constituencies and then see what people want to do. I don't think we're in a position this very minute.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele, I agree and I think Flip had a good question though that I think has been answered at least in context of an IRP.

Flip Petillion: Flip Petillion. And Flip did not want to take any position. Flip just wants to avoid that anybody would come back with a different story. I would prefer that everybody goes with a complete, neutral, independent assessment of what the timing is and the measures, instead of all going back with a different story and then it's really an M-E-S-S.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Flip and so I think maybe we should take an action item to find the resources that would inform that discussion. In other words, as we go back to our stakeholder groups and constituencies that we all have a common understanding of what the pathways might be were we to decide to try to take action. But I think it's also important to note that the Council, the GNSO as a group through Council is not the only entity that could file an IRP. It's not necessarily something that we would have to do if someone else decided to.

Marika, I saw your hand go up.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm just wondering and I can check with my colleagues if this is possible if (unintelligible) can share maybe the rationale from the Board. There may be more information and detail in there that may help further inform that conversation. So I can take an action item to check on that and as soon as I, of course, receive something, we'll share it with the Council.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Marika. That's great. Again, so we're all going to our groups with a common baseline. Okay. I think we need to move on so thanks for that conversation and discussion. The next item on the agenda is our strategic planning session. We're on Number 5 right now for those following along.

So as everybody knows, we have a strategic planning session at the end of January in Los Angeles. This will be the second annual strategic planning session. The one that we had last year I think was a smashing success. Thanks to Heather, and the leadership team, and staff, and everybody that helped to coordinate and pull that together.

So we have an opportunity and a challenge to try to make the one in 2019 as successful as the next. So this is on number 1 bullet point, reminder to book travel. You should all have received a notification from ICANN travel. Please respond to that. If you are not able to attend for whatever reason, please advise us and ICANN Travel of that as well. And the sooner you get this done the better for logistics and for cost. It is a time-consuming process for those that have not participated in it before.

And so Marika or Nathalie, I assume that the new councilors will have received instructions or will soon receive instructions? Thank you Nathalie. Excellent. So please make sure you focus on that. Don't let it linger.

Next item is planning and next steps. I think we will be pulling together an agenda for that strategic planning session. Leadership team will be working closely with the staff to come up with a proposed agenda, but this is also our opportunity to start thinking about - this is your opportunity to start thinking about the kinds of things that you think should be on that agenda, the things that you think would be helpful either substantively something that we want to focus on; process updates; a refresher on what the picket fence was.

I think there was a lot of good stuff that we'll probably do again this year as a refresher and that will be something new for our new councilors. But it

doesn't have to be a carbon copy of what we did before. I think PDP 3.0 will absolutely be a component because there are quite a few questions or points that came out of our last round, the last year of effort that basically were called out as needing further conversation, needing further discussion. So I think that's going to be a major focus. Continue the tradition and Michele, I saw your hand. Go ahead.'

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Keith. Michele for the record. Totally supportive of everything you said about the value of the planning session. Just in terms of time management and everything else, it would be helpful if we could see what time of day we finish on the last day. For those of you in the U.S. that obviously has implications on whether you're able to fly home that evening or not. For those of us coming from slightly further afield, it has implications about whether we want - when we move on to our destination.

Just in terms of timing, it's great to see that it's not coinciding, clashing, or anything else with other events. So for some of us, we'll be doing LA, Vegas, LA, and then home.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele. That's a great point about logistics, and timing, and scheduling so we can make sure that we have flights. Marie?

Marie Pattullo: Thanks, Keith. Marie. And to go back to your point, I think it's not just PDP 3.0. I think it's wider. There are a number of issues that all of us here around this table need to talk about in the way that we as Council are managing process, which also includes managing human beings, and with so much going on in the community right now. So I'd be very grateful if when you guys come to planning this session, we do have enough time to talk about how we as Council ensure that everyone is treated correctly and fairly. And when I say everyone, I don't mean a few people. I mean everyone.

And also it would be incredibly helpful, because I know that staff love it when we have requests for them because clearly, they just love doing things. It

would be really helpful if we could pull together this is what the bylaws say. This is what the operating procedures say so that all of us have time to really figure out where we are. And if we need to amend anything, we've got time to think about it in advance. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Marie. Great comments. I agree completely. Anybody else want to get in the queue? Yes. Sorry, Rafik. Go ahead. And then Michele.

Rafik Dammak: This is Rafik speaking. I think one way maybe in term of organizing for the strategic planning session is to take what we did this year and to adjust. And so maybe the leadership team starts with that outline and I think we can remove some stuff because, like the changes we did in relation to the empowered community and take the input as shared by Marie and other, and see how we can shape that in the discussion.

But I think we should remember that it's also about the planning as what we try to do for the whole PDP. And as Heather talked about, the scary spreadsheet that we use that again. So we can start that, can be used as (straw person) to share with the whole Council and try to get input.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Rafik. That sounds great. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks again, Keith. Michele for the record. The other thing as well to bear in mind is with the meeting being held in ICANN's offices in Los Angeles, it does mean we have the opportunity if we organize in advance to have conversations with specific members of ICANN's team. But I think we need to think about that a bit in advance because not everybody is in the office every single day due to other things.

But for example, when we had the conversations earlier this year around trying to get greater transparency on the cost things and other things associated with PDPs, and other projects, I mean the obvious people to talk to would be the finance team. I know they're based there but they may not

be there at the time. If we want to continue those conversations, to give them a bit of advance warning, et cetera, et cetera.

There are probably over people that we might want to involve in some way. And the fact that they're mostly based in LA means there's no extra cost implications really.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele. That's a great point and so we should all be thinking about, you know, in addition to managing Council work and the things that we need to understand and that we need to know to engage on and discuss, that there may be opportunities to engage with ICANN staff on their home turf. And so start thinking about the topics or the subject matter that each of us think might be helpful for our work. And then we can try to identify the right resources or people. Marika?

Marika Konings: Thanks, Keith. This is Marika. It may be helpful as well to remind the Council that as you may recall, the original request was for three days and actually two days were granted. And what was done was to add the Council development session, the one-day event that we usually had at that end of an ICANN meeting, or the AGM, to that. So you could treat it in a way where maybe day one is your development pat, where indeed you identify what topics you want to hear about, or discuss, or learn about. Then have your next two meetings more focused on the strategic planning aspect, which is the objective of those two days or the support provided for that.

One thing you also may want to think about, because I believe the Board workshop takes place - I think they start probably on the Friday and then go over the weekend. So there may also be an opportunity, if there's an interest, for an exchange of view with certain board members. And I believe, I think last time that was well received. And then I think that was a good dialogue. So again, that is something you may want to factor in and consider as well, as you plan.

Keith Drazek: Agreed. Thanks, Marika. And to your point, what we're talking about here is the strategic planning session, right. So it's about setting the - sort of the roadmap for our work for the year. So important introductory conversations and setting the stage and benchmarking our common understanding of things. But it's really about, at the end of the day, making sure that we will be efficient and effective for the 12 months to come. Tanya?

Tatiana Tropina: Sorry, further to what Marika said, today I was going to ask if there would be a Board workshop because I found that lunch with the Board very productive. And I think in the light, what we were discussing here during the GNSO Board meeting, we can just continue that discussion because it was about participation, about policy development, about process, about everything. So I think it would be super beneficial to continue these conversations. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Tanya. Any other questions or comments? All right, let's move on then. Next item. Sorry.

Carlos Gutierrez: Listening to the comments here, I see, like, two different levels. There is this project or structural issue, PDP 3 that would require changes in the operating procedures, et cetera. That sounds like a project, which I already suggested to the Board, just like internalizing the organization review that would be worthwhile keeping track as a project. And then as you said, Keith, the meeting is about our agenda for the year.

So I think it's very important to keep track of both levels. They are very well interconnected but not lose sight from either side. I know Donna lives very close by so it might be very sensible to invite her. I don't know if Heather is close by. I'm afraid she's (unintelligible). So I think it's very important that we consider keeping the philosophical part, the technical part of the PDP as a project, as a longstanding project on itself, and of course keep track of our agenda, strategic agenda for next year. I think that's clear interconnected but two different levels. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Carlos. I agree. The other thing I would -- before we move on from this -- I would also strongly recommend or encourage all of us to go back and either read, or watch, or review the documentation that we heard from Cherine in the opening statement and to go back and review the blog posts from Cherine. Basically, we've heard now and seen his vision for the next 12 months, the 2019 year. It will be Cherine's last year on the Board and the last year as Board Chair. And I think basic - what I took away from his remarks and sort of the discussion of sort of his priorities and the trends going into 2019 is that I think the more we are in tune with.

We don't necessarily have to agree altogether that things are - that that's the direction, but we have to be in tune or understand what his vision is and where his concerns are, and where he sees opportunity, and the Board sees opportunity for sort of directional change, or improvements, or things. I think that will be really important as we go into our conversations and the strategic planning session. Tanya?

Tatiana Tropina: Tatiana Tropina for the record. Keith, your suggestion is like everyone is doing it individually, or shall we create maybe kind of digest, kind of with links so we can all ensure that we read the same thing.

Keith Drazek: Yes, that's a great suggestion. Thank you. This is Keith and we'll take that as an action item to pull together those resources. Thank you. Okay, let's move on. Thank you. So next item on the agenda is the membership of the standing committee on ICANN's budget and operations. So here is the relevant excerpt from the SCBO Charter. I'll read it.

"Members of the standing committee will be comprised of volunteers from the GNSO Council, and the nomination of the Chair will be determined by said committee. Each stakeholder group is expected to designate at least one councilmember and one alternate to this effort. Membership to the standing committee is based on a council member's term. Constitution of the

committee will be reviewed at each annual general meeting, as councilmember terms expire and new members are elected by their respective groups.

The standing committee may decide to solicit additional volunteers throughout the year as needed. Members will be listed on the community wiki."

So we have to go through this process and Marika, or Steve, or somebody, help me out. So next steps here in terms of - or Berry I see moving to the table. If you could help me out here just in terms of what the timeline is around our next steps. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Berry Cobb for the record. So a few things here. First, Marika pointed out and I guess it was a slight oversight as part of reviewing the liaisons for the groups, according to the charter, you as Chair will also become the liaison for SCBO. As it relates to membership, we only lost Stephanie who was currently assigned to the SCBO. So we still have Michele. Philippe, Martin, and Ayden, and Erika. Ayden still being Chair for the group .

Basically what this agenda item was is just a verbal call for additional volunteers since we have a few new members that joined. I'd note that Michele is the only one from the registrar stakeholder group and we don't have any BC members or IPC representation. Not that it's a requirement but the more, the merrier. Additionally, so I will have Nathalie send out an email reminder for anybody interested and you can respond to the GNSO SEC email address if you wish to join.

We will also send out another refresh call for volunteers to the stakeholder groups and constituencies in case any subject matter experts either want to re-up or come in. Last thing I'll say is as you noted on the public comments, the 12th is the deadline for the IANA PTI comments. We did set up a calendar invite for the 5th of November for the SCBO to meet. I'll shortly be

sending out a blank version of last year's comment that the Council submitted. I think in general it was mostly just acknowledging it. There wasn't a whole lot of controversy or anything and I don't believe a whole lot has changed from this year's version of the budget.

So anyway, that's due the 12th and so we'll need to rapidly draft a statement and that statement in and of itself will need to be, I guess, ratified or accepted via the Council list. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks very much, Berry. Very comprehensive update. So again, this is a call for volunteers - for additional volunteers to round out this group and it does have some work ahead of us or ahead of it in the near-term, including a potential call on November 5. So any questions, comments, thoughts on this before we move on? Rafik, thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Keith. This is Rafik speaking. I said the same comment yesterday during the public Council meeting. My recollection from the report coming from the SCBO that one issue they arise is that they said they didn't have enough participation from the Council. And so I would encourage new Council if they want to join. I think it's important. Even if we have those committees, it's quite important that a councilor take ownership of (unintelligible) and to participate directly. So I think that's just the call is to have maybe more councilors. But also we'll have this call for volunteers is for the - what we call the subject matter expert.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Rafik. So if you like numbers, we need your help. All right, next item on our agenda then is the schedule of GNSO Council Meetings for 2019. This is a currently - this is the current schedule as it's planned, as it's proposed. This was circulated to the list earlier today. I know some folks have responded already saying I have a conflict here or I have a conflict there. That's unavoidable I'm sure with a group this size with our very travel schedules and obligations. But let's make sure that we are - if there is a date

that doesn't work for a large number of people, that we identify that early and make adjustments as needed.

So any comments or questions on this? Marika, thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Keith. This is Marika. One thing I mentioned previously as well is that it may be worth putting in some placeholder meetings around the January/February timeframe because it's likely that the EPDP team final report is supposed to come your way, according to the timeline. So to avoid having to schedule special meetings, maybe it's helpful to put in some placeholder meetings that are at least already announced. And then when you're closer to the date you can kind of decide which one is needed or how many conversations you need to have before being able to take a decision on it.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you, Marika? Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Keith and thanks Marika for highlighting this. So the EPDP team discussed quickly today about adjusted timeline and they will send it to the Council for information. So I think that will help us maybe for planning for next calls and also about deliberation within the Council regarding the EPDP team.

Keith Drazek: Excellent. Thank you, Rafik. So just for my edification, what is the current -- well, even just the month -- what is the current target date for the delivery of the final report? In other words, the finalization and delivery of the final report.

Marika Konings: If I'm not mistaken, it's February. Because as a reminder, after it goes to the Council there will need to be another public comment period before it goes to the Board. So there needs to be margin for that to happen.

Keith Drazek: Thank you. That's helpful. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Keith. Michele for the record. It's related in terms of EPDP but not related to the Council meetings. Do you want me to wait or are you okay now? Okay. Thanks. Do we have any issues around funding for the EPDP that we need to consider or is that all happy place?

So good question, Michele. I don't have an answer for you right now. We haven't had a chance to meet as a leadership team with staff, including Xavier, and David Olive, and basically the team that's pulled together to talk about these issues. I think we'll need to assess what comes out of this meeting here and to try to figure out what's going to be necessary. I think the two questions are face-to-face meeting support and the possibility of hiring a subject matter expert with legal advice, right. I think those are the two possible - Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: There's also the third one, -- Michele again for the record -- also I think in relation to the mediators. Because I don't think that was originally budgeted that they would be involved as much as they have been. But from all conversations I've heard both with our own stakeholder group and further afield, they've definitely been very, very helpful.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele. That's a great point. I'd forgotten that third point. Marika, you wanted to get in queue. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Keith. This is Marika. Just as a reminder that the Board did communicate to the GNSO Council the specific budget allocations for the different buckets that were identified I think early on by the Council as being needed and the way that is being managed is that there is a - I always forget what it stands for the - the PCST, I'm sure Berry knows the name that consists of leadership of the EPDP team, Council leadership, and then also I think Xavier is a member of that and then David Oliver as the budget owner of that.

So I think they're due to meet soon to kind of review what is remaining, what is still identified as being needed. And I think there's also -- and I'm looking at Berry here -- I think there's also an ability for the group to kind of reallocate resources if they would want to move things from one bucket to another. But I think the Board has been kind of that this is what has been allocated. And unless there's specific additional needs identified, this is what the group is expected to work with and prioritize accordingly their resources.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Marika. Great question, Michele. Any other comments or questions? And again, we're back to the Council meeting schedule for 2019. Let's move onto the next. Okay, next item. ICANN - this is Number 8 on our agenda, ICANN 64 meeting planning, update from kickoff. So I had a conflict and was unable to attend the ICANN 64 meeting planning discussion that took place today. I think Pam was there as well as Marika, Nathalie, and others. So if I could maybe turn, Pam, to you, or to staff to give us a quick update on the conversations that took place about the initial planning for 64.

Pam Little: Pam Little speaking. I think the discussion was high level given that it's the first meeting. I took away from the meeting that ICANN reported there were 2,568 people attending the Barcelona meeting. 2568. And so that's the attendance for this meeting. But for ICANN 64 today we discussed about the potential topics for the high interest - potential topics for the high interest topic. So kind of a mouthful. Anyway, so they include, like, the five year strategic planning plans for budget, GDPR/EPDP and also the innovation of new gTLDs. Because apparently, there was one held today, earlier today, and was very well received. And so there might be a repeat of that session.

So we just kind of flagged those potential issues, sorry, potential topics at this point. The other thing that was discussed was about the timing for the opening ceremony. You may recall Goran has spoken a couple of times. He doesn't like the 8:30 opening ceremony in the morning and he's been suggesting or thinking it might be better to be held in the afternoon. I believe Nick Tomasso indicated there are some logistic challenge with the afternoon

session followed by a kind of cocktail type of reception. So the thinking is if you have the opening ceremony, you have all those gifts and followed by a reception, you can have people staying and then mingle immediately for that purpose.

But there is also issue with ICANN - sorry, doing that with ICANN 64 being the gala is going to be on Monday. And also the consideration if you move it to the (unintelligible) Sunday instead of the Monday. But Sunday, you may not be able to get government officials to attend on a Sunday. So that hasn't been decided. It's kind of just tested and discussing the idea. I'm not sure whether it would happen at ICANN 64. That's all from me and for those who were there as well, have I missed anything or didn't get anything right, please chime in.

Philippe Fouquart: Very little to add really. Just one point on the innovation of new gTLDs. It was on IDN essentially. It was not meant to be a repeat of the session, the very informative session that we had this morning. It would be, well, there's discussion of having that IDN TLD session possibly with EIA, universal access, and all these sorts of things given the region. That was the point and as far as the ISPs from the region, there would certainly be an interest in having that sort of thing on the agenda.

Pam Little: Thanks, Philippe. That was excellent point. I forgot about that one. Sorry.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you very much Pam and Philippe. Any further comments from staff that were in that session? Anything else that we should be aware of or tracking? Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Michele for the record. Just of these high interest/cross-community sessions, how do I put this diplomatically. I think the - from what I've heard, the innovation and new TLDs type one, I think that was something where it was actually new. It was something people hadn't seen before. But we really don't need to have these high interest/cross-community things where it's just

the same people as normal, the same groups as ever, reiterating the positions they've already held in multiple other arena.

So I think we need to put, I don't know, just stop it. It's just a waste of everybody's team. I mean this week, I didn't even bother going to several of them because it's just like what's the point. You know, the CPH, the registrar is going to say one thing, the registry is going to say something else. IPC will say what they're going to say. There's going to be nothing new. And for those people who are following all of these things closely, the schedule for the meetings is already challenging and carving out time so that everybody can potentially attend something like that, that means we have a situation where this wrap-up is held at 5:00 and the room is practically empty because everybody is at the 20 years of ICANN shindig a few doors down.

I'm not saying there's anything - the scheduling I know is difficult but it's just these high interest things I just find them a bit ridiculous.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Michele and just noting we are approaching the bottom of the half-hour - bottom of the hour. So we don't have a lot of time left. So I want to agree with what you've said regarding the high-interest topics/cross community sessions. I think they serve a purpose. At times, they can be helpful, when there is a truly high-interest topic and cross-community requirement where we need the community in the room together or there is substantial and significant interest in a cross-community event. I think there is a place for it. But I think it's a rare, and unique, and special case in my view, or should be at least.

Because when you have a cross-community high-interest session, it can't be conflicted and it displaces all of the other meetings that would normally be taking place at that time in tracks and forces it into conflicts with stuff throughout the rest of the week. And so I think we need to take a real serious look at this and at the SO/AC level make sure that if we're calling something

high-interest and cross-community that it truly is. And I'll take your guidance as Council on this but that's my view. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: And I agree. In fact, I think they may actually be causing calcification of positions rather than opening up any sort of way forward. I just think it's a way for everybody to say things in public that they can't back out of later. Or at least rename them high-volume.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thank you. All right, in the interest of - Tanya, okay.

Tatiana Tropina: Very briefly because I know we are at the top of the hour. I believe that they should be abandoned whatsoever. First of all, in many cases they hold high interest to whatever cross-community just to fill in the slot, just to come up with something. Secondly, I do believe from what I've seen at this ICANN meeting they cause more misunderstanding and more mixed feeling and mixed positions than (unintelligible) before them. So my feedback would be why do really we need to go proceed with them. Why just do something else?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Tanya. Flip?

Flip Petillion: Thank you, Keith. I had raised my hand here electronically but I will do it physically in the future.

Keith Drazek: I should be on Adobe and I'm not so it's my fault.

Flip Petillion: Does the cross-community sessions, does that include the cross-community on GDPR that we had this week? And if the answer is yes then I really must say that I personally found that that was a really good meeting and that Bruce Tonkin has been leading that brilliantly. And that yes, we did not agree on quite a number of things but there was clearly an agreement that we had to go in the direction of a balance. And I personally think that this session has

been held among adults who clearly expressed their point of view and I personally think that this was a really useful session.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Flip and again, as I said at the outset, in my remarks, I think there is a place for these sessions but I think they need to be truly special and unique. And obviously, with what's going on in this community around GDPR, the EPDP, and all of the focus on this in a very compressed timeline, I agree that I think that was a positive and constructive session, speaking personally again.

But I think the -- as Tanya said, I think sort of the feeling that we are obligated to fill these slots with something is really unproductive. So the default I think should be to not have necessarily for high-interest topic/cross-community sessions. But if the community, SO and AC leaders agree that something does warrant it, then we put it in and make the adjustments for it.

Okay, Tanya, Elsa, and then we've got to draw a line under it.

Tatiana Tropina: Yes, and if we still go with cross-community, please let's make sure that they're cross-community because sometimes it's only one constituency and they define whom they decide to invite and there is always, like, one side not invited. So if we are going with them, let's make them truly cross-community. Thank you.

Elsa Saade: Agree with Tanya. Elsa for the record. And just want to add maybe we could change the structure of that high-interest session. Instead of having so many questions maybe just give a summary for the very interested people, especially on EPDP. And rather than having such a long Q&A, have a much shorter one so that we would avoid having this havoc of a cacophony of questions and big issues that would arise from it. My two cents.

Keith Drazek: All right, thanks everybody. This has been a great conversation and I think really valid views on all sides. I think this tells me we're going to have some very good conversations in LA. In January on this topic.

All right, two more items. PDP 3.0 next steps. I want everybody please to review the detailed language around - in the PDP 3.0 and specifically focus on sort of the recommended next steps and action items for further conversation and consideration. I think that's going to be really important as we head into the face-to-face in Los Angeles. But there's certainly an opportunity to talk about these in the near future on our next calls. And I'd like to ask staff if there are any specific action items related to PDP 3.0 coming out of our resolution and the passing of the motion this week? Is there anything imminent or urgent for us to do around PDP 3.0?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I need to double check. It has been a really long week but I don't think so. But at least I think from a staff perspective, what we'll probably do is kind of take those items that were approved for implementation and out of the document and kind of start a new document where we'll start kind of documenting what the group discussed and what the next steps, and identify what the specific action items for each of those items are if that's helpful.

It would be very helpful. Thank you, Marika. So I saw Maxim and Michele or Michele and Maxim.

Michele Neylon: Maxim is being a gentleman and ceding to me first for some reason. Michele for the record. Okay, just on this PDP 3.0, very - I'm going to speak faster than normal to make up for the time. The issues we were made aware of this week involving certain activities within certain working groups and that entire situation is something that quite a few of us are deeply troubled by. And part of the kind of cornerstone, I suppose, of the entire PDP 3.0 was to make sure that people, when they're engaging in this week that they're doing so in a particular fashion.

And if we end up with a situation where people are taken to communicating by third parties with lots of letters after their name instead of actually engaging here meaningfully that breaks the entire system. So I think we do need to have some kind of conversation somewhere, whether that's on the list or elsewhere. But we can't really leave it until LA because I believe there's going to be some kind of a chilling effect. If that kind of situation were to arise involving myself personally, I know what my actions would be. It would be bye-bye everybody. See you around. I'll hand over to Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: I wanted to thank Michele for expressing the more polite version of what I was going to say because effectively to avoid all PDPs turning into discussion clubs about their charter and the work they can say at the meetings, we might need to do something. At least start conversation about it, because effectively, it would be like freezing. Because if EPDPs just have meetings but don't do anything effective it's meaning just putting on ice all PDPs while wasting money on them at the same time. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks to you both. That takes me to a point just to note that obviously, there's been some challenges in some PDP working groups recently. There have been some challenges reported this week by a couple of the co-chairs of from the RPM PDP working group. I think those that were in the second public forum today heard Goran read a statement that was carefully worded concerning his asking or ordering the General Counsel of ICANN to do some investigation around some allegations and some behavioral issues in a particular PDP.

And so I think we as a Council and as individuals need to be very cautious and careful in our conversations about these issues, and we need to give a little bit of breathing room for ICANN's General Counsel to assess the situation, do whatever interviews need to take place, and to map out a path forward and take appropriate action. So I think we probably should leave that conversation at that until we hear more. You can be assured that Council

leadership and leadership of the PDP working group will be engaged with ICANN staff and ICANN legal, and we will report out as warranted.

But I think for the purposes of what Michele and Maxim just raised is that there is a risk because of this development and these challenges to a possible chilling effect on other PDP working groups and future PDP working groups, to the extent that this continues or is unresolved. And as a Council, as it relates to the PDP 3.0 work that has been done over the last year, this is something that we need to be aware of and focused on.

But I think for the moment, and for the time being, we just need to be a little bit careful and a little bit cautious in terms of our approach and our discussion of this until it becomes more clear. Comments? Questions? We have one more item on the agenda and then I have one more item for AOB. So the next item on the agenda is ATRT 3. I think this is on here as a reminder to everybody that ATRT3 is gearing up and that there is a call for volunteers out, and that there is a process that the standing selection committee will go through to identify the GNSO representatives to this group.

As a reminder, it is a process of identifying the candidates that are eligible, making sure there's geographic diversity, et cetera, et cetera. So the sooner each of our stakeholder groups and - yes, Tanya?

Tatiana Tropina: I just want to ask a question. We flagged on one of the calls that we were fine with the issuing new call for ATRT3 because there were basically two representatives more or less with secured places, (unintelligible) and then Michael Karanicolas because they stepped down from (unintelligible). Was it taken into account, yes or no? Thank you. I just want to have it on the record again.

Keith Drazek: I'll defer to Maxim on answering that specifically but I think what I'm saying is that we are just reminding and flagging that there is a call for volunteers. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. The short version. The first slate of candidates who passed the previous round are supposed to be passed. But there might be some changes in the some factual changes. For example, some persona might change work or something. So it won't help to just copy/paste the previous.

And the second thing is please do not forget to concern to GNSO secretaries that we support these persons. We draft them. It could be two, three, whomever you are able to lure into this. So the thing is please do not forget that the letters of support has the same date. So formally, it is a good idea to have expression of interest letter being sent. Maybe a few minutes later it's like, okay, we do support this person. And it will make rank of this person higher. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Maxim. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I maybe want to put a little bit of nuance on what Maxim said because the (SEC) does have a responsibility to look at the overall slate and ensure that there is adequate representation based on the applications. If I recall well, I think in the first round there actually were certain groups that didn't put anyone forward, which resulted I think in some groups having more nominees on there. So based on the applications I think the (SEC) may need to see how that pans out in the ultimate selection.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Marika, and Maxim, and good question, Tanya. Thank you. Okay. That brings us to the end of our agenda. Like I said, I have one other AOB. Does anybody else have any AOB or anything else to add? Marika?

Marika Konings: Just a pre-announcement that the 20-year anniversary cocktails are taking place in the banquet hall on the second floor.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Marika, which is why I'm rushing us to a conclusion. All right, so my last announcement for everybody's benefit is I received during this

meeting an email from Brian Winterfeldt from the IPC and I'm going to read it. He says, "Dear Keith, I am writing on behalf of the CSG ExCom to confirm that we support Rafik Dammak as our Vice Chair for Council for this new term. Thank you."

So with that. So hold on everybody. Hold on. I will just say I think this is an excellent demonstration of our efficiency of this new Council that before even leaving Barcelona, we have our Vice Chairs and leadership team in place. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just one minor thing. We need to get that communication from the House, not only the CSG. But I think an email has been sent and presumably it's coming, but just for the record.

Keith Drazek: Thank you. All right, sorry, Rafik. You're not here yet.

Paul McGrady: Thank you, new Heather. So Rafik, you owe us \$186 for your day off yesterday. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: All right, any other business, any other comments, questions, observations? Pam?

Pam Little: Just very briefly, Keith -- Pam Little. I think it's really great outcome for Rafik to be able to stay on the leadership team. It gives great continuity and given that Rafik was working so closely and effectively with Heather and Donna on the leadership team. Thank you Rafik, and I'm so relieved.

Keith Drazek: All right, thanks everybody. With that, we'll call this meeting to a conclusion. Thank you very much. Look forward to seeing you all virtually in November. Thanks.

END