

**Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference
23 July 2015 at 11:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 23 July 2015 at 11:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-23jul15-en.mp3>

and the Adobe chat transcript can be viewed here:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-chat-council-23jul15-en.pdf>

on page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jul>

List of attendees: NCA – Non Voting – Carlos Raúl Gutierrez

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Volker Greimann, James Bladel, Yoav Keren

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jonathan Robinson, Donna Austin, Bret Fausett

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Phil Corwin, Susan Kawaguchi, Osvaldo Novoa, Tony Holmes – absent apologies, proxy to Osvaldo Novoa, Heather Forrest, Brian Winterfeldt - absent apologies, proxy to Heather Forrest

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Amr Elsadr, Marilia Maciel - joined after roll call, Edward Morris, Stephanie Perrin, Avri Doria, David Cake

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Daniel Reed – absent apologies proxy to Stephanie Perrin

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Olivier Crépin-Leblond– ALAC Liaison

Patrick Myles - ccNSO Observer - absent, apologies

Mason Cole – GNSO liaison to the GAC

ICANN Staff

David Olive - VP Policy Development

Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director

Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director

Mary Wong – Senior Policy Director

Julie Hedlund – Senior Policy Director

Steve Chan – Policy Director

Lars Hoffmann – Policy Analyst

Steve Sheng - Director, SSAC & RSSAC Advisories Development Support

Berry Cobb- Consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Eric Evrard – End User Support

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, Jonathan. I'll do a roll call. Please answer to your name if you are on the call. Thank you. Bret Fausett?

Bret Fausett: I'm here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Donna Austin?

Donna Austin: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Jonathan Robinson? I know Jonathan's on. James Bladel? Not yet on. Yoav Keren is on.

Yoav Keren: Here. I'm here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Volker Greimann?

Volker Greimann: Yes I'm here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thomas Rickert?

Thomas Rickert: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Philip Corwin?

Philip Corwin: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Susan Kawaguchi?

Susan Kawaguchi: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Brian Winterfeldt is absent and has given his proxy to Heather Forrest. Heather Forrest?

Heather Forrest: Here, Glen. Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Osvaldo Novoa has - will be late coming onto the call. Tony Holmes is absent and has given his proxy to Osvaldo Novoa. Marilia Maciel? Amr Elsadr? David Cake?

David Cake: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Edward Morris?

Edward Morris: Here, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Avri Doria?

Avri Doria: I'm here. Thank you, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Stephanie Perrin? And Stephanie Perrin has got the proxy for Daniel Reed, who is absent. Carlos Gutierrez? Maybe he will be late. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, ALAC liaison? Olivier (unintelligible) I think he's probably not on the call yet. Patrick Myles is absent. He is the ccNSO liaison. And Mason Cole?

Jonathan Robinson: Glen?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes?

Jonathan Robinson: Olivier says he is on the Adobe Connect.

Glen DeSaintgery: On the Adobe Connect, yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. And for staff we have Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong, Lars Hoffman, Steve Sheng, myself, Glen DeSaintgery, and I think we have David Olive as well.

Thank you, Jonathan. Over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Glen. Welcome, everyone, to our GNSO Council of the 23rd of July. So that was item 1.1 of the agenda. 1.2 is an opportunity to provide any updates to your statement of interest, so please do raise your hand now if you would like to provide any updates.

Seeing none, are there any comments or points relating to the agenda? I note that we have a request from Philip Corwin to add something under the any other business item, and that's already been captured. So are there any other points? Actually looking at the agenda as it stands and the Adobe Connect room, Glen, this is - this looks like the previous version that we prior to our review, when I look at item nine. So if you could just look at that, whoever's posted that agenda, it looks - it doesn't look current or the last revised version.

Glen DeSaintgery: We'll get the correct version now, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. That's really only the any other business items, I believe was the main change there to ensure that's the case.

Okay. Good thanks for that. So then in terms of the minutes of the previous meetings, (unintelligible) changing in front of me now, so let me just go back. Yes so we should have a full set of minutes apart from the June meeting has not been yet posted and approved. So we are still waiting for - to post minutes from the June meeting, but other than that we're current with the minutes.

Thomas, go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Jonathan. I'd like to follow up on a memo that I sent to you and Glen. There is actually overlap of this call and the CCWG call, which is prioritized for our progress, which is why I need to leave this call early, and

I would appreciate if you could ensure that my part can be presented before the end of the first hour.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Thomas. Yes, I did just see that e-mail, and we'll bring item six ahead of item five if necessary. I'll keep a track on it and depending on where we get to with the first four items, if we get through item five, we'll stick to the schedule, if not we'll bring you forward.

Okay good. So under the next item, item two, we just have a quick look at the open items on the action list. And I've been through that yesterday. I don't think there's a whole lot to cover that isn't touched on in this meeting itself. We'll touch on the meeting planning later.

If you haven't already completed the survey from Buenos Aires, I guess it's not too late to complete it now. Could someone correct me if I'm wrong there? But I think, you know, ideally it would have been done, but please do complete that if - thanks, Marika. So Marika confirms that it is not too late to complete the survey if you still have the opportunity.

Please do note, anyone who is expecting to or likely to remain on the council post the annual meeting in Dublin that we would like you to be present at the meeting, and you will be funded for an additional night in the hotel in order to stay for that second Friday of the meeting. So typically we have our wrap up and of course the public session, and closing cocktails and all the rest are on a Thursday. And then we will run an induction and development session for the council on the Friday of that week. So it's - we would very much appreciate if you could stay for that Friday meeting.

And just to note, I mean some people were unsure when booking traveling before and so on, I think it's our intention, and again Staff could perhaps help me if - remind me, but it was previously the way worked that led after the induction development day into a dinner for - to get together afterwards. And I expect that it still planned.

So it's really a very valuable opportunity to both work together with the more experienced counselors to plan the key themes of the work ahead, obviously within the scope and remit of the council, but also to induct and inform and educate any new councilors coming on board. It makes a really - it seems to be a very effective way of bringing new councilors on board.

So, you know, we can't make it mandatory but in terms of a productive and effective council for the year ahead, it's a really - there's an investment gone into, and your investment in that session, your personal investment, will your ensure your - value for your community and those whom you represent on the council.

David Cake, go ahead.

David Cake: Yes, I just wanted to basically back up what you've said but also add that we do - we have tended to talk about this is a training, you know, induction and training for new councilors day, but it's really mostly a lot of it is planning and strategic planning and so on. I think it's really important for active councilors, returning councilors to attend as well. It's a really valuable day, I found, especially the last time we ran it. So I really hope everyone can be there. That's all. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, David. Appreciate that. Really the only reason I keep clear a little of the point on strategy is although we have thought about key themes and worked on this, it's just to make sure that there's some sensitivity about the role and remit about of the council within the GNSO. And so it's making sure we stick within the boundaries of what is set out for the council in the bylaws. The objective is to make sure that the council is fully effective for the year ahead. So agreed, to that extent its strategic planning as well. So - and thanks Volker for your support in the chat.

Good. So hopefully we'll see all of you there and we'll make it a productive session. It reminds me, can we put a note then under this session please that we need arrange an additional action, Glen that a facilitator needs to be arranged for that session, we need to line up someone to do so? And so that's important.

Glen DeSaintgery: I'll do that, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: If we can capture that -- thank you -- as action number one from the call. Good. So that's that. And glancing down at the list further, many of the items have either been completed or will be dealt with in the remainder of this call, so I'm not going to walk through them laboriously. To the extent that they're completed, that's good. To the extent that they come up later in this meeting, we'll deal with them there.

So any other questions or points? I'm checking the - yes, Thomas, that's a good point. The prospect of having outgoing councilors at the meeting. Some of this is about the issue of the funding, but that's a good point. Typically the scope of the funding is to cover the council members and relevant policy staff.

Personally I have no objection to a further contribution. It's an interesting point, so we can think about that as well in terms of either planning for other meetings, or. My personal view is I wouldn't object to any councilors staying on, but right now I don't think we planned for that in terms of funding for it.

Okay. Any other comments or questions in and around the overall action list that we've just touched on, and also the project list? And actually maybe a good question to anyone: any objections to any councilors who are standing down? Should they be in Dublin for the Friday or have the opportunity to attend? Any objections or concerns with their attendance so we can make that clear and understand if there are any concerns about that?

Okay so I'm seeing a run of comments there in the chat, indicating that there is a receptiveness to that participation. So, Glen, if you could note that as well under this area that we might make - formally communicate that to outgoing councilors that their presence or attendance would be welcome. Of course we'll need to know we can plan for that if anyone is - and we'll want a prior acceptance or intention to participate, and their attendance would be welcome, for logistics.

Glen DeSaintgery: I'll do that, Jonathan. And then I can also alter the hotel night as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Then you'll need a prior commitment though if that's the case. You will need a prior commitment. I'm not sure about the budget issues there. That's something you can take offline with staff. So at the moment, I've gone so far as to say we'd welcome inviting prior councilors should they be present. If there is a funding issue, I suggest you take that up internally from a sort of staff point of view and clarify whether that's possible or not. Thanks.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Next item is we have nothing on our agenda item under item three, and so I suggest straight forward to the motion, which is the one and only motion we have on the table today, and that's the opportunity to approve the review of the GAC communiqué from Buenos Aires.

Now you'll remember this is in some sense it's quite timely to come onto this, because at our previous annual induction and development session, one of the suggestions made, a constructive suggestion that arose from Bruce Tonkin's input, was to this about how we might, as part of our overall work on improving the way in which we work with the GAC and within other groups within the community - there's an open mic. I think it might be - I see one - maybe Julie. I'm not sure who's got that. If you could just make sure mic's are muted. We're getting an echo back. Thanks.

Yes so we took that suggestion on board. We've been slightly slower than we intended getting it sorted out but we've nevertheless now in timely way used the template that we developed, and with Volker's admirable leadership, we have now processed the most recent GAC communiqué and sort of filtered it in the way in which we planned to do or processed it in the way we planned to do it and looked at the policy-related implications.

So let me hand over to Volker, if there's anything else you would like to say, Volker, in terms of remarks or comments on - I think on the substance of the way - the substance of the way in which we processed the GAC communiqué and take any questions or comments on that. So before presenting the motion as such, Volker, you might want to just comment on the content of what we've done there, those three items, and just see if there's any comment or discussion on it from other councilors.

Volker Greimann: Yes thank you, Jonathan. First of all I would like to thank Marika, who has been invaluable in summarizing the - and analyzing the comments. We have looked at the GAC communiqué that has come out of Buenos Aires and from that we have analyzed how that impacts current past or future GNSO policy work, put that into the table that we had prepared last time around but didn't - weren't able to finish the complete response at that time.

So we used that work that had come before to press that into a format, so to speak. And afterwards the proposed analysis was distributed to the council list for comments, of which there were none. And then we have moved forward to the motion.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So - Volker, thank you. Are there any questions or comments on the content of those three items and how we've dealt with them in the document that's processed it?

Volker Greimann: The document is...

Jonathan Robinson: And thank you, Amr. Go ahead, Volker.

Volker Greimann: I just wanted to point out, if anybody still wants to look at the document that didn't have the chance to read it when it was posted to the list. It's included in the motion, so if you wanted to give it a quick read before or while this discussion is going on, please go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Volker. And I note that in the chat Amr has volunteered to second the motion. So that's welcome. Thank you, Amr. Let's record you as the second of the motion, and we do need a seconder for the motion, so it's great that we've got you to do that. Thank you very much.

So any comments or questions on the content itself of the GAC - of the document we proposed to send to the board and ultimately communicate to the GAC? Is there anything in that content, Volker, that you would like to highlight or get comment or question on to make sure that there's anything you would like to make sure people are specifically aware of?

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Jonathan. Not quite for content. I mean if you look at the proposed review, it's very bare bones as in identifying the issues and framing them for the board to see - to help them see what our work on those topics is, or is going to be, or has been, and what the status of that is. It's not really - we don't really say for example that this is - we don't have anything controversial in there I think. It's a very formal analysis, informing the board of work that has gone on, is going on, or will go on.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Well thanks, Volker. Then if we don't have further comment or question, let's proceed to present the motion. I think as is customary, there's no reason to go through particularly all of the whereas clauses. I think the important points are that we vote on the resolve clauses. So if you could present those to the council, and then providing no one else raises their hands or has any questions or issues arising, we can move forward to a vote on the motion.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Jonathan. I will proceed to read the resolve clauses then. First, the GNSO Council adopts the GNSO review of the Buenos Aires GAC communiqué link and requests that the GNSO Council chair communicates the GNSO review of the Buenos Aires GAC communiqué to the ICANN board.

Second, following the communication to the ICANN board, the GNSO Council requests that the GNSO Council chair informs the GAC chair, as well as the GAC-GNSO consultation group of the communication between the GNSO Council and the ICANN board. And that's it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Volker. So it'll be clear to everyone that not only we will prepare and reference this communiqué to the board, we will make sure it goes to the GAC chair and secretariat in addition, as well as the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is aware of it.

Any final questions or comments before we move this to a vote? Any objections to a voice vote?

Glen DeSaintgery: Jonathan, this is Glen.

Jonathan Robinson: Glen, go ahead.

Glen DeSaintgery: I just would like noted that Marilia Maciel from the NCSG is not on the call, and I would like to ask if anyone has been given a proxy for her at the last minute? I have not received anybody. Anyone? So just to make sure that she will be absent from the vote. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. Thanks, Glen. James suggests we use the Adobe but I'm not sure we have everyone in the Adobe room. I mean I have no objection to doing that. We could try that. It's something - it's possibly easier, James, just

to see if there are any no votes and abstentions and (unintelligible) quite quickly.

So let me see, let me call - does anyone - would anyone like to vote no to the motion? Please make yourself known. Make sure microphones are muted unless you're actively speaking. Do I hear no one voting no? Would anyone like to abstain on the motion, from voting on the motion? So I see no no votes and no abstentions and so therefore for a vote we will record everyone present as having voted in favor of the motion.

So if you could record that please, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, Jonathan. With the proxies that people hold. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thank you, including the proxies. Okay? So self-evidently the motion passes. I don't think we've got it in the agenda as such, but - oh it does say voting I show a simple majority, so therefore the motion passes.

Now I note that Marilia has just joined the meeting. Marilia, we just have voted on the motion, and you joined exactly as we concluded the vote. If no one has any objection, I think we should take your vote and add that to the vote, notwithstanding the fact that has it has passed. I think it would be useful to now record you as present and to record your vote.

So if you could let it be known whether you would like to support the motion, abstain from voting on the motion or vote no for the motion, if you could let us know that as soon as possible, please. Thank you, Marilia. Glen, if you could note that Marilia has voted in support of the motion in the chat. So if we could record that as a vote in favor of the motion, please, providing there are no objections to that slightly late vote.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, Jonathan. I will.

Jonathan Robinson: Good. Thank you, everyone. Let's move then onto item five, which is an opportunity to receive an update and have some discussion on the new gTLD registration data policy development process. And to lead us on that will be Marika Konings from staff. So let me hand straight over to you, Marika, mindful of the fact that we do have some time constraint, but it looks like we should be well within the time to accommodate Thomas on item six. So please go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Marika. And yes I'll keep it brief and just in advance apologize if there's any background noise. I'm in a public location and there may be some noise around me.

So basically this is an item that was carried over from a public session in Buenos Aires. As you may recall, we had initially anticipated that the preliminary issue report would have been published by that date, but we needed a little bit more time to do so. This item was deferred to this meeting, so this now gives me an opportunity to give you an update on the issued report that has been published in the meantime and the expected next steps.

So as you may recall, the information that we shared awhile back to the council mailing list, I don't - on the 26th of May, the board reconfirmed its request for a preliminary issue report on this topic, following the work that had been done by the process framework group that was constituted of board members as well as council members to come - to talk through a best approach for dealing with a PDP on this topic.

So in response to that, staff published a preliminary issue report on 13th of July and the comment period will remain open until the 6th of September. As noted, the issue report is, to a large extent, based on the process framework as has been agreed to between the council and the board. So you'll see that flowing through the whole document, as well as the draft charter that is included in the preliminary issue report.

A brief snapshot of the information that you can find in the report, because as you all know this issue has been extensively covered in many efforts that predate this work. So we've tried to capture as much information as possible on those preceding efforts. All the information that may be relevant to the PDP to consider for example that the GAC communiqués on this topic and letters that have been received from the article 29 working party Whois study statements from stakeholder groups and constituencies have been included or referenced as relevant information.

The information provided by the expert working group and its final report and recommendations, which are to form the basis for this work are of course included. And as said, it also further introduces the process framework that has been developed by the board and GNSO Council to be able to address the many significant as well as interdependent areas that this PDP covers.

Then there's a section as well that specifically deals with a discussion of all those proposed issues that need to be addressed. And that is the issue report also includes a draft of the PDP working group charter, again modeled on the process framework that basically outlines the way in which the PDP's expected to be structured and it's - so those are the different elements that are covered in the report and that we hope to obtain input on.

So as a very brief reminder of the process framework that was developed by the group, and several of you who acted in the group are on the call, so please feel free to speak up or correct me if I get anything wrong here. But basically it was broad based baseline. The group agreed that this should be done in a kind of three-phased approach, where the work is broken down in three distinct phases, and after each of those it would be checked by the council, is sufficient progress being made, have we checked all the boxes, and are we ready to move over to the next phase of the process.

So phase one would really focus on the policy requirement definition, so the if and why are we doing this. Phase two would focus on the policy functional

design, you know, so what are we actually going to be doing. And then phase three would really focus on implementation guidance on how are we actually going to implement all of this.

So some of the steps that we were taking before the process were of course the new issue report, the public comment on it, the final issue report, and there's also the expectation that the process working group may come together and look at the comments received to determine whether there's any tweaks or updates (unintelligible) through this process framework that needs to be reflected in the final report.

It seems we have an open mic. And then of course with the usual PDP, at the end stage of all that, it would be GNSO Council and board consideration of the recommendations, formation of the implementation review team and - which would be informed by the implementation guidance that's provided by the PDP working group.

Here you see, and again this all comes from the work that has been done by the process framework working group, basically identifying which are those different issues that need to be covered. And as I said, all of those are again reflected again in detail in the report. So the anticipation is that for each of those phases, those specific topics would come back. Of course each of them then would have a specific focus on the policy requirement, the policy functional design and implementation in conflict and guidance, so that just gives you a better idea of how this is expected to work.

You'll see here as well the reference to ABC, the process working group also did quite a bit of work on trying to identify which topics could be considered in sequence, which ones would need to be dealt with subsequently, so that is also - that is something that has been covered and is reflected in the issue report.

And I already mentioned this, they are recommending methodology and timeline. Again, the proposal is that the PDP would work along the line of phases, where on each phase there would be a sign up by the council before it moves onto the next phase and as well as close consultation with the board as the requester on this PDP to ensure that there's an ongoing communication and coordination around this topic and make sure everyone's aligned in their thinking.

I think the suggestion is that there will be a kind of coordination team formed that would help with that process and, again, also be in a position to coordinate with the board, which I think is looking at creating a specific committee or group that would serve that purpose from their side.

The idea is of course that there would be for us to save progress and time to completion of the process, do defining a time and a target that the PDP working group does, and again looking at whether there may be way to do work in parallel, but also being aware of interdependencies that may exist. It hasn't suggested that this functionality include the PDP, whereby face-to-face meetings it would be beneficial or - as well as considering whether sub teams could do - could make progress on some of the work.

(Unintelligible) is being recorded as it is a preliminary issue report. We're mainly looking at input on - we cover all the information, did we miss anything, if there's anything in there that's incorrect, and specifically as well, are there any issues that should be explored in addition to those that have already been described in the report. And again, you see all of those here.

And this is not the moment to maybe share opinions on some of the report works of others or talk about solutions, the focus here is really on is the issues properly scoped, in put on, you know, solutions or views on recommendations or items that are in the report on the phase, for the working group to gather that and collect that information, as well as the required steps of a PDP at the early stages.

So very briefly, just again highlighting where we are in the process, as you know, we had an earlier version of the preliminary issue report, but due to the additional work that was undertaken by the EWG and as then as well the subsequent board GNSO Council effort, the preliminary issue report was published again, so we're now in the phase of gathering public comments and reviewing that input that has been received.

So from our perspective, the timeline is that in July, August, comments will be coming in. We hope then in September we're in a position to update the final report to reflect those public comments. And then as I said, they may be a need or desire by the council and the board for the process working group to come back together again to look as well at those comments to see if they are the perspective, for the updates - if updates need to be made to the framework itself, following which then the GNSO Council would consider the charter for a PDP working group.

I said, and I think you all know, as part of the PDP improvements, since the charter is being included and is out as well for public comments, so the council will have the option to either adopt that charter and suggest modifications or potentially drafting team to either modify the draft charter or to start it fresh with a new approach. And basically from there, it would move into the PDP itself.

So for further information, here are some links to the relevant documents. As noted, the deadline for comments is the 6th of October, so we all hope that you'll be encouraging your respective groups to provide input so we can move forward in this effort. And I think that's all I had at this stage.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. There's a question coming from James, who I'll just turn to in a moment. Can you just clarify one point for me and possibly for the benefit of others? Those phases you refer to, those are phases of the proposed PDP? They aren't those phases - how will those phases be deal

with in this issue report? Will they be spelt out in the issue report or how does that phasing work? Go ahead, and then we'll come to the queue.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. So basically it basically explains how it's expected to work. So the safe approach is indeed how the working group is expected to conduct it as work. And again, those phases were developed or outlined by the process working group that was formed by the board and the GNSO Council.

So what the issue report does is outline that proposed approach, also reflects it then in the PDP working group charter, and again this is also an opportunity for the community to comment on that and, you know, provide feedback on whether that's a desirable approach or whether (unintelligible) should be made.

And if I can take the opportunity as well to mention one additional thing that I forgot to say before that this is the first PDP that we're running following the adoption of the issue scoping recommendations that were developed by the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group. So this is the first time where we've basically informed the GAC. At the time of the request of this issue report, the GAC has responded and provided relevant links to documents that they have developed on this topic, and we've now also received their formal response as part of a quick-look mechanism approach.

And we hope that that will be shortly published. Basically they indicate that that believe that our public policy implications relates to this topic and they expect that they will have an interest to be involved in this effort. So I just wanted to note that that process is also on the way and being tested here as well as other PDPs that will be commencing or have commenced over the last nine months.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks, Marika. James?

James Bladel: Hi, Jonathan. James speaking. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes we hear you, James. Go ahead.

James Bladel: Fantastic. Thank you. And thank you for enabling Adobe, to Glen. So thank you for the overview, Marika. I just wanted to emphasize that this is a very heavy list. This could be a multi-year project, and I think it's very important that we get all the stakeholder groups on the record during this public comment. So take it with you on the beach or wherever headed on vacation and then come back in late August and then get the comments ready.

But I just wanted to point out one small item. It's really more of just picking - nitpicking here a little bit. But the agenda item refers to this is new gTLD registration data policy, but the public comments and the issues report itself refer to it as next generation gTLD registration data policy.

And I think that's an important distinction because the use of the world new gTLD registration policy makes it seem as though it's limited only to new gTLDs, which of course it's not, and, you know, by this thing works its way through the process, we could be several rounds down the road and the current new gTLDs could be old gTLDs. So I would just emphasize that we please use next generation wherever possible. I just wanted to point that out. It confused me for a few moments; I had to go look it up, and so it's probably confusing for others too. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, that's a good spot, James. Thank you for pointing that out, and actually it's not correct as written and should be - it could be better written as a heading, so thanks for pointing that out and we'll make sure that if the item is repeated in a future meeting it's more clearly headed. Thank you.

Go ahead, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. When we did the EWG group, there was a - at least the language was that we were doing a more or less a de novo review. Now it seems to me that one of the things about Whois is that was implicit always in the creation of ICANN from the commerce department that Whois data would be available and public. And we can see from U.S. negotiations and Europe trade agreements that the Commerce Department continues to feel that Whois data should be public.

To what extent is that whole question in scope or out of scope of this review and working group? I realize that's a difficult question but it is one that I would encourage folks to look at while we're looking at accountability, because it's from some perspectives, it's directly in opposition to adherence to rule of law and the fundamental human rights that we consider important.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Well any comments or points in response to that, Stephanie's point are welcome. I note that Marika suggests a potentially good comment and input for something where - for the public comment forum and to make sure that that's covered in public comment on the issue reports itself, and James supports that as well.

Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. I have a question but I suspect -- this is Amr for the transcript -- yes, I have a question that I suspect the answer's probably similar to the answer to Stephanie's question. But I do note that this issues report is a very - fairly thorough one and it's - it really lists a lot of Whois activities dating back to a task force in 2003. So I think it does a really good job of covering almost everything, at least I am aware of, that took place in terms of Whois discussions that may impact this PDP.

One of the activities that is not strictly a GNSO activity, because it was also an ad hoc group similar to the EWG, was another expert working group on internationalized registration data. And if I'm not mistaken there is no mention

of this group's work or their final reports in this issues report. I was just wondering what thoughts there may be on this. I'm guessing this may be something that would also be worthy of consideration in this PDP.

I know it was considered in the PDP for translation and transliteration of contact information, and that is one PDP that is listed in this issues report. So I just - I figured I'd just mention that here. I probably plan to also include that in a comment on this issues report in preparation for the final report. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry I was on mute. Apologies, Amr. I note that Marika records in the chat that this may have been taken into account by the EWG, but certainly to the extent that it has or has not, this may - this is still something you could potentially add in the public comment in addition.

All right, well I'm very mindful of making sure we accommodate the significant topic of ICANN accountability and the progress update on that ahead of the top of the hour when Thomas has to leave. So I think I'm going to nudge us onto that topic and recognize that we've had a good update from Marika on the develop of this issue report, and its clear what the timetable is. We've got a link to that presentation, so it should be available to all of you.

So I think with that I'll move us onto the next item, which is an opportunity to hear from Thomas on that. So, Thomas, please go ahead and come in and bring us up to date with the latest work on the ICANN accountability and any questions or issues you feel are of particular importance and relevance to come.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And hello, everybody. I would like to briefly update you on the progress that has been made by the CCWG. As you might remember, we have analyzed the outcome of the public comment - the first public comment period, and I presented to you on that when we last met in Buenos Aires.

One of the big issues at the time we saw was that the reference model for community empowerment, i.e. the legal vehicle, used by the SOs and ACs to exercise the community powers was under discussion and criticism. We had proposed a model whereby SOs and ACs would install legal entities through which they exercise certain powers. And this model was said to be too complicated.

The big progress that we made over the last couple of days was that our group has agreed on a new reference model. We have a two-day face-to-face meeting in Paris last Friday and Saturday. And before that we had countless hours of volunteers to analyze, further analyze, the public comment and draw the conclusions, draft and come up with proposals that would meet the needs of the community.

So in Paris, we have had an in depth discussion of the pros and cons of a variety of models that could be used. There was a voluntary model on the table, which basically leaves the situation more or less as it is at the moment without any enforceability mechanisms for the community. Then we discussed what we called an empowered SO/AC designator model. We discussed an empowered SO/AC membership model, and then a variation there was brought to the table and introduced for discussion over the last week, and that is a single membership model.

And the two big concerns that have been voiced with the models were that the voluntary model was deemed not to be robust enough for the community to allow them to enforce their rights in case the board is not willing to honor the community's wishes or honor decisions made by the independent review panel.

On the other side of the spectrum, there is the membership model, which gives full authority to the communities mainly, but there was the fear that SOs and ACs having membership status would give them statutory rights under

California law and also the rights to start derivative lawsuits against ICANN, and that was deemed as a risk that could destabilize ICANN.

Just to give you an example, if we invent all these community powers, therefore the community could use an IRP if they're aggrieved or for the community to hold the board accountable with respect to decisions made on the budget strategic plan bylaw changes and all of that. And if a single SO or AC was in a position to bypass these community processes and run to a cross-community, that could destabilize and open the door for capture by individual interest groups, which is why this was criticized.

So the new model, the new reference model, the single-membership model as we call it, puts all SOs and ACs which we have in the community together, they don't have to do anything, but they would jointly exercise right as a single member. So they would participants of the whole community being the sole member to ICANN. And with that, we would enable the community to only exercise the rights that we want to equip them with jointly.

So if there shall be the exercising of the statutory right, then that would require a certain voting threshold so that no single SO or AC could exercise such powers. That model got so much traction that we were able to agree on it as the new reference model for our upcoming second public comment report.

And I consider, and I'm sure will you agree, this to be a breakthrough in our work, because the legal vehicle for exercising community powers, if need be, and make them sufficiently robust to substantially increase ICANN's accountability, was one of the major hurdles.

Also, we had more discussions starting in Buenos Aires on who the community would be. So that would be the existing SOs and ACs, but then the question is who can exercise voting rights. And SSAC and RSAC, whom we had allocated voting rights, or votes, to had indicated to us that they would

prefer to maintain their advisory role and not exercise any voting rights, yet they would like to be invited to the table when it comes to deliberating community positions and decisions.

So SSAC and RSAC will be removed from the voting scheme for our upcoming report. With respect to the role of the Government Advisory Committee, there has been a question there issued by the GAC to GAC members, and many of them have responded. And it appears like there is quite a big variety of views inside the GAC as to whether the GAC should be merely advisory or whether - the government should be merely advisory or whether they should also have voting powers.

So currently we cannot foresee the GAC to have formed a decision on that for the Dublin meeting, which is the time in which we hope all the SOs and ACs will approve our recommendations, and therefore we can, I think with a high probability, expect that the GAC will stick to its advisory role and that our system is designed to be sufficiently open to allow for a change of that so that the government, should they wish to do so, change their way of contributing to the community at a later stage.

Again, this new model doesn't require any formalities by the SOs and ACs. Everything will be embedded in the bylaw language. We don't need an extra body to be managed, if you wish. The community comes together to discuss important topics anyway. So this community forum, as we might wish to call it, would assemble, it would discuss the important decisions, and then it would take decisions if it has to do so.

But leading the legal vehicle, the model aside for a moment, it is still our hope, and we will put that into our report as well, that everything that needs to be done inside ICANN can be done by virtue of consensus voting and that the community powers that so much support from the community will only have to be invoked if there is a need to do so.

So let me conclude by saying that we also refined the independent review process. We defined other areas of our work, such as work on diversity on human rights on SO/AC accountable. That's the watch the watchers concept, because we need to make sure that an empowered community itself is also accountable. Not all of that is going to be worked in prior to the transition, but we're currently in the stage where we are working on remaining questions for our second public comment period, which is going to start on the 31st of July for 40 days.

And I would like to encourage all of you to take a look at the communiqué, which was issued after the Paris meeting that contains a link to a presentation on the different community mechanisms. That I think is quite a good recommendation for reading so that you can understand what we're doing.

I think I should pause here.

I'd like to encourage those that have concerns with where we're going to let me, let our group know before we start the public comment period, because at least we can afford to take place is that we're going to hear major criticism after the public comment period, because that would jeopardize approval in Dublin. And if we jeopardize approval in Dublin, the CCWG-CWG relationship might also impacted. In all there are a lot of dependencies, which I think will also (unintelligible) and it would be unfortunate to say the least if we would hear your concerns only in the 11th hour.

I think I should pause here and open it up for questions. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Thomas. And I'll defer immediately to Philip Corwin, who had his hand up. So go ahead, Philip.

Philip Corwin: Yes thank you. Can you hear me okay?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Philip. Go ahead.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Thomas thanks for the report. It's not a concern but a question. As I understood it, you said that the question of whether the GAC will remain exclusively advisory or will have some voting role within this single member on the decisions whether or not to invoke certain accountability measures is up on the air and is unlikely to be resolved by the Dublin meeting.

I'm just wondering whether there was any discussion in Paris of whether if at some point the GAC decides it does want voting rights within that single-member structure, whether that - those voting rights would be consistent with the NTIA condition regarding, you know, no governmental control of ICANN. It wouldn't give them control but it would change their role to some significant degree. So was that discussed at all in Paris?

Thomas Rickert: Well we did discuss the whole area of topics with respect to government's role in ICANN. What I can say is that one of the responses that we received to the GAC's questionnaire came from the U.S., and in that the U.S. government, NTIA, has - the U.S. government, I should probably say, has confirmed that that they would like to see government either having an advisory role or a voting power.

So there is no formal requirement for the transition issued by the GAC. We can certainly take the U.S. government's response to the questionnaire as guidance with respect to that. But also let me say that one of the countries that were very much in favor of giving voting rights to the Governmental Advisory Committee has confirmed through its representative, as a preliminary answer I should clarify, that there will likely need to be tradeoff.

Because, you know, there are two additional requests or features of our work that do not only come into play when it comes to government but also when it comes to other experts. And that is, number one, to keep our system

sufficiently open for new participants to enter. So let's say we had a supporting organization on Internet of things at some point in time, we would need to be flexible enough to allow for that.

And the second point is that our system must not allow for a single interest group to take control over ICANN or to have excessive rights. So this concern does not go for a single group but it applies to all groups in the ICANN ecosystem that we need to avoid capture.

So I think this maybe not a 100% satisfactory answer to your question but I hope that it can shed some light on where we stand with that discussion.

Philip Corwin: Thank you very much for the response.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Thanks, Philip. Thanks, Thomas. Go ahead, James.

James Bladel: Hi, Jonathan. James speaking. Thank you. And thank you, Thomas, for updating that. I think it was a fairly good meeting in Paris, and I do thank Thomas and the other co-chairs for really getting us unstuck a little bit, because I admit I was a little downhearted coming out of Buenos Aires at where we are and I feel much better about the group now.

And to Phil's point, I share a lot of the same concerns that Phil raised. And I just wanted to point out, and perhaps Thomas said this, and if so, I'll just repeat for emphasis. I didn't see what I would call a unified GAC position on some of these questions. It was just more some governments are responding more strongly on certain points than others.

And it is something that I think that was - that caught the attention of the rest of the community and the non-government participants. It was an active point of discussion throughout the rest. I'll just leave it at that. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, James. And thanks, Thomas, for that updated. It does seem like you moved a lot further. Is there any response you'd like to make to James or anyone else, Thomas, before - I know you've got a time constraint.

Thomas Rickert: No, just to maybe make it very clear that we think that our group has made sufficient progress to stick to the timeline we issued. That means that unless we get pushback to our report that we're going to put out in a few days, we think we are on track. So I confirm James' observation that after the Buenos Aires, things didn't look that good but now I'm very much on the optimistic side that our group will live up to expectations by the community to not jeopardize the transition.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks, Thomas. That's very encouraging then, and you must be encouraged. But I think we should let you get on with that piece of work now since we're past the top of the hour. Thanks for the update and good luck with getting your report out for public comment.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks (Jonathan), everyone thank you for your attention bye-bye.

Jonathan Robinson: Bye now. All right I think that leaves us the opportunity then to move onto the next item which is an opportunity to get under item 7 and update and potentially some discussion on the work going on on new gTLD auction proceeds.

Now here you will be aware that we of the very recent history whereby we as the GNSO council initiated some discussion about the perspective cross community working group on new gTLD auction proceeds.

That was received favorably by the various supporting organizations and AC's that we reached out to and various expressions of interest were received. And however before proceeding further we ended up with a couple of meetings taking place in Buenos Aires to really flush out some of the issues, process points and related areas of activity.

And those took place in two forums in Buenos Aires. One was the so called cross community high interest session which took place on a Monday and that was a sort of if you like an ICANN hosted session on behalf of the broader community.

And in addition there was a session which we essentially initiated on a Wednesday where there was input from a select group of ccNSO's who themselves had to deal with community based process to excess fund management and we had Steve Crocker of the ICANN board providing input there.

And so together those two areas produced a range of valuable and interesting input. And one of the suggestions that came out of in fact the high interest session I think on the Monday further developed a little bit of momentum during the course of the meeting was the prospect of a discussion paper preceding the work of the cross community working group.

Now in my mind this is an analogy or analogist to the preparation of an issue report if you like. It's a form of scoping document that takes into account various inputs and sets the scene in order to effectively set the working group or the group that initially developed the charter in fact on their way in the most well informed manner possible.

So that's where we seem to settle coming out the Buenos Aires meeting and to that extent I prepared as agreed and sent off a note to the various SO and AC chairs and the various stakeholder group, GNSO stakeholder group and constituency chairs.

And also included the ICANN board in that correspondence which was actually finally sent off yesterday informing them of the plan to do the work on the discussion paper and make sure that when the cross community working

group commenced its work in earnest that it was as well informed as possible based on broad community input encapsulated in a discussion paper.

There's two attractions to that at least two at least. One is as I have outlined already that we end up with a very well informed basis for the work of the cross community working group.

And in effect it also creates a measured pace at which to do this work and we're all acutely aware of both the size and importance of this topic dealing with the auction funds but also the stretch that community results are currently under.

So yes so those are some thoughts enough to set the scene that I'll note Amr's point on thinking that the high interest topic was very much focused on the substance of the topic rather than the process to deal with it and that's less than perfect.

And I think in many ways that's a critical point. This is not in the first instance about how to apportion or allocate the funds but rather to have a well worked process to deal with such funds and to make sure we're very well equipped to do that.

So any thoughts or comments I mean this is I guess fundamentally an update but of course there's always the opportunity to take comments, questions or input.

The timing of the proposed of the draw to the discussion paper is the plan is to try and get that out by the end of August such that it can be then put out for public comment.

So it's not just simply going to be fait accompli like many things we work on. It will be subject to further discussion and advised at public comment process.

Any comments, questions or issues that this raises for the council at this stage? Amr go ahead.

Amr Kaminski: Thanks (Jonathan) this is Amr. To be honest I haven't had a chance to read this yet or I think there was a letter also circulated through the NCSG on this topic which I also haven't had a chance to read. It might be the same one.

But to me right now I'm just not very clear on what the next steps are when we left this off at our last council meeting there was some issue with populating the charter drafting team.

If I'm not mistaken ALAC had promised that they would get this done as soon as possible. Is the membership of the charter drafting team complete at this point and then what exactly are the next steps if you could highlight those for me right now I would be grateful. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point and good question Amr. In essence we have effectively slowed this down. So rather than go straight into a charter drafting team which you remembered correctly was not fully populated.

And we will need to recheck the population of that charter drafting team when it commences its work in earnest. But prior to doing that the plan now is to take broad community input as provided in the high interest topic session as provided through the session we hosted as the GNSO in Buenos Aires.

And any other input that has been provided and structure that into a discussion paper which will then be published for public comment early September. And following the revision of that for public comment then to constitute the drafting team in earnest and hand over to that drafting team the discussion paper as a key piece of informational basis from which they might start their work.

So that's the plan. So we've effectively slowed things down and created the opportunity for more background information to be consolidated in a structured way.

I think that's a new hand coming and make your point again.

Amr Kaminski: Thanks (Jonathan) and thanks for the explanation but just to be clear as opposed to the actual cross community working group conducting this outreach to the community is the purpose of the outreach at this stage is it sort of like what we would have in a GNSO process of an issue scoping phase prior to a charter drafting team taking on its work and then a cross community working group following that.

If that is the purpose I guess that would answer my question. If not I would seek further clarification. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I think that's pretty close to the position Amr. You might call the preliminary issue report is probably the most accurate way of describing it in GNSO speak.

But I think we and I am very conscious that this isn't a solely GNSO effort which is why we haven't used GNSO terminology but in essence it's in the form of a preliminary issue report setting out the scope in advance of the charter drafting team.

Thanks Amr and just to be clear this is in no way precludes the charter drafting team for doing any of its own work but really provides it with a structured foundation and a form of credibility at the outset that there's been some initial broad community into the framing of the topic.

Indeed to your very first point you made dealing with issues such as the fact that there's going to be a structure to this. This isn't simply about leaping

straight in and saying right where should the funds be dispersed to, where should the money go.

This is much more about making sure that the appropriate structures and processes in advance of, you know, those need to be established prior to - they are the basis on which one would then establish where the (unintelligible) and the funding.

We will be conducting the outreach at this point. While the outreach was conducted by the Buenos Aires public meeting by those two sessions. The discussion paper will be prepared by ICANN staff and then posted for public comment.

I know one of the points that was interesting one of the points that Steve Crocker has made is that he is keen that this topic receives attention outside of the ICANN community as far as possible.

So I guess that will be incumbent on the staff publishing the discussion to make sure that we circulated it as broadly as possible and make sure that it's well known that this work is going on within the ICANN community.

Such that any, you know, others who may not follow very closely all of the myriad work going on in the ICANN community that may be a specific interest in this topic and make themselves known.

So hopefully we're doing a thorough job here and a careful job and we can make sure that we note attention or issue with the ICANN board that the community is doing a responsible and thorough job of this.

Personally I think we've shown great community maturity in the work that's been done in both of the cross community working groups dealing with ICANN accountability and the IANA transition.

And so we've built a great platform in which to take the next substantial and sizable issue and show that the community is maturing and not only can we work with relevant matters within the GNSO but we can also work more broadly in the cross community way and this is a great topic to take that further.

Okay thank you for your questions Amr it's great to interrogate these things a little and make sure that A they're properly understood by whoever is participating and that it checks. So thank you for that.

And seeing no other hands I'll draw a line under item 7 and move us onto item 8 which is the proposed selection timetable for the GNSO council chair. As you know this is an annual event that takes place at the election of a new council chair takes place at the annual meeting in or around October.

And so we are heading up to that time again and we will propose to formally adopt the timetable at the next council meeting in early September but there is an opportunity to have a look at this now and be aware of it coming along so as to make sure that this gets as wide as possible coverage.

And the discussion in the different groups and thoughts about candidates and effective running of the council and that we get the best possible candidates stepping forward within a structured process.

Staff do you have a document to share of that timetable draft so the council can review the headline points. I'm not sure if you have something you can post to the meeting room. If you do that would be great if not we will have to share that on lists shortly.

But there is a draft timetable that should be available either now or very shortly that we will propose for formally adopt at the next council meeting. If we just, if you don't have a document to prepare maybe someone who has

got that document in front Marika or another member of staff could just highlight the critical points in that timetable.

Marika Konings: This is Marika I'm just going to pull it up in Adobe Connect now, one second.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika and then I will take off that - okay so here you have in front of you the key elements of the timetable and we will formally adopt this at the next meeting as I say.

But essentially the key points to be aware of here is that this proposes to have a submission from each house should each house choose to submit a nominee by the 25th of September.

So this is something that the houses and the stakeholder groups and constituencies within the houses need to be aware of. And to the extent that you're in the Northern hemisphere and away on any kind of summer vacation during August this is something to pick up immediately in September and that will be what we need to do.

There will be a requirement for a candidacy statement which will be due very shortly after that, one week after that. So anyone who is a candidate nominated by the 25th of September approximately one week later there will be a requirement to provide a statement.

And then those candidates are likely to have some form of interview or opportunity to interact directly with the GNSO via the council managed weekend session in Dublin.

And that will lead then to us running the standard council meeting on a Wednesday the 21st of October in Dublin. And then coming as we've done in the past we'll run the meeting, deal with the standard business that closes out that year of business if you like.

And then invite the new councilors to join the next meeting a follow on meeting and the new counselors or those remaining on the council will be responsible collectively for electing the new council chair.

So any thoughts or comments or points on that? It's very standard it's along the lines of what we've done previously but we will formally adopt this. We'll publish it as a draft now. Please make your groups aware of it, please be aware of it yourselves and do whatever you can to try and make sure that we get the best possible candidates coming forward to stand ultimately for GNSO council chair.

It's an important job obviously, a responsible one and that one as I highlighted before requires significant time commitment on behalf of the individual who takes that.

Okay seeing no comments on that we'll expect that it will be more or less a formality. There was a good question from (Carlos) about do the co-chairs remain.

Not necessarily for example I mean there's a couple of issues. One of the co-chairs could be the candidate for the chair and there are also issues with respect to the stakeholder group.

To the best of my knowledge you wouldn't have a co-chair and a chair from the same stakeholder group. So there's a (knock) on implication for that as well.

So should a chair candidate be nominated by one of the houses from the same stakeholder group that the vice the current vice chair is but not being that current vice chair then there will be an implication for the vice chair.

So there are some implications for the vice chairs. One or both could be house nominees for the chair position and to the extent that they aren't and

the nominee is from the same stakeholder group there would be a need to change the vice chairs if my memory serves me correctly. Thanks for that question (Carlos).

So there will need to be some work done for those council positions over the next, the forthcoming month or so.

All right we've got a few items under any other business so I'll move us on then onto item 9 the any other business items and let's work through those. The first one 9.1 deals with a staff request for a time extension in preparing the issue report on new gTLD subsequent rounds.

You will have seen that request came to the council list recently. The initial plan was to do this within I think 40 days or 45 days from the receipt of the discussion paper but there was a request made.

So perhaps someone from staff might like to just sort of remind us of the nature of that request and then I'll call for any comments or questions.

(Steve Chan): Hi this is (Steve) from staff and I was the one that sent the request in to the council list. As the preliminary initial report is quite substantial we're actually looking at each of the issues that if you recall in looking at the charter there is a number of separate subjects.

We're actually looking at each of those (neutral) subjects for in depth analysis. And we believe this is a necessary step to properly scope the issues and to ensure that both the council is aware of issues as well as the wider public when this is published for public comment.

And then also to effectively set up the working group to be able to offer effectively if and when it does actually lead to a PDP. So staff is requesting an extension until the preliminary to be delivered at the end of August.

This would actually jeopardize the possible delivery and initiation of the PDP in Dublin which was discussed as the very earliest possible initiation for the PDP.

And I actually just did want to point out that that timeline was dependent upon some accelerated and contracted timelines for some of the steps within the issue reports steps.

So I think that would have required a shortened portion for the final report. So I just wanted to point out that, you know, based on the actual schedule for - it would actually have the final issue report being delivered sometime actually in the middle of the Dublin meeting.

So I did just want to point that out as well. So the possible delay here or actually the delay here would not be quite as substantial as it might. I think that's all I wanted to say there.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Steve). I think one other question might be useful to answer is has something changed in order to make it happen or has the scope of the work simply just as you've undertaken the work the extent of the work you've just realized quite how much there is to do or has something changed which made you have to re-estimate because that would be useful to understand I think.

Steve Chan: This is (Steve) again from staff. I think you've touched on it there that it's just once we actually sat down and started working on it we realized how substantial the amount of work is.

We had a sense that this might be the case and I think we hinted at the fact that it might take a little bit longer than anticipated. So as I mentioned, you know, we're looking at each of the subjects that were identified in the charter individually which, you know, it doesn't necessarily translate to, you know, that many different individual issue reports.

But the scope is more substantial than perhaps your normal issue report where you're looking at a limited set of issues rather than extensive lists that we're looking at now.

So I think it's just, you know, coming to the realization that there is a lot of work to do here.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay and Marika notes that this is not the first time an extension has had to be asked for and something we need to think about whether it is a realistic time. Are there any other comments or questions from councilors in relation to this request for an extension report? Is there anything else anyone would like to comment for Steve or Marika or any other thing that anyone would like to get on record? (Stephanie) go ahead. (Stephanie) I don't hear you yet.

(Stephanie Perin): Can you hear me now?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes (Stephanie).

(Stephanie Perin): Very good sorry about that, (Stephanie Perin) for the record. This is more a question of substance rather than the process. I find the request for an extension reasonable because there do seem to be a lot of issues.

And one of them it seems to me is a policy issue. When we were in Washington for our intercessional meeting Fadi spoke to us about the need to get to work on account of public interest.

And it does seem to me that until we get a better grip on what we mean by in the public interest we shouldn't be moving forward on scoping the next round because there is an awful lot of problems that stem from that.

I just wondered if that's an issue that you're dealing with in the issue report.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks (Stephanie) and obviously you refer that to the NCSG intercessional meeting that took place in Washington earlier this year. Is there any comment or response from staff in relation to the scope of the issue report and dealing with the issue of public interest or is this something (unintelligible) on this particular issue report.

Okay and Steve comments, Steve Sheng from staff comments in the chat that the area of global public interest is indeed listed as a subject for analysis within the scope here.

And apologies for my, our old typo referring to as the NCSG intercessional when it was a non-contracted parties house intercessional. Come in Heather, go ahead Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you (Jonathan). I would like to make some comments on behalf of the IPC. There isn't objection in principle to the extension that's been requested. However there has been a significant amount of discussion within the constituency as to perhaps assurance having been made by staff that this would not be delayed by accountability, by IANA transition, by any other ongoing ICANN activity.

And here we are now with a request for a delay and I just wanted to note for the record that those concerns had been raised. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Heather. I'm not sure if there's any response or comment to that but that's useful to get that on record. So go ahead (Edward) you're next in line.

Edward Morris: Thanks (Jonathan). This isn't the first extension request we've had recently. And the question to the staff is very simple, do you guys need more help, are you properly staffed? Is this something we should be looking into?

Jonathan Robinson: Any - Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. On that point and I'm happy to report that I think (unintelligible) thinks as well too and supporting the GNSO council in relation to the budget discussions we'll soon have a vacancy published for someone to join the GNSO team.

So additional hands are coming on board and of course with efforts like, you know, the (unintelligible) RDS as well as this PDP and we can use all the help we need.

So as I said hopefully we'll have more hands and even though there's a lot of work going on I don't think this delay we're asking here is not necessarily the result of a lack of staff support as (Steve) pointed out, you know, that the timeframe is relatively short and there are quite a number of issues that need to be covered or expected to be covered as part of the issue report.

So we hope as well that the extension we're asking is minimal and I think as (Steve) pointed out as well we actually anticipate that as well and may actually provide an additional opportunity to flag the preliminary issue report to the broader community as part of the Dublin meeting.

And ensure that everyone is aware of this effort and able to provide their views on this topic as it moves onto the next step.

Jonathan Robinson: Good, thanks for that Marika. Go ahead Amr you're next in line.

Amr Elsadr: thanks (Jonathan) this is Amr. Yes I was just going to basically say that the concern that's raised by Heather on behalf of the IPC and (Edward) as well quite (unintelligible) and I guess most of what I would have responded would have been in line with what Marika just said.

I will just add that this is not an issue that is sort of catching us off guard. The GNSO council I guess did sort of foresee that there may be problems in this

area which is why we pointed it out in our comments submitted during the public comment period for the ICANN budget and strategic plan.

And in response to this there has been some budget allocated to hiring two full-time employees to add to the muscle of ICANN policy support staff. So hopefully that will make a difference.

Heather is absolutely correct this is not the first time we've been seeing these requests for extensions and we have noted those and hopefully this is something we have planned for an mitigated in terms of future possible occurrences. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Amr. (Edward) is that a new hand are you coming in again onto this? Okay well unsurprisingly I mean to me at least and perhaps to others of you there's been some reasonably substantial discussion over this and it's more substantial than one would normally expect under sort of any other business item.

But given the substance of the issue to be covered in the issue report and the conservative timing it's hardly surprising. It strikes me that we don't - we are more or less in a position where we have to accept the request for an extension.

It covered the discussion; it's on record in the council's meeting the concerns or issues arising. So I think we have to go on - my suggestion to the Council, unless you object -- and I'd like you to let me know if you do -- is that we grant the extension and recognize that the request, should we note anything - I think probably it's suffice to say that we should note that there was some discussion of the issues around this, and that any interested parties should follow the record of this Council meeting in order to track those.

And I note from Bret a final comment that we should support the staff request for more time, but should be careful not to make this a pattern.

And I'll record overall that there has been quite some efforts, over recent times, to ensure that the overall timing of PDPs does not extend unduly, and we've done quite a lot of work to try and compress the time frames wherever possible. But also, those points that were made, that there has been more than one extension request lately.

And then (Heather)'s point in the chat about the prospective sensibility of increasing the public comment period, I wonder if we need to make that decision now. It's certainly something to consider. But right now we have the request for the extension, and I'm not sure that that's necessarily - and I think it certainly may be also something to note.

So perhaps we could accept the request for the extension, note that there has been some discussion, and that we will need to resolve the length of the public comment period.

So, Avri, when you say you suggest we just accept it, you mean we don't record any notes? Is that your suggestion?

Avri Doria: Essentially yes. I mean this is an incredibly - I'm sorry. This is Avri speaking. Essentially yes. First of all, it's an incredibly complicated report that we've asked for, and I wouldn't have been surprised at a request for an extension even if this had been the only thing on one or two people's plates that were writing it.

And, you know, I just - I guess I just don't understand the stress over an extension on getting this written. And so yeah, I suggest that we accept it. I think the staff knows that, you know, they're trying to meet all these many requirements, even without the other stuff.

And this part of our policy staff is not the policy staff that's working on the accountability and all the other stuff. That's a different group of people. So I

really wish we would just sort of graciously say, sure, you need more time?
Take it. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Understood, Avri. And I don't think - I don't see anything particularly ungracious about the response of the Council. For me it was important to record that there have been quite some discussions, and so that if anyone was interested to understand that, that there was a reference made to it. I didn't want to be sweeping it under the carpet in any way.

So I'd like to sort of stick with that to some extent, and just say, yes, we accept the extension, and note that there was some discussion, and if anyone interested would like to follow that, they are welcome to peruse the records of the Council, or words to that effect.

All right, let's grant that issue, that request, and then note that we still will need to deal with the time of the public comments.

And let's move on then to Item 9.2, which is a requirement to discuss the appointments of three experts from the GNSO to join the new working group to review IDN guidelines.

I guess what we're looking for here is - I'm not sure if anyone would like to add to this from staff or anyone else, but I suspect we're looking for potentially the volunteers to do this, or to locate these three - assistance in locating these experts. Mary, go ahead, and come in on voice if you'd like to add anything. Mary?

Mary Wong: Hi, Jonathan. Hi, everybody. Not really to add anything, but just to emphasize that the three experts from the GNSO would need to be endorsed by the GNSO. So while it would probably be helpful to have each stakeholder group consider if they wanted somebody on that working group, that ultimately the Council would presumably have to sign off on whoever those three experts are.

Jonathan Robinson: It feels to me it makes sense that the Council writes to the stakeholder groups, doesn't it, Mary? And corresponds with the stakeholder groups and reminds them of this call, and says do they have anyone they would like to put forward, because we'd like to endorse them. And do we need to endorse them? Isn't there a relatively short deadline for that endorsement?

Mary Wong: Yes. Unfortunately they'd like to get this group going. And you might recall that this has been under discussion for some time. So it is a deadline of August 3. I don't know how strict that is. This is not a policy project. I can check. But I think, Jonathan, you're right that if there can be coordination between the Council and each stakeholder group, sooner rather than later, that would be very helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I'll come to you, Bret, in a moment. Then I think we really need to send something out to the stakeholder groups, seeking any suggestions for those experts, and referring to the link to the call, and seek that. Mary, are you aware, has anyone been put forward at this stage? Do we have any names put forward at this stage?

Mary Wong: Jonathan, not to my knowledge. What we did have was an informal community group where there were several volunteers, including a couple from the registry group. Unfortunately as I said in my email, that group did not actually produce a list of issues as requested.

But for what it's worth, there were people who volunteered for that group who may well be interested. And I can send those names to the Council, if you would like.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I would think that what might be sensible there is when we call for those volunteers, call for those names that we referenced, the names of those that were in the group previously, so that we can link the two topics, let's get a communication out immediately. And if necessary, we'll have to

formally endorse this at the next Council meet. That's the only way forward I can see, unless someone's got a better or different idea. Bret, you had your hand up for a while. Come in.

Bret Fausett: It certainly seems like not very many slots. I know that we from the registry constituency, we've had three people express interest. And I think they're all very capable. I know we've had Jian Chuan Chang from China. Let's see.

Someone (unintelligible) - I just had it open. Dennis Tanaka from Verisign and, I believe, (Rubin Coles) from Brazil had all expressed interest from the registry constituency. So I know we've got at least three people from the GNSO interested, but how we narrow it down to three is going to be difficult.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Bret. I must say I'm not intimately familiar with the call. Is it limited to three? Or is it a minimum of three? What's the requirement there? Do we have a - go ahead, Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Jonathan. I think the suggestion was three, because this is going to be - I won't use the term cross-community working group, but the idea is to have representatives from across the community who are going to be affected by these issues. So that's the suggestion from the staff in charge of the project.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, well let's get the call out. Let's see how many names we get. And if it ends up being close to three, then that may be acceptable. If it ends up being significantly more, we might need to do some work on that in order to narrow it down somehow, and work with alternates or something like that. Okay, I think that deals with that one.

Item 9.3 is then the selection of a PDP working group for a facilitated face-to-face meeting. Now here is a program where there's an extra day put onto an ICANN meeting for a working group to get together to have a face-to-face meeting, with the idea this is a more productive session, or at least moves the

work forward rapidly in a way that wouldn't necessarily take place on calls, telephone call-type meetings or Adobe Connect-type meetings.

This is a flag in the item. It's part of the continued GNSO Council pilot project to improve PDP effectiveness. I think there is a proposal for a group on this. Is there - can staff remind me? There's certainly one group that's proposed, which is, I think, the privacy proxy group. Is it more than one proposed? Or are we just on the privacy proxy group? And are there - go ahead, Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Jonathan. Yes, it is the privacy proxy group. And the staff has looked at the list of projects we have, and PDPs, and who's in what stage. And it seemed that for the privacy proxy group -- because of their extending their timeline, which would go beyond Dublin -- at this stage of their work that they would be a good candidate.

What I should add is that this was discussed amongst the working group on the call this week. And there is some interest in doing that face-to-face meeting. But the group hasn't, you know, definitively said that it would like to.

I think it would be - and obviously the Council would be the ones to make the selection. I think the working group would welcome the Council confirming that this group should be the one, should the group choose to want to do it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Well that seems like the right way forward, that we just communicate, as a Council, to that group that based on analysis by staff, the Council accepts that this group would benefit most from the face-to-face meeting, and we would appreciate confirmation as soon as possible whether they would like to take this up. Are there any concerns or objections to that approach?

All right, Mary, let's get a note out from the Council to the group as soon as possible, in order to convey that message. And then we'll get a confirmation or not from them whether they'd like to stay for that.

9.4 is an item raised by, I think, Avri on list, and then further supported by David Cake, regarding the IETF proposal for a special use domain name. I'm not sure who would like to introduce that. I'll give the opportunity to either David or Avri to introduce this point and see whether there is any action we need to take at this stage. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, this is Avri speaking. And I'm not so much recommending that there's an action that we want to take. And possibly it's because I am attending the IETF meeting this week, and this was such an important topic here. But basically this process with RFC (6761) - which is the special use names that first came into place with .home, and now is moving on to .onion and .hall.

And what really concerns me is that there isn't a communication between the two organizations on this thing. So, you know, I come to the IETF meeting. I have sort of taken my eye off this for a little bit, although I think I've actually brought it up to the GNSO Council in the past, that we now have, you know, two different ways to assign TLDs.

And I just think that it's something we needed to be aware of. We need to decide, at some point, if there is an issue, RFC (6761), is, you know, a proposed standard. There will be more applications for special use general TLDs - I guess special use TLDs. They're not gTLDs.

But it's something that I think, whether it's part of the new gTLD process or some other, that we really just need to have sort of an awareness of it, and perhaps even a communication path, so that we know, in the GNSO, what's happening, and that there's communication back and forth on it.

And so in seeing this one so close to acceptance, I personally don't see a problem with it. But I really wanted to make sure that A, it's not just my opinion that I don't see a problem with it, but that we use this occasion to start thinking about how we want to pay attention to that in the GNSO.

Now once I leave, you know, the GNSO Council at the end of the year, I'll be much more part of the IETF process of creating special use names, and so perhaps I should keep my mouth shut. But it just seems like something that should be on the Council's radar. And that's why I brought it up. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. It's a good point. I have a question - I see David's coming in as well. But I have a quick question which could be - apologies. I see David is waiting, but I just had a quick question about - I know there's an IETF liaison to the Board. I wonder if there's any history of how IETF work is liaised with the GNSO; what format that's taken in the past.

So if anyone wants to comment on that in relation to this topic, please raise your hand. And, David, you come in now, please. David, we don't have you on audio yet.

David Cake: Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, we can hear you.

David Cake: You can hear me now. I'm sorry. I just had a technical problem just at that right second that I switched from (unintelligible) to Adobe Connect. Yeah, I've been following this issue pretty closely. I don't have any concerns about this particular proposal. I don't think the .onion name is one that there is interest within - you know, that's likely to cause any problems within ICANN. I don't think anyone will be interested in registering it particularly.

And so on that, it does raise a lot of issues on future concerns, for example, with the (unintelligible), the main name, which is not currently, you know, likely to go through it in the points, but might be of interest to some within the GNSO.

So a name that might be considered - it either become contention between people within the ICANN process that want to use a name and (unintelligible) within the IETF process, want to reserve it and so on. There's a lot of issues where a better coordination might be possible.

So I think - and while I think this particular proposal should more or less go through, it raises a lot of issues about how we consider coordination between the two bodies in the future.

I do think it's important to note that the name (unintelligible) IETF process almost always - well so far have - (unintelligible) names that are unsuitable for registration within the ICANN TLD process, when everything in the ICANN process is aimed at delegation, and there's a name that often explicitly they do not want delegated and dealt with by anything less than normal domain name (unintelligible) as we know it.

But still, there's a lot of interesting - there are issues of coordination between the two bodies, which I think at the moment the Board seems to be sort of saying, we perhaps should do these informally by just having people who are in both. But that's probably not a - I think many people are starting to think that in the long term, that might not be a reliable solution. That's all I have.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, David. Mary, I think you were next before I go to (James). So go ahead, Mary.

Mary Wong: Jonathan, I was actually raising my hand on behalf of Steve Sheng, who would like to speak especially to your question. So, Steve, if you're on the call...

Steve Sheng: Yes, Mary. Thank you. Jonathan, you had a question about the liaison role on this issue. I note that last year the IETF liaison sent a statement, the (IAB) statement, to the ICANN Board, and that was later copied for the (unintelligible).

So that note, he was saying at that time, the IETF was starting up discussion and inviting participation of interested parties, including members of the ICANN community that work. And I think as a result, David participated in those efforts. So hearing the conversation, I would agree with Avri and David that more and better coordination and discussions on this topic is warranted. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Steve. So then I'm just going to - for the moment, because we've clearly got a time constraint. And before I go to (James), I'd like to capture this action that the Council needs to consider whether there is scope for improved and possibly formalized future coordination with IETF, between GNSO and IETF activities.

So if we could just capture that as an action, please, Glen, and then we can come back to this. In the meantime, (James), I'll go to you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. I think you've hit on it, and it's something I've raised back when we were on agenda Item Number 5. But, you know, I'm glad to hear that we are being - that we do have a liaison on the IETF to the Board.

But I think that this issue in particular, and also the (RDEP) issue and perhaps some others, really make a case for closer coordination at the GNSO level, because I think that there are some policy issues that are not necessarily being directly addressed, but perhaps obliquely discussed with the IETF.

And some of the things coming out of that body will constrain future policy work, or have that potential. So just adding my voice to Avri's, that this is a concern that there is not currently a formal channel. And I think that there needs to be one.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, well we haven't quite resolved this, but it's clear there's some sufficient concern and points of note here. So we'll capture it as an action, too, to do some more work on this. We'll welcome any other points on list, and we'll think about what the best mechanics of that are.

We've just hit the top of the hour. There is one other item to be linked to the planning of ICANN 54, but I think we can take it off list. It's typically the responsibility of the vice chair, in coordination with the chair and policy staff, so we'll work together on that. From memory, it's David is the vice chair working on this. He'll be working with myself and the staff on this for the Dublin meeting. So we'll pick it up on list. We need to get moving on that.

And with that, I think I'll just check if there's anything else anyone else needs to raise. There's Philip. Now that point is somehow missing from this list, so I've missed off Corwin's point that he wanted to raise. Go ahead, Philip.

Philip Corwin: Thank you. Jonathan, I'll make this as brief as possible. And the reason this is getting on the list so late is that this is something which just arose came to my attention in my capacity as co-chair of the IGO curative rights process working group yesterday.

Yesterday we received a copy of a letter to Fade Chehade from Angel Gurria -- apologies if I'm mispronouncing that -- of the OECD, detailing that there was a meeting last week in Paris, attended by Chris Disspain of the Board; Thomas Schneider, chair of the GAC; representatives from the UN, WIPO and the Universal Postal Union; and several ICANN staff members.

There's an assertion in the letter that the matters concerning protection of IGO acronyms in the domain name system are becoming increasingly critical. And then there's an announcement that there was an agreement at this meeting in Paris that the OECD and the IGO colleagues will work with Chris Disspain, the GAC and ICANN staff to draft a comprehensive proposal on IGO protections for the GNSO's consideration.

Now let me tell you where our working group is. I am co-chairing a working group that's become increasingly restive. We made very substantial progress early on. We have one remaining issue, which is to make a decision on whether we need a new curative rights process based on the appeals mechanism, which in turn is based upon the scope of sovereign immunity of IGOs.

Staff put us in contact with a purported expert on that issue months ago. The person we were put in touch with was not up to date on current legal thinking on that issue and was not particularly - it was the consensus of the working group they were not particularly helpful.

We've been working with staff, and my comments here are in no way critical of our staff for the working group -- Mary and Steve. They've been doing a great job. But we're still waiting for identification of some experts, and for approval of some modest funding to get their assistance.

The concern raised here is that this letter appears to say that the GAC, ICANN staff, and some Board members want to put together a so-called comprehensive proposal on IGO protections, and that overlaps with the work of our working group. And I believe that raises both procedural issues as well as substantive issues.

Now we do expect to have a call. When I say we, I mean Petter Rindforth and I, the co-chairs of the working group, with Chris Disspain, Thomas Schneider, and some of these other parties in the next week or so, in which we get a better idea.

But frankly, we have a so-called IGO small group which has been generally non-cooperative and refusing to interface with our working group at all to - even though we're trying to assist them in their quest for effective curative rights protections at the second level.

And now we see the OECD -- which did attend our working group meeting in Buenos Aires, and has a very hard line position on the appeals mechanism, which we're not sure is justified by current legal thinking, on the scope of sovereign immunity for IGOs -- proposing what I have to tell you is perceived by quite a number of members of my working group as an attempt to end-run our work.

So I wanted to flag this issue so the Council is aware. I'm not saying it's a problem yet. It all depends on what this comprehensive proposal encompasses. But we have a working group that's bogged down because we can't get the legal expertise we need as input to complete our work.

We have an IGO group which has been non-cooperative with our working group, and is now engaging with the Board and the GAC to seek to develop its own so-called comprehensive proposal, which may impinge on the work of our working group.

So I want to make the Council aware of this situation. So we'll see what the next steps are. And I'd be happy to take any questions on that report. And again, I brought this issue up at the last minute, because the first time our working group saw this July 20 letter was yesterday afternoon.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Phil thanks for that. And it's clear and succinct in the context. What I'm hearing from you is that you want us to - you want to go on record of noting this concern. I very much suspect you're not alone with the concern.

And for the moment, we don't take any action but we have recorded the concern, and we await the next meeting that's due to take place between yourself, Petter, Chris and anyone else who's involved, and at which point you'll come back to us seeking further action or...

Philip Corwin: Yes. I'm not asking for any Council action at this time. I merely wanted to inform the Council of the situation. I'll report back to Council once we hold that call, which I expect to be scheduled within the next week. And we'll see how this proceeds.

But I want to make you aware that I'm co-chairing a working group where the members are becoming increasingly restive over being bogged down. And now with this OECD letter, their concerns are broadening. And it raises process concerns as well as potential substance concerns, depending on what this OECD/Board/GAC proposal, so-called comprehensive proposal, encompasses.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Well let's just record that and note that for the moment, and resolve to come back to it based on when you next raise it on the back of the meeting that's due to take place. Thanks, Phil, for bringing that up. It is a concern, and I'm sure you're not alone in that.

So I think with that, yes, we bring the meeting to a close. We've overrun slightly. Apologies for that. There was quite some comprehensive business to cover under this Item 9. Thanks, everyone, for your attendance and participation and active work, as usual.

Okay. Thanks, everyone. With that we'll call the meeting to a close, and look forward to working with you in the interim. And for those of you that are taking some form of summer break, I hope that goes well for you. And we'll be in touch shortly. Thanks again, everyone.

END