
ICANN Transcription

GNSO Council

Thursday, 18 July 2019 at 2100 UTC

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

[https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/ypqik0HjbpCD0IYZClbIKFjZQKi1UmV0rV9JBdTirAxnPTa4JZHNIe_oN5j9-Hb \[icann.zoom.us\]](https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/ypqik0HjbpCD0IYZClbIKFjZQKi1UmV0rV9JBdTirAxnPTa4JZHNIe_oN5j9-Hb [icann.zoom.us])

Zoom Recording:

[https://icann.zoom.us/recording/share/qe4Fv1Jb_nX462hO2j1fFIT2OhegobryIKu7EKGpw6CwlumekTziMw?startTime=1563483748000 \[icann.zoom.us\]](https://icann.zoom.us/recording/share/qe4Fv1Jb_nX462hO2j1fFIT2OhegobryIKu7EKGpw6CwlumekTziMw?startTime=1563483748000 [icann.zoom.us])

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

List of attendees:

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

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Pam Little, Michele Neylon (absent, apology sent – proxy to Darcy Southwell), Darcy Southwell

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Maxim Alzoba, Keith Drazek, Rubens Kühl (absent, apology sent – proxy to Maxim Alzoba)

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Carlos Raul Gutierrez

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo, Scott McCormick, Philippe Fouquart, Osvaldo Novoa, Paul McGrady, Flip Petillion

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Martin Silva Valent, Elsa Saade, Tatiana Tropina, Rafik Dammak, Ayden Férdeline (absent, apology sent – proxy to Martin Silva Valent), Arsène Tungali (absent, apology sent – proxy to Rafik Dammak)

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Syed Ismail Shah (absent, apology sent – proxy to Elsa Saade)

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison

Julf (Johan) Helsingius– GNSO liaison to the GAC

Maarten Simon – ccNSO observer

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Guest Speakers:

Kathy Kleiman – Co-Chair RPM WG
Phil Corwin – Co-Chair RPM WG
Jeff Neuman – Co-Chair New gTLD SubPro WG
Brian Cute - Independent Facilitator

ICANN Staff

David Olive -Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional (apology sent)
Marika Konings – Vice President, Policy Development Support – GNSO (apology sent)
Mary Wong – Vice President, Strategic Community Operations, Planning and Engagement
Julie Hedlund – Policy Director
Steve Chan – Policy Director
Berry Cobb – Policy Consultant
Emily Barabas – Policy Manager
Ariel Liang – Policy Support Specialist
Caitlin Tubergen – Policy Senior Manager
Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Operations
Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator
Sara Caplis – Technical Support

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 18th of July 2019. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you ever so much? Pam Little.

PAM LITTLE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maxim Alzoba

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. We have an apology from Rubens Kühl and he has given his proxy to Maxim Alzoba. Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Darcy Southwell.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: We received apologies from Michele Neylon and he has given his proxy to Darcy Southwell. Carlos Gutiérrez.

CARLOS GUTIÉRREZ: Here. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Carlos. Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thanks, Marie. Scott McCormick.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I'm here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Oh, perfect. Thank you very much, Philippe. Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Elsa Saade.

ELSA SAADE: Present. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Elsa. Arsène Tungali sends his apologies and he has given his proxy to Rafik Dammak. Flip Petillion.

FLIP PETILLION: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Osvaldo. Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: I'm here. Thanks a lot.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Martin Silva Valent.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Ayden Férdeline has sent his apologies. He has given his proxy to Martin Silva Valent. And Syed Ismail Shah has also sent his apologies and he has given his proxy to Elsa Saade. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Erika Mann has sent apologies, she's currently travelling. Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here. Thanks.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maarten Simon.

MAARTEN SIMON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. From staff we received apologies from David Olive and Marika Konings will be dropping from the call shortly for travelling purposes. On the call for the duration we have Steve

Chan, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Caitlin Tubergen, Ariel Liang, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Sara Caplis with technical support, Terry Agnew and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes. Thank you, Keith, and over to you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Nathalie. Hello, everybody. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Thanks for joining the call today, the 18th of July 2019. Let me take this moment to ask if there are any updates to Statements of Interest that anybody would like to note. Elsa, I see your hand. Thank you.

ELSA SAADE:

Thanks, Keith. I'd like to update that I've started working with an organization called Urgent Action Fund. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Elsa, and congratulations on the new opportunity and we look forward to hearing more about that. So, thanks for the update. Rafik, I see your hand.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. So, I meant to update the Statement of Interest. The company I work for my employer just went through restructuring and reorganization, so it's a little bit hard – I mean it's hard to explain but the name of the company changed and then

also for which division I work. But yeah, it's just related to restructuring, so I updated with the new name of the company.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Excellent. Thank you very much, Rafik. Noted. And would anybody else like to update a Statement of Interest? Alright. Thank you very much to you both. Let's move on then to Agenda Item 1.3, which is to review and amend the agenda. I'll just run through the agenda really quick. Nathalie, if you can scroll as we go, that would be helpful. Thank you.

After a review of the action items list and the consent agenda, we have a consent agenda item which is a motion to adopt the GNSO Council response to the GAC communiqué from Marrakech and that has been circulated in draft to the list. So if anybody would like to remove that item from the consent agenda, please advise before we get to that time. So we have one agenda item for the consent agenda. No other votes today.

Item #4 on our council agenda is a discussion about the council's letter in response to the ICANN Board on the status of our consultations regarding the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations that were not fully adopted by the ICANN Board, specifically Recommendation 1 Purpose 2 and Recommendation 12. And so, there has been a draft letter circulated to the council list.

I know that Marie Pattullo has responded just a few minutes ago on behalf of the BC, so it looks like we may have some discussion there. But that's something for us to discuss, it's not a vote today or a final decision necessarily, but we do have to discuss next

steps related to the council's responsibilities with regard to those two recommendations that the ICANN Board did not accept in full.

Okay. Next item on the agenda will be – scrolling myself – on a council discussion on ICANN Org's request for clarification regarding data accuracy and the Phase 2 of the EPDP process specifically around this topic specifically related to WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System, the ARS is the acronym. And again, we have circulated some documentation to the list associated with this in terms of our next steps. I think the plan here as proposed is for the council to acknowledge the letter that was sent to us to indicate that we acknowledge the issue that the council has an action for it and that the draft letter has been circulated. So again, an opportunity for us to discuss this in more detail.

Okay. Agenda Item #6 will be a discussion of the council. This will be the PDP updates on ICANN65 activities, so I believe we have representatives from each of the ongoing PDPs SubPro EPDP and RPMs to give us an update on developments from Marrakech.

Next item, #7 is a council discussion on the evolution of the multistakeholder model of governance. This is the Brian Cote effort. Brian is going to join the call and to give an update and to give us an opportunity for further council discussion on next steps related to this effort.

And then Agenda Item #8 is Any Other Business. We currently have three things on the list for Any Other Business. One is to discuss the public comment on the fundamental Bylaw amendment related to the ccNSO's change of Bylaws related to obligations around the IANA functions review appointment

process. The second is an opportunity to ask questions following the webinar that took place on the NomCom Review Implementation and Planning Team. And then the third is – I guess there’s actually four, sorry – reminder of the open public comment period on the FY 2021-2025 operating and financial plan. And then finally, a discussion of the repopulating of the IRP/loT, and again prior to the call this week, a notice has been circulated to the council list on this topic indicating that we received as council seven requests or expressions of interest, requests for endorsement, and that the Council Leadership Team has gone through a review process of those and indicated our recommendation that all seven of the applicants be supported by the GNSO in their applications to participate in the IRP/loT repopulation. So again, that has been circulated to the council list.

So, let me stop there, see if there’s any other agenda items that anybody would like to add. Any questions? Okay. I don’t see any hands, so let’s go back to the top of the agenda. Okay. Thank you, Nathalie.

Next item is to note the status of the minutes for the previous council meetings. The minutes of the extraordinary council meeting on the 28th of May were posted on the 13th of June, and minutes of the council meeting from the 26th of June were posted on the 13th of July. And with that, let’s go to our review of the action items list. So if we could go to the action items list first, that would be great.

I think in the interest of time today, we won’t do in-person review of the projects list. I think the projects list is pretty straight forward,

everybody should have the opportunity to review that individually but we will go through the action items list.

Okay. Nathalie, if I could ask you to scroll along as we go. I think the first item refers to the SSR2 Review Team. I think that most or some will remember coming out of the Marrakech meeting, right at the end of the meeting there was a letter sent by the SSR2 Review Team to the ICANN organization concerning concerns about the lack of, I guess, support and appointment of a technical writer, and so this action item is a reference to the fact that there appeared to be some concern among the SSR2 Review Team. At a minimum, the leadership of the SSR2 Review Team concerning ICANN Org's support and commitment and engagement in support of the efforts of the group. My understanding here is that since that time, the technical writer that was in question during the letter's writing apparently has now been appointed and perhaps some of the concerns have been lessened. I may call on Scott McCormick here. Scott, if you have just any very brief update on this one, I welcome you to provide it at this point. I don't want to put you on the spot necessarily, but the council has an action item at this point to ask for an update on this topic to see if there's anything further that the council needs to consider or do as it relates to the SSR2 letter that was sent. And if not at this time, then we will want to circle back at some point. Scott, I'm not sure if you have anything that you'd like to add for the council at this point on this topic.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Sure. Thanks, Keith. Scott McCormick for the record. Yes. Things have moved a little bit better since Marrakech. I'm not exactly sure

where we're at with the contract with the new tech writer but I know that there is someone appointed. I do also believe that we're still targeting for a draft report from the next meeting, so we should be on par for that. We're working diligently in small teams to get some of the last recommendations finalized.

KEITH DRAZEK: Great. Thank you very much, Scott. So, I guess at this point we'll consider that this action item on our list is sort of taken care of. But we would ask that if there's anything further that we should know as the council related to the SSR2 Review Team, its progress, any challenges that it sees, that we'll look to you to raise that question with us moving forward.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I'm happy to do that.

KEITH DRAZEK: Great. Thanks very much, Scott. Okay. Next item on the agenda is update regarding council liaisons. We have two action item bullets here. One is for staff to update the relevant documentation to note changes of liaisons and staff to review the existing liaisons to determine who is termed out at the upcoming annual global meeting and seek replacements and perform handover before that takes place. And I know that that is underway.

Next item is ICANN Org's preparation for its implementation of a new round of gTLDs. This is related to the letter that we received prior to Marrakech from Cyrus and GDD regarding sort of the

preparatory work and the thinking that's going on in GDD to help start planning for the implementation of the next round of new gTLDs, acknowledging that the policy work is still ongoing in the Subsequent Procedures work, but that at this stage I think the recommendation from council leadership is that the council invites GDD and Cyrus to come speak with us as a co-council at a future meeting, probably the meeting in August, and if not August, September, to provide perhaps a view in context as to what GDD is thinking to help us better understand the letter, particularly in the context of the ongoing policy work and sort of where the nexus is there and what the GDD is thinking as we try to support the Subsequent Procedures Group in completing its work.

If anybody has questions along the way here, please feel free to put up your hand, but I'll keep going through.

Next item is the CCT-RT recommendations. I think as we all know the Board, in considering the CCT-RT recommendations, did not accept quite a number of them and actually deferred or referred many of the recommendations for further consideration. A lot of those went to ICANN Org for further investigation of cost and expense and viability for implementation. Some of those were referred to council and some of those were referred actually to some of the PDP working groups.

And so, I think in this particular case, one of our action items was for the council to convene a small team to look at these and to determine next steps. I think at this stage, the plan is for the group to come up with some recommendations provided to council and for council to send a letter back to the ICANN Board concerning those recommendations and to include the recommendations that

were referred directly to some of the PDP working groups to basically say that in this case and looking ahead, any recommendations that are referred to a particular group under the GNSO auspices should come to the GNSO Council for action and for farming out, if you will.

Pam, I know that you are leading this effort. If there's anything that you'd like to say on this at this point, feel free. Please go ahead.

PAM LITTLE:

Hi. Keith, thank you so much. Pam Little speaking. I have not much to add apart from what you just said. Yes, and that's the approach we feel it's appropriate at this point. I'm hoping we could have that on our August meeting agenda so we can move things along, move forward. At the moment, those recommendations that are directly passed through to the GNSO, I'm hoping the small team can wrap up fairly quickly hopefully within next week or so, and then we can look into other recommendations that are passed through to our various working groups and maybe stakeholder groups as well. Thank you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Pam. Thanks to you and to Carlos and to Michele and we look forward to that next update from you. Thanks very much. Sorry, Pam, is that a new hand or an old hand? Oh, old hand. Okay. Thank you very much.

Alright. Next item on the agenda for the action items is the IRP IoT. I think this is on our agenda under Any Other Business for today. We can talk about that further in a minute, but essentially

as I said, the ICANN Board put out a request for expressions of interest for members to repopulate the IoT IRP – sorry, the IRP IoT, yes, I got that right – and the council has now come up with the recommendation based on the seven expressions of interest we received, requesting endorsements, and our recommendation is to support all seven of those. We'll talk about that more a little bit later.

Okay. Next item is the ATRT3 issue. We had two issues here. And again I sent a note to the list this week regarding this. One is that Erica Varlese, one of the GNSO appointed members of the ATRT is resigning from the position due to a change in job responsibilities. The question to the council was whether to try to go to an appointment process to identify a replacement. I explained in my note to the list that the GNSO actually had a very full slate – beyond full, really – of seven full members where as we were essentially allocated three guaranteed and we had four additional and all of them were seated, and that at this stage in the ATRT3's work, it probably doesn't make a lot of sense to try to replace somebody and have that person get up to speed. And so, the recommendation to council from the leadership team is that we not initiate a new expression of interest process and going through that. We don't have anybody that wasn't appointed who were waiting as a backup. So, the recommendation on that was essentially not to replace Erica on the ATRT3.

And then, the second point under ATRT3 was to review the questions that were post to us during our face-to-face meeting with the ATRT3 Team. They post some specific questions to us. We had some conversation in Marrakech but it was a brief

conversation, and we want to make sure that either the council or our SGs and Cs have the opportunity to respond to those and to provide the ATRT3 the input that it needs to do its job well. So again, I sent an e-mail to the list on this one. So please, everybody, review that and ensure that your SGs and Cs are aware of the questions that have been post and respond directly if needed, and if there's anything that the council needs to respond or address specifically as a council-related issue, we can take that on. But that's a sort of an ongoing action item.

I note that Cheryl has typed in the chat regarding the ATRT3 as one of the co-Chairs of that group. So, Cheryl, if there's anything that you'd like to say here, you're welcome too. But if not, no worries. We can move one.

Okay. Next item is the RPM charter amendment. This is an action item that we discussed in our face-to-face in Marrakech and that we are looking for volunteers. We have two in this particular case, Paul McGrady as the council liaison to the RPM group and Martin Valent had volunteered. If anybody else is interested, please make note of that and contact council leadership or staff or send it to the list.

But this group effectively has – there's two components to this. One, is work on the RPM charter to incorporate work on the IGO curative rights to the IGO protections issue, following the discussions that we had with the GAC and IGOs in Marrakech as well as the language that was included in the motion that we passed back in April on this topic that basically said that we were referring Recommendation 5 to the RPM group for further work. And so, that's one component.

Then the second component of this action item is for the council to look at redoing the RPM charter for Phase 2 generally, to try to incorporate some of the PDP 3.0 reforms and to essentially try to set that Phase 2 work on a path for timely and effective resolution. And so, there's really two components to this but it's a big and important effort around updating the RPM charter.

Next item is an update on the legislative tracker. This is also in progress. There's a letter that has been drafted on this topic that was circulated this week to the full council list. If you haven't had the opportunity to review it, please do so. I've received some feedback. I think Ayden responded just a little while ago. There has been some feedback but we need to make sure everybody's comfortable with the council's approach and sort of input to ICANN Org related to the legislative and regulatory tracking process.

To summarize, the letter essentially says that ICANN Org needs to take responsibility for this effort and to own this and to ensure that there are opportunities for input but not to – and this is the word I think we used in there – not to crowdsource it but rather to take a professional approach and make sure that ICANN has the resources and the processes in place to be able to do this in an effective way. And it also acknowledges the ongoing discussions that there needs to be some interaction or engagement between ICANN Board, ICANN Org, ICANN community including the GAC, and one of the things that's under discussion is perhaps the CCEG Internet Governance might be a possible venue for that further engagement, not to replace the other processes that have been identified in the letter but to augment. That's a very brief

summary of the letter. But please, everybody, review that and respond to the list if you have any questions.

Okay. Next item is the CSC effectiveness review final report. This one is subject to the appointment and the finalization of the IANA Naming Functions Review Team which is not yet seated, so this is something that is still on hold. If I have that wrong, somebody please speak up. This is again the IANA Function Review Team is not yet seated because of the ongoing questions around the appointments of the ccTLD member either ccNSO or not.

And I see Philippe is agreeing that that's correct. So, thank you very much, Philippe. Much appreciated.

Okay. Next item on the action item list is comments. So this is about GNSO council comments on the 2021-2025 Strategic Plan and FY20 Operating Plan and Budget. There's some work assigned to the SCBO to do some analysis between the ccNSO and GNSO comments. There's actually a call, I believe, next week between SCBO and the ccNSO counterpart to have conversation on this and perhaps other points. So we'll report out on that as that takes place. Just reading through here on the list. Basically, it talks about the collaboration between the SCBO and the ccNSO counterpart to come up with some recommendations, if necessary.

Okay. Next item on the agenda is the IRTP policy status report. As usual I'm not exactly sure what to say about this one. Council will determine next steps for the transfer policy. Particularly this third bullet, as part of our effort to identify the implications of the EPDP recommendations from Phase 1 and GDPR, that these questions

about the impact of all of that on the transfer policy among many, many other things – about 13 or 14 other things that have been identified from Recommendation 27 and I think this is an important point that we’re going to have to consider as something for further policy work.

Pam, I see your hand. Thank you for bailing me out, as always.

PAM LITTLE:

No, problem. Thank you, Keith. Yes, in addition to the GDPR or EPDP Phase 1 recommendation impact on the transfer policy, there was also this review of the transfer policy that was already started with the staff prepared status report, so it’s kind of two interrelated but separate efforts, if you like. So, this one is the overall review of the transfer policy. And the one pressing issue about the gaming registrars sending a form of authorization to registrant – we had some discussion on that issue with ICANN Org or some of the registrar representatives, and so there is some part we think that can take on its own or will be related to the transfer policy review. I’m hoping we could have sort of a more clarity in the next month or so, and maybe in our August meeting we could actually have this on our agenda and consider the appropriate mechanism to do the transfer policy review. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks very much, Pam. Very good. Okay. Next item on the agenda is the point on the IFR Team, the IANA Functions Review Team. I just mentioned this that the ccNSO has initiated

the process for fundamental change to the Bylaws or I should say a change to the fundamental Bylaws concerning the appointment process for ccTLD members to the IANA Function Review. And so, we as the GNSO as a decisional participant will have some responsibilities here, and that's something that we can discuss a little bit later on.

Okay, scroll down please. Okay. Next item is managing IDN variant TLDs. This is, as everybody knows, an ongoing process and the action here was for a small group of volunteers to be identified. We agreed that it would be councilors but not limited to councilors, that we would also invite other experts to participate in sort of the scoping efforts around how to tackle this issue and specifically looking at this from what requires policy development, what is truly implementation, how to look at this, how to coordinate with the ccNSO as requested by the ICANN Board in its resolution from Kobe. We have a small group of volunteers that have been identified and are going to continue working on this issue. If anybody among that group would like to speak to that now, you're welcome to. Otherwise, we'll circle back to it.

Okay. Next item. Okay, IGO-INGO curative rights. This I mentioned earlier we have the ICANN Board has now put up for public comments Recommendations 1-4 that we as council approved and forwarded to them and that we have now the action item to continue. We as council now have the action item to continue engaging with the GAC and the IGOs and internally to identify next steps for the re-chartering of the RPM-PDP Charter Working Group charter to incorporate that.

Okay, let me pause. I see Maxim has typed into chat regarding the previous issue, that there is work in progress on the IDN variants issue and the IDN guidelines issue that there's drafting work ongoing. So thank you, Maxim, for that. We certainly look forward to seeing the output of that small group work and making sure that we get some forward movement on that issue. So, thank you for that update. Okay. Next item.

Okay. And then the rest of these are coded in blue which means these are the items that are on our agenda for today, so let us move back then the agenda for today's meeting. Thanks to everybody for your patience in going through the action items. It's important to make sure that we all understand the things that we have before us in terms of work.

Okay. Nathalie, if I'm not mistaken, we're now at Item 3, the consent agenda. Is that correct?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: That's correct, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Nathalie. The consent agenda then is a motion to adopt the GNSO Council response to the GAC's communiqué from Marrakech. I would just note for everybody that the GAC really didn't say anything new or different in its communiqué from Marrakech. It restated several things, and so the language that you'll see in the motion and specifically in the table that the small team put together – thank you, Julf, and the group that worked on

that – is essentially a restatement of some of the previous points that the GNSO Council had made in relation to those topics.

So I think it's fairly straightforward non-controversial. There were some good discussion I think just in the last 24 or 36 hours on this on the list. And I believe we're in a good place on this one. So if anybody would like to raise a point here, feel free to do so.

Okay, Paul, I see your hand. Go right ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Keith. Is there any way for us to see the final table, how it turned out? I went to the link that Nathalie posted. I didn't see the table there.

KEITH DRAZEK: Got it. Thanks, Paul. So let's pose that question to Nathalie and staff to see if we can get the table up on the page. There we go.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. So, the change on Item #1 that there was a lot of e-mails back and forth that did not appear. Julf made a change earlier today at my request.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Keith, this is Nathalie, if I may.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Nathalie. Go ahead.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Apologies for this but if you see in the chat, I've posted the link with the date of the 18july19.pdf, and if you look in the actual text of the motions of the link I posted in the chat, that's the updated version. So if on the list, it's there.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Nathalie. Paul, I see your hand again. I'm sorry, I think Nathalie has pointed to us the link that she's posted and in the language that's in the motion, the change that you requested and that Julf agreed to, it has been incorporated. Let's just make sure that we're all in the same page there. And, Paul, if you'd like to get back in, feel free to do so.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah. I just want to make sure we're on the same page. Pam's post now reads, "As this advice from the GAC is merely a request for the Board to explain its actions, the GNSO Council sees little harm in the Board doing so." If that's what's in the column then that's great. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Paul, and thanks very much for confirming that the language is accurate and that we're all on the same page before we go forward with the consent agenda vote. Obviously, better to make sure that there's no question about any of that before the vote takes place and so there's no confusion. So thank you, Paul. Thank you, Nathalie and Pam and Julf and the team for all of the

work on this. Julf is confirming that's what's in the final version, so let us then move to the consent agenda vote.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Keith. I'll note also that Ayden is connecting to the call on and off but has obvious connectivity issues, so for the purpose of this vote, Martin Silva Valent will be his proxy.

Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say "aye."
Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion?
Hearing none, with all those in favor of the motion please say "aye."

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: I'd like to call on the proxies, Maxim Alzoba, Darcy Southwell, Rafik Dammak, Martin Silva Valent and Elsa Saade to please say "aye."

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all. No abstention, no objection. The motion passes. Thank you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you very much, Nathalie, and thanks to everybody. So let's then move on to the next item on the agenda. Nathalie, if we could get back to the agenda. Thank you. Thanks, Nathalie.

Okay, item #4 on the agenda is a council discussion on the draft council letter on the status of the consultations about the board's non-acceptance of two of the recommendations from the EPDP Phase 1 report. I sort of teed this up at the beginning of the call here. and essentially just to recap, we as the council had discussions in our face-to-face meeting with the ICANN Board during the Sunday working session in Marrakech. This topic was discussed – and I guess this is a general statement, although I think Marie has sent an e-mail to the list indicating perhaps difference of opinion from the BC's perspective. But I recall that the discussion in Marrakech centered around the Recommendation 1 Purpose 2 which essentially during the EPDP Phase 1 work was identified as placeholder language. The Board had some questions and concerns about approving that recommendation as it was and that there was general recognition that because it was placeholder language and that the EPDP Phase 2 was going to focus on that anyway that the Board's non-acceptance of that particular point or recommendation was non-controversial. And in the draft letter that we circulated to the council list, it essentially says that there's not much concern or not any concern about that one and therefore we're not looking to have the Board reconsider its decision to not accept that component of Recommendation #1.

The second point was regarding Recommendation #12 which specifically referred to the deletion of data related to the

organization field. And there was during our conversation with the Board in Marrakech, it was explained to us that the Board felt like it didn't have sufficient detail or sufficient understanding of that rationale for Recommendation 12 and specifically that point related to the deletion of the data, related to the org field when the data was not validated by the registrant. And at that point we had a discussion, there were some engagement. We had some folks from the EPDP Team provide an explanation in real time to the Board and we received as council some indication back from the Board that that further clarification was helpful and that that seem to be able to address their concerns and that they would reconsider or at least take that on board.

So, really what we're talking about here from a council perspective is what do we do with these two recommendations that were not accepted by the Board in full? And the recommendation and the letter that has been circulated to the list basically says no problem – and this is paraphrasing and generalizing – no problem with Recommendation 1 Purpose 2 for the reasons I stated and on Recommendation 12, here's the explanation in writing that we provided, that the council and others provided to the Board in Marrakech with the goal of having the Board reconsider its non-acceptance in full of recommendation 12. And again, I just want to point out here that these were recommendations that were forwarded from the council to the Board and were part of the entire package. These were recommendations and specifically Recommendation 12 was one that had consensus within the EPDP Phase 1 working group. And so, the question is do we go back to the Board and ask them to reconsider its decision regarding these two points?

Let me pause there. I hope everybody has had a chance to review the draft letter that was put together and I want to thank Pam and Rafik for helping to shepherd that while I was on PTO over the last week and if anybody would like weigh in at this point. And, Marie, I know you sent a note to the list, if you'd like to weigh in on this one at this point, you're welcome to do so. Marie, go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks, Keith and thanks everyone. I don't really want to read out what I've just sent to you but nevertheless. First off, of course thank you for the work putting this together. It's always much appreciated what somebody has done.

As I explained, I haven't really had a chance to speak to my members properly yet but my initial feedback from them on your draft letter is that on Recommendation 1 – so the first paragraph, numbered paragraph in your letter – the beginning fine, I absolutely agree. But the second sentence, the one that starts “as such the council does not expect, it will need to take further action,” that's the one that is a concern to the BC members to whom I've spoken so far.

They tell me both those that are on the EPDP Team itself and also they're so following it closely, that we really do need clear language. We, the council, need to tell the EPDP Team that we need to get this reworded. Now, all of us agreed that it's within scope and all of us agree it was just placeholder language but if we don't actually tell the team to reword it, it's not going to happen because it's not on their timelines. It's not on their roadmap. So, that's a big concern and the Board with our discussions with them,

we know that they also agree in scope but they haven't got a Purpose 2 to adopt if we don't give them wording for perhaps two. So, that's our concern with your first paragraph.

The second one, the one that has Recommendation 12, while yes there was a lot of discussion in Marrakech. There were a lot of people come to the mic, it was very, very interesting, our take on it is different. That we really do you think that Recommendation 12 should be amended, that the deletion option should be removed? Now, understanding that the contracted parties are concerned in particular about inaccuracies, there can always be an option that would allow them to update inaccuracies within the org field as appropriate, if that's necessary. But the way that the para 2 in the draft letter is worded and that council now all agrees and we would really like to resubmit Recommendation 12 as it was in the beginning, is not really our understanding. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Marie. I'm sorry, I'm getting some feedback there. Thanks, Marie. I'm happy to take further look at the point on the Recommendation 1 Purpose 2 and I would welcome Rafik to weigh in for us, the council liaison and vice-chair to the group on that point. And we don't have to make any decisions on this today, obviously. This is a discussion point. There's a draft for consideration and an opportunity to discuss it now, so we can certainly take on any suggested edits or discussion points and it might make sense for us to work on having a small team come together to further work on this. But, I think on purpose – on the second point related to Recommendation 12, I don't know that the council at this stage should be in a position or can be in a position of recommending changes to the recommendation as it is.

I think we're looking at this from council procedurally to say, the council approved the recommendations including Recommendation 12 which had consensus coming out of the EPDP Phase 1 group and the Board didn't accept it. And the Board didn't accept it because they said they didn't have sufficient information and that now the indication is that with clarification that's been provided and that we're suggesting to provide, that that satisfies the questions that they had. And so, I don't think the council at this stage should be in a position of suggesting changes to a recommendation. It's really about holding the Board to account for accepting or not accepting in this particular case a recommendation that was sent to them with consensus support from the GNSO. So, that's my initial take on that and I'm happy to have further discussion on this point, either one of these.

So, Rafik, I see your hand. Thank you, Darcy and then Pam. Go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thank you, Keith. This is Rafik speaking. For the first recommendation, so it's marked as placeholder as you know in Phase 1, and so we had that expectation that will be reviewed in Phase 2. The EPDP Team is expected to cover all the tasks that are assigned to it, so I'm not sure what is the concern here. We know that we have an aggressive timeline but we are going to cover all the left over and that's why we have this kind of two – I'm going to say two track but this idea of two priority and so we are covering. We are going to cover all those items. So, we just started with the SSID but we are going to cover everything at the

end. So, what I can say that – to stay ensure that this will be reviewed and done in duly timely manner.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Rafik. I'm sorry, I think I heard Marie suggest that perhaps some language in the charter or some language needed to be reformulated, to help inform or to help instruct or guide the EPDP Phase 2 work. I understand from your comment and from other discussions that this certainly is on the agenda and on the radar of the EPDP Phase 2 for its work. And I guess I just want to try to better understand that if not now then coming up, over the coming days and week or so, as we try to bring this to a conclusion, is there something that the council needs to do as it relates to updating the charter or further defining the scope to instruct EPDP Phase 2 work or does the EPDP Phase 2 work really sufficiently have what it needs to get the job done. And it's just a matter of making the time to get to it. So, with that let me hand it over to Darcy.

DARCY SOUTHWELL:

Thanks, Keith. Darcy Southwell for the record. Like Marie, we need to review this with our stakeholder group as well. I think as far as the first point on Recommendation 1, I think at this point this is something that would need to be done later on, and I'm not sure I understand why the EPDP Team needs to address that issue so quickly as opposed to at the end. Because there is definitely information that is necessary from the legal analysis in order for them to define that purpose.

Then on Recommendation 12, I guess my concern is that the final report had this as a full consensus I think from the chair's perspective but a consensus item from the EPDP's team's perspective and the council approved it to go forward. So, I'm a little concerned that we're trying to maybe relitigate it. You know, providing the explanation that we discussed with the Board, I think provides some parameters that should give comfort to what we really mean there. And that delete did not mean what some of the assumptions meant. So, I would hate to see this matter sort of relitigate. The recommendation is what it is and I think the registrars are going to suggest that this needs to stand as is in the explanation especially if it gives the Board understanding of what was really meant and that's part of the process here, should be acceptable. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Darcy. And to your point, we all need to take this to our stakeholder groups and constituencies. There's no decision imminent on this. This is the first time that anybody's seen a draft this week, so certainly this is just our first opportunity to discuss this. I need to just acknowledge that a time check, we've got quite a bit on our agenda and we've got some guest coming, so we need to work through this pretty quickly here. I have Maxim and Rafik in the queue. Maxim go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think that speaking about Recommendation 12, it seems to have an overlap with our Item 5 on data accuracy because the recitation where "an established

fact” that information in the organization field is not true, basically. I believe that we will need to just cover it clearly in our letter to the Board as an explanation. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Maxim. Okay, Rafik last word on this one before we move on.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Keith. I would like to make a long comment here. Yeah, I agree with the previous comment from Darcy. For the Recommendation #12, I think our role here is not to try to do reword recommendation but give explanation and that request was made to the EPDP Team to give an input and we using what we got in fact. I mean not common EPDP Team response but the different input from the groups that they submitted. We also have the discussion in Marrakech, so I think it’s more really about giving rationale and we should not go into substance at the council level.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Rafik. Marie, thanks for bringing these points to our attention and let’s make sure that we keep this conversation going and probably it makes sense to have further discussion on e-mail and if we need to get a small group together, we can certainly do that.

I see that Paul has also noted in the chat that the IPC is looking at this as well and he is still working on it, need to consult with the constituency. So, absolutely. And again, let’s make sure that we

as council are all in alignment as far as we can be on next steps here. Because as I've noted before in conversations on this point, this is important because we're in uncharted territory, we're setting precedents. You've heard me say this before, but the Board essentially did not accept all of the recommendations that were sent to it and we need to make sure that the process that we have in place ensures that the Board is held accountable and that we have a clear process for engaging with the Board and resolving any differences of opinion in terms of their non-acceptance of consensus recommendations that were sent to it by council, as the result of EPDP.

So, with that, thank you, everybody. Let's move on to the next agenda item #5.

Okay. This is council discussion on ICANN's request for clarification related to data accuracy and specifically around the data accuracy reporting. We received a letter on the 21st of June from ICANN Org. It was essentially seeking a better understanding of the EPDP Team's plans to consider the subject of data accuracy and specifically as it relates to registration data, related services and as highlighted in that communication specifically the WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System.

Nathalie, thank you for putting the letter on the screen. Basically, the action of the council now is to consider our response on this. I think at this time after conversation of the leadership team, that our recommendation is to respond – we have an obligation to respond and acknowledge this – and basically say that GNSO Council is aware of this issue and that we're taking it on board and that it's something for the council to consider next steps on. And

then, we need to figure out as council exactly what we do with this.

As I noted in my e-mail setting this up to the council list this week, this is one of the topics, one of the items that was listed in Recommendation 27 from the EPDP Phase 1 that identifies possible impacts from GDPR and the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations on other existing policies and procedures. So, I see this as one of the 12 or 13 or 14 topics that have been identified. We kicked off the community discussion during the Cross Community Session in Marrakech on this topic broadly and I think this really is part of the effort that we as council working with ICANN Org and specifically the implementation review team for the EPDP Phase 2 work, that we've got to tackle this and we've got to tackle it somewhat holistically.

So, my recommendation and you'll see in the language, if you haven't read it yet, is basically an acknowledgment of the letter and acknowledgment of the issue and indicating that it is now with the GNSO Council for consideration and to figure out next steps and how best to deal with this specific issue around data accuracy and specifically the WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System, that clearly has been impacted by GDPR and the Phase 1 recommendations.

So, let me pause there and see if anybody would like to get in queue and discuss this. I don't see any hands going up. And again, this is just an opportunity to discuss – there's a draft out for consideration or at least a proposal for next steps. Marie, I see your hand. Go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Keith. Sorry, I'm having connection issues, so my apologies for being slow. The way that we see this at the moment – and again I need to talk my experts about this but this is really just an initial kickoff for the conversation – is that the EPDP we know is looking at this as part of Phase 2 and we know that it's already included in the timeline and the work plan that was published – Rafik could correct me here – I think it was the 31st of May. We also know that the team has asked for a legal analysis on the accuracy requirements.

So, all of that wrapped up, we think that right now the council should simply respond and say this issue is in the hands of the EPDP in Phase 2 and that if Org has any issues that it sees around ARS, just bring it to the EPDP and in the meantime, keep publishing the ARS reports. I hope that make sense. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Marie. So you're specifically referring to the WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System, the ARS, as being one of the topics for the EPDP Phase 2. I just want to make sure when you say this issue or this topic that we're being clear it's the ARS that you're referring to. Because some of the language in the letter it appeared to talk a little more broadly about data accuracy, whereas I think it was specifically referring to the fact that they're challenged in publishing the ARS reports or the impact on them.

I'm sorry, I'm tumbling this a little bit but I just wanted to make sure – and we don't have to finalize anything here right now. This

is just really the first opportunity for us to discuss this and to figure out how we're going to respond.

Marie, if you'd like to get back in, feel free. Otherwise, I've got Rafik in queue. So, Rafik, why don't I hand it over to you and if Marie would like to get back in, she can do so. Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Keith. It's more of kind of a general comment here. I know we just started discussion about the letter and the approach you are suggesting, but in general I think we need to be careful of what putting more tasks and overload the EPDP, to try to cover as much items as possible. But maybe we need to think in the future that we cannot fix all related WHOIS or RDS matters, and maybe we need to initiate EPDP in the future. I am not saying when but it's something we should plan as the council in particular since like for the case of ARS or accuracy, it's kinds of tricky since it's not a consensus policy. So, this is more like in general comment that's something that we probably need to think about later on.

Since I think Marie made some comments, I will double check because I don't think, for example, we sent any question yet to the legal counsel, we are doing here a few but I need to check again about the question we have.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Rafik. No, problem. That's great, thank you. A couple of points here before we need to move on and get to our PDP updates. Our guests are on the line. So, look, on this

particular topic I think Rafik makes a good point is that the EPDP Team during Phase 2 obviously has its work, it has its scope, it has its charter and in order to help and to enable that group to move as quickly as possible and coming up with some consensus recommendations to develop a standardized system for access and disclosure or UAM or whatever we're going to call it, we need to make sure that we're not adding things over having things included in the mix that might be better handled elsewhere. I'm not making any assumptions or statements about whether this is the fact here or not. I think this is something that we need to dig into a little bit further.

So what I'd like to suggest as far as next steps on this one is that for this and for the other items that we're talking about today where there is an e-mail out to you is to the council list. Let's use that to begin an electronic conversation about moving these things forward. In other words, we can't wait a month until our next call to continue this conversation. If we need to set up separate conversations or sides small groups to discuss particular topics, let's do that. But in the meantime, let's please use the e-mail threads that I have begun with the spamming that I did to you all – I apologize – over the last two or three days, but let's use those as the opportunity to sort of move these conversations forward.

And with that, let me pause here and to say all of these things we're talking about today are just the initial conversations and we'll have plenty of opportunity to discuss them and to socialize with our stakeholder groups and constituencies before coming to any final decisions.

Alright, before we move to the updates from our PDP Working Group leadership, any final comments? Let me then hand it over – if you could scroll down please, Nathalie? Thank you very much.

I don't recall whether we had an order. If somebody could help me out here in terms of who's going first and who's available. I see Jeff maybe having some Zoom issues. Could somebody help me with who's going first here?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Rights protection is listed first.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Cheryl. It makes sense. Thanks for pointing me to the actual agenda language. Let's go to the RPMs. If I could hand that over to Phil, Kathy, and Brian.

PHIL CORWIN: Yes, this is Phil. Can you hear me okay?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes, I sure can. Thank you.

PHIL CORWIN: Good. Kathy is also with me. I'll be presenting. She's available to answer questions. Brian Beckham is not on the call because it's past midnight in Geneva. Before I start, congratulations to Kathy.

She just started her new position this week with American University Law School in Washington. That's great news for her.

Overall, my report – I don't think I have scroll control here, so if someone could scroll down – but our RPM Working Group is in good shape. We have a tight timeline but we are sticking to it and staying at it. We've made good progress for the last few weeks.

Marrakech – I don't think I need to read all of this. You know that we've been at this for over three years. Hopefully, PDP 3.0 will shorten the future timelines. We've completed most of our work. We're right now finishing up the review of Trademark claims and Sunrise registrations to RPM's key to Trademark Clearinghouse registrations. And when we wrap that up, which will be very soon, we're going to get to our final substance topic which is review of the operations of the Trademark Clearinghouse and the standard recoding marks in the Clearinghouse and then we'll be moving on to our initial report draft in this call.

We operated very efficiently with two subteams on the claims and Sunrise issues. We didn't make major earth-shattering recommendations, not surprisingly, but we have made some substantial and important recommendations that received large support within the subteams that have been generally accepted within the full working group as we review them and that I'm optimistic we'll have consensus report at the end of our process. I think we can move to the next slide.

In Marrakech we held four sessions. I was not there physically. I was there remotely starting at 4:30 A.M. Eastern Time on some mornings. The subteams used three and a half of the four

sessions to finalize their development of preliminary recommendations and also hashing out answers to the charter questions. At the second half of the final session, the Trademark Claims Subteam presented its status report.

Following ICANN65, the subteams gave final approval to their deliverables and submitted their preliminary recommendations to the full working group. The last two weeks we held two 90-minute calls of the full working group reviewing that. We completed our review of the Trademark claims recommendations. The call held yesterday, we used about half of it to begin our review of the Sunrise answers and recommendations. Next slide please.

We discussed all the questions and the five individual proposals on claims which did gain wide support and we reviewed also the draft language for proposed answers, important background materials for the community when they review the initial report. We did accept individual proposals and we had a number of them but none of them received wide support in the subteam. If we can move on to the next one.

The Sunrise Subteam had more substance to go through. They had 12 charter questions and 10 individual proposals. They completed all their discussions. Again, no wide support for any of the individual proposals except for part of one of them. The subteams wrapped up their work in Marrakech. We're in the full working group review stage now. Next slide.

This is the timeline. We started back in 2016 and we're now in July 2019. We've completed the subteam reviews. The full working group is considering them and it's going very quickly.

Generally they're accepting the subteam work. We launched the Trademark Clearinghouse review. Next month we expect to wrap that in October and then initiate drafting the initial report, which really is reviewing all the recommendations and proposals.

I personally hope that the full working group will give some additional attention to the URS proposals because, frankly, there's almost three dozens of them. We kind of threw in the towel back in Abu Dhabi because of internal problems in the working group. I don't think it's fair or efficient to burden the community with that many proposals on URS [inaudible] which are likely to gain consensus support in the end. But we'll see how the full working group feels about that. Then we project delivering our initial report for public comment in January of next year, reviewing the public comments February to April, and delivering our final report to you in April.

It's a tight timeline but we have been sticking to it recently. I do want to note that since an extremely disrupted member of the working group exited – thanks to assistance from council – the work has gone much more efficiently and productively, and we thank you for stepping in and helping on that matter. It's clear now that we no longer have that problem, how much it was slowing us down, and really showing the descent and making it difficult to reach agreement on many issues. So we have that in the past now.

So that's it. We're in good shape and we hope not to have to extend our timeline at all. I assure you that the three co-Chairs working with staff take this timeline very seriously and we've really been pushing hard to stay with it scheduling the longer sessions,

extra sessions sometimes, whatever it takes to stay on the timeline. I'll stop there and see if there are any questions about our work and our progress. I don't know if Kathy has anything she wants to add before council asks questions.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks very much, Phil. Much appreciated. Kathy, feel free to jump in. She typed, "Nothing to add." So if anybody would like to ask any questions to Phil and Kathy regarding the RPM PDP Working Group timeline and progress and next steps, feel free to do so now. Go and put up your hand.

Okay, I don't see any hands going up. So, Phil, thanks very much for that update. Very comprehensive. I'm sure if there are any follow-up questions, we'll make sure we get those to you and Kathy and to Brian. So, thanks very much for the update.

PHIL CORWIN: You're very welcome, Keith. Take care.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks very much, Phil. Thanks, Kathy. Okay, so with that let's then move to the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. I will hand it over to Jeff and to Cheryl.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, thanks. Hopefully you guys can hear me. This is Jeff. I'll start and I'm sure Cheryl will jump in. We have just a few slides in here because we did a lot of our update just before ICANN in

Marrakech and, to be honest, although we've had plenty of meetings and not much from a status perspective has changed. At ICANN65 we had two sessions for Work Track 5, two sessions for the full working group. Full working group – I think it was really productive – discussed the document that was put out by GDD staff, the Assumptions document, which I understand that you have had some conversations on as well. So that was a pretty lengthy conversation there.

Then we discussed in the next session the topic of application prioritization. Just at this point it's worth noting that although we discussed the Assumptions document at length during our session, there is not a plan right now to do any kind of formal or any kind of response to the Assumptions document other than perhaps just the fact that there may be a statement saying that some of the assumptions are based on topics that are still being discussed in the working group, and so to make sure that whatever assumptions are made are flexible enough to adopt to whatever comes out of the policy group. I'll note that there weren't that many assumptions that were related to the work that we're doing. Most of it was truly operational but there were some that got into some topics that are within that we're already discussing.

Within Work Track 5, I think they're making some pretty good progress at least in terms of getting through the preliminary recommendations and identifying what issues are still open, and since ICANN65 has been through a lot of the subjects, albeit the most controversial one, how to protect, if at all, non-AGB terms, geographic terms, the topic that was started this week and I think will take up some time.

I think that's as far as what took place. If we could move on to the next slide.

A lot of this is repeat. Just before the meeting in Marrakech, we did a webinar for [you all] and in that slide there were some tasks or list of current challenges and asks of the council, so some of these are going to look very familiar. I know Steve had sent you the slide last night. There were a couple of changes I made more specifically – a little bit on the slide but more specifically on the next one. One of our challenges is just the great amount of subjects we have to cover. This is hopefully something PDP 3.0 will help us in terms of making sure the scope is narrow and much more in bite-sized pieces that can be tackled. So, we are getting through it but it's one of the reasons why it's taking so long to get this far.

The other issue we're having now is that now that there's the Assumptions document that was out there and it's starting to seem more real to people we're having some working group members that haven't shown up in a long period of time just starting to show up, some new members joining. This is not to say we don't like new members, we do. But there's not often the appreciation of all the work that has been done in the last couple of years prior to getting to this point, and so we spend a lot of time saying, "Thank you for raising that." This was discussed two years ago in Work Track 2 (or whatever it was) so that does take some time. I'm not sure how much we can do about that either now or in the future, but that does tend to slow things down.

I think this next two, they're not new. They're something you've heard from me for a long time, which is that there's a lot of

members that have strongly held beliefs and opinions, and they will stick to those regardless of the whole notion of a multistakeholder model, which is to try to see if we can come to a consensus with some kind of compromise solution. It's very difficult to get people to move off of their initial position which relates to the next bullet point, because they either lack the authority or the incentive to compromise. So there are working group members there from either companies or from Stakeholder Groups or Advisory Committees. My feeling is that they may not be comfortable in talking about compromise solution because they may not believe every authority to do so, and so that tends to get a little bit in the way.

We do have hundreds of people within our working group if you put the Work Track 5 and the rest of the group together. But despite the fact that we have such a large group, we only really get active participation from a small number of people. Again, that's not to put down that small number of people. They are very valuable. But we do have some good attendance on the calls and we do have some people that I've noticed that have not been there in a while but they don't necessarily participate either through chat or through the discussions.

If we go to the next slide on the asks, I think there are some important things that we'd love some council feedback on, not today necessarily but through your discussions. Obviously to the extent that we're getting towards recommendations and final, there are likely to be people not necessarily thrilled with how we're coming out on some of the recommendations or how we measure consensus. So the liaisons have been [slipping] and Elsa had

been there and paying attention, so they're certainly available if there are any issues.

One of the other things that certainly comes up is to help us navigate through – there's a number of interdependent topics. For example, the Assumptions document I know is presented to council to the extent that it may impact our work. It would be good to see how we can help you, whether that's leadership of our group or the group itself. There's IDN variant issues I know that you have been discussing, I don't know if it has been done yet, but I think Edmon is leading some efforts, so understanding the relationship between those and then of course with things like the Name Collision Analysis Project and other areas and string similarity, which I know that the ccNSO has approached you all on a potential Cross-Community Working Group. I know that you've had some discussions on it. Thank you, Keith. I think Keith or Pam or someone has forwarded the e-mail I sent to Keith early on before Marrakech on the leadership team's thoughts of a separate working group or effort with the ccNSO.

So, with all that, I think you all can help us do a couple of things, reinforce the notion that the substantive discussions would take place at the working group level, to the extent that council members or others in the community think that substance will be addressed that the council after we submit our report or that it will be individual topics like the Assumptions document and others that may be raised. We should quickly dispel the notion of the council substituting itself for the substance of the policy. And then the hardest point for a lot of people in the working group but one which operate every day on is to reinforce the notion that absent

consensus on changes recommendations are likely going to be that which we did in 2012 for good or for bad. To help us clarify dependency for the next round and that has to do similar to a previous bullet but specifically with the RPM PDP, the IGO PDP, and all these other efforts that are ongoing.

Sorry for taking a lot of time. I'm looking at the chat. I don't know. Keith, do you want me to address Marie's question?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Jeff. Why don't I just jump in here real quick with a couple of comments? And then we'll get to any Q&A including Marie's comment here on chat.

First, Jeff, thank you very much. You and Cheryl, as the leadership team and the entire PDP Working Group. I want to just respond specifically to your asks and acknowledge that yes, these were in large part asks that you identified to us before Marrakech. You reminded us during our council meeting in Marrakech that these were still outstanding in some cases, and that we still actually now today have some open action items here to get back to you and to provide some either council perspective or engage with you more directly in terms of some of these next steps.

Specifically, I want to refer to your bullet 3 and bullet 7 here which relate to the interdependent topics and the dependencies on other ongoing PDPs. I agree with everything that you've got here in terms of the list but I think bullet 3 and bullet 7 are probably the ones that are most actionable for us at this point in terms of clearly, we need as council as the managers of these processes

and processes yet to come, how do we engage? How do we make sure that we're doing it in the most effective and efficient way possible and then coordination with all of the relevant parties?

Your point about the IDN variants related issues with string similarity, those clearly have some interface or interrelation with the ccTLDs and the ccNSO. The Name Collision Analysis Project obviously there's interest there obviously at the Board level as well as SSAC and potentially others. I think you're absolutely right that we as council need to step up and lean in to these issues to try to identify and clarify the issues so there's a common understanding of the path forward. That includes, as you noted, the bullet #7, any independencies with the RPM group.

So I just wanted to acknowledge this, acknowledge your previous communications on this. Thank you for the e-mail that you sent. And yes, that has been forwarded to the council list. Thanks to Flip and to Pam for flagging that for me and making sure that got circulated. So let me just stop there. Jeff, thank you and we'll get back to you for Q&A. You can respond to Marie and if anybody else would like to get in queue, please do so.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Keith. I actually agree with everything you said. I think those are the two most actionable ones and the sooner we can get guidance to it, the better.

On Marie's comment, yes. We are tackling the string similarity, confusion analysis, the confusion objection. Those are all topics within our PDP. We've had extensive dialogue on those. We have

recommendations on those in the initial report and comments back. I think at least with respect to plurals, I probably would not be going too far in saying that there was a recommendation or is a recommendation with the group to address that situation I think in a way that the BC and others in the community will be satisfied.

Pretty much any topic that you can think of is being addressed at the PDP. If not, please just refer these questions to us and we'll absolutely let you know not just that we're covering them but [inaudible] the council just doesn't start additional [inaudible] for a few years. Also to the CCT Review Team where all of the recommendations that were adopted by the Board and referred to the GNSO and the SubPro PDP in particular, these are all within topics we've been discussing. So, yeah. That's, I guess, my answer.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Jeff. Just so you know, your audio is getting a little bit choppy there. I think we heard you perfectly fine but it was starting to cut out just a little bit. Anyway, we'll [solder] through.

I have Pam in queue. We've got about five minutes left and we still need to get to the EPDP update. Pam, over to you.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Jeff. I just want to make a couple of comments very briefly. I want to thank Jeff for bringing those challenges that the working group is experiencing or having to the council's attention. It's really helpful in informing our PDP 3.0 ongoing work and as well as the council as the manager of the overall PDP to be aware

of those issues and challenges. I think your group is one of those who really does this well. I was the one who thank you for acknowledging our council liaison, the PDP Working Group, Elsa and Flip, to be your assistant to the group.

The final point is about your fifth bullet point in the slide we're looking at, reinforce the notion that substandard discussion or policy discussion will take place at working group level. I totally support our notion and that idea. I think it's fundamental to the operation of the PDP and the multistakeholder model. That principle does not only in my view apply to this working group but all other working groups. Thank you so much, Keith and Jeff.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Pam. And thanks, Jeff. Any other questions or comments on the Subsequent Procedures Group before we move on? Cheryl, do you have anything else? Feel free. But in the interest of time, perhaps we can move over to Rafik for the EPDP updates. Alright, thanks, Jeff and Cheryl. Much appreciated. Rafik, over to you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Keith. I don't have slides here. This is the written update I shared a few hours ago in the council lead, so I'm happy to go through it and maybe give more details and I'm happy to answer any question.

Since Marrakech, the EPDP Team continued to work following the idea of use cases. The team members were asked to propose different use cases they see from their perspective. There was just

an agreement. In the call we had a few hours ago that since we have at least I think 19 or 20 use cases, it's better to consolidate and to have a few that the team members can go through. So we'll follow the tentative schedule with the target to finish the review by August in order to prepare for the face-to-face meeting and to use that more effectively and not just to continue discussion on use cases. The whole idea of using this kind of tool is really to try to derive some policy principles or preliminary recommendations and to use that to start, to have the building blocks for the society.

On the other hand, this may be relevant to us, it was discussed before, is that at the same time the EPDP Team had the [inaudible] priority to worksheet and the priority too, as a reminder, are the leftover topics from Phase 1 and those in temporary spec annex. Again, the worksheet is a tool for summarizing the shorter questions and the deliberation, all relevant background documents and the legal questions in a single place. So again, we will use that later on when we work in our recommendation.

Related to also the previous agenda item, the EPDP Team received the letter regarding the accuracy errors and discussed briefly. I don't think we have any action now for the EPDP Team on that matter.

As you know, the EPDP Team with regard to resource asked for face-to-face meeting as we know that it was quite effective and helpful for Phase 1. So we already started for the face-to-face meeting in September in L.A. with the travel arrangement. The leadership team to work with the professional facilitator and noticing that they were quite helpful in previous face-to-face session.

Also the team initiated and got an early input from the different groups regarding the charter question and also it's planning to review them. Since we are working now in the use cases, the idea is that we create the document that the EPDP members can add their input and question. So I can see we are trying here really to cover so many parallel workload while we're focusing on our initial target or milestone for November to get the initial report.

In the meantime, the Legal Team also started with its first call to review the question. The kind of approach agreed here is to review the question coming from the EPDP Team, to rework them if needed to make them more, I'd say, legal question and [avoid] that we ask any policy question and so on and then sending them to the legal firm. For now we have the budget and we will see if there is maybe later if we need more resources but it seems it's okay for now.

That's it as an update in the last two weeks after Marrakech. You can see we are already trying to cover several fronts.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Rafik. I just have one follow-up question. I see that there's a summary timeline slide on the screen right now. In the interest of time, we don't have time to go through that in much detail. If there's anything that you'd like to flag or specify in there, feel free. But I have one follow-up question for you about the use cases, and I understand that there has been quite a bit of discussion about the use cases and that there's quite a list of proposed use cases and also some I think corresponding concern that if the list of use cases that the team has to work through is too

long or has too many variations that it risks extending the time required to complete Phase 2 and to complete this portion of Phase 2, I'm just curious if you have any thoughts about that for council at this point. If not today then maybe that's something that we could talk about a little bit more in the future. Is the group biting off the right size bite rather than trying to capture dozens and dozens of different use cases rather than perhaps taking a look at a smaller number that might encompass a broader range rather than getting into super explicit or super specific granularity. Anyway, a question for now or for later, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. It was in fact the topic for discussion in the last EPDP call. The concern was shared that we have a long list here and there was a proposal in the way how we consolidate the use cases. We have a small team, let's say, volunteers to work with the staff maybe to try to see how you consolidate following some categorization, kind of the idea of clustering. But there is the consensus now within the team we should have a more consolidated use cases to be effective and then we can review, acknowledging that sometimes there might be some specifics. But yes, I think we are moving from this list of 19 use cases to more consolidated or clustering of use cases since we have quite aggressive timeline here if we are targeting by end of August to finish the review. I think that corresponds to the concerns previously.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you very much, Rafik. If anybody else would like to ask a question of Rafik, please do so now. Otherwise, in the interest of time, we need to move on to our next agenda item which will be the discussion of the evolution of the multistakeholder model and our guest, Brian Cute. Any final questions for Rafik?

Okay. I don't see any hands. Rafik, thank you for the very detailed update including your e-mail summary to the list earlier. Much appreciated.

With that, let's move on to the next item on our agenda which, as I said, is a discussion with Brian on the evolution of the multistakeholder model effort that he's shepherding. Brian, why don't I hand this one over to you and feel free to provide whatever update you'd like. And if there's questions specifically for GNSO Council or our stakeholder groups and constituencies, please flag them for us. Brian?

BRIAN CUTE: Thanks, Keith. Can you hear me well enough?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes. Audio seems good.

BRIAN CUTE: Very good. Thanks. Thanks, everyone. I'll try to be succinct here. What I want to give you is a snapshot of where we are in this particular process and know that there will be a call for public

comment going out sometime next week. What I want to do is give you a snippet or a preview of what you're going to see in that and so you can anticipate the questions that we're trying to answer at this point in the process.

Where we are it's through community input we developed a list of issues of the community, I believe, may be hampering the more effective, more efficient functioning of the multistakeholder model. Those issues are have them prioritized and in some cases, as you see, consolidated or combined in the list of 11 that remains.

In Marrakech we began pivoting toward the process of developing a work plan. So now the community has identified the issues that we think are hampering the effective functioning of the multistakeholder model. Now we turn toward developing a work plan. And in that work plan, we're going to map the issues. We're going to identify who should take on the task of developing a solution. We're also going to ask that owner, if you will, when they could propose a solution in a five-year timeframe of the Strategic Plan 2021-2025. Then finally, what resources do we need.

So we're now starting that process – developing a work plan. The first step here is launching public comments to get answers to two specific questions at this point in time, and these are really critical first two.

First, we want to make sure as I suggested before, we don't need to duplicate what's being done elsewhere in the community. So we want to identify to this public comment if there's work being done or work that's going to be done – and GNSO PDP 3.0 is one of those perfect examples – where a solution or an approach to

addressing this issue is going to be developed, we need not create a new work stream.

So the first question to answer is, is there other work going on? Are there other solutions being developed? Let's identify those. And if that's the case then let's take some of these issues off the table.

Having answered that question, the next question is, okay, if there's an issue that there isn't a solution being developed or there's work being done but it doesn't fully address this issue, then who should take on that task? Which AC, which SO, the community as a whole, ICANN Board or ICANN Org, which entity should take on the task of developing a solution or an approach to address this issue and approve the functioning of the multistakeholder model?

Those are the two questions we want to really answer in this next call for public comment. Nathalie, if you could scroll down.

I just want to show you a couple of excerpts, what you can expect to see. This is prioritization of the work. What you're going to see in the public comment – this is just an excerpt – is you'll see a box that has the definition of the issue of prioritization of the work, has defined through community input and public comment. Then you'll be prompted in terms of providing a comment to identify existing solutions or solutions that are being developed. Secondly, you should take on a task. Then thirdly, further prioritization of these issues.

Nathalie, if you could scroll down a little bit more? What you will see is I have mapped, for example, a prioritization of the work. ATRT3 has a Board Working Team (WT1) and it's developing a potential recommendation for the Board with respect to finance and prioritization. So you will see indicated where there's other work that's ongoing in the community that may develop a solution or an approach to this issue. You'll see that on each of the definitions of the 11.

You're going to ask to consider, is this the solution that can address the issue? In this case, ATRT3 may in fact develop a recommendation for the Board with respect to its role in finance and prioritization. What's also come through in the community comment and input on the question of prioritizing the work of ICANN is a clear view from the community that the community itself should be prioritizing the work and it should have, if you will, the lead role in prioritizing the work of ICANN. And if that's the case, then there's still an open question. Should the community take on the job of developing an approach to prioritizing the work? These are the questions that are going to be presented and looking for public comment in response to that.

The last column is prioritization. Once you've had the chance to review the other work that's going on in the community, in other work streams that are developing solutions, a chance to think about whether that would address the issue or not, and if not, saying this is the entity – whether it's an AC, SO, the Board, ICANN Org, the community as a whole, and who would that be – then prioritizing issues in terms of priority. Does it need to be addressed right now? Is it critical to improving the functioning of

the multistakeholder model? Or is it a priority but it's going to be addressed by some other solution someplace else in the community? Or do you think this is not a priority at all, that this may not be addressed at this time? So it may be another opportunity to prioritize these issues as we work to a shorter list and we work to identify the owners of issues that need to be addressed.

That's just one example. Nathalie, if you can scroll down. I know this one would be a distinct interest to the GNSO, and that's precision in scoping work. This is an issue that was identified by the community as the lack of precision scoping the work in a number of different work streams and creates delay, can create duplication of work. So this has been identified as an issue. And you know very well that in PDP 3.0 for GNSO PDP in your implementation plan that in number 11, you're going to address precision scoping the work for PDPs, and that's excellent.

A question might be, is the solution or approach that the GNSO is developing and how to be more precise in scoping work, could that be the solution for other community work streams? Remember, in this work involving ICANN's multistakeholder model, there's a community-wide dimension to some of the inefficiencies. So the question is, okay, GNSO is developing an approach, some tool so that in PDPs it can more precisely scope its work and deliver all those efficiencies that we all desire. Could that be a solution that is useful for other work streams, other working groups in the community? Or should some additional work be done on this issue?

These are the questions that are going to be framed in the call for public comment. So I'll stop there. I wanted to give you a flavor and give you hopefully a clear understanding of what's being asked and I'm happy to answer all your questions.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Brian. I'll open it up for questions in a moment but just a couple of comments for me. First, thanks for the detailed explanation here and helping prep us and our respective stakeholder groups and constituencies for what's to come in the comment period. I would absolutely acknowledge and thank you for the observations around PDP 3.0 and your specific statement that if there's ongoing work in a particular track that we don't really need to or shouldn't need to redo the work or to duplicate or to replicate work that's already being done. But I take your point that work that's being done, for example, PDP 3.0 could be valuable in forming the work of other parts of the community or the community broadly. So I think that's an important distinction that this process that you're shepherding is going to respect existing work and existing processes, but at the same time, look for opportunities for those efforts to inform one another. I think that'll be really helpful.

Let me stop there and see if – I don't have my chat box up or participation box. Okay, would anybody else like to get in queue? Tatiana and then Darcy.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Hello. Tatiana Tropina speaking for the record. I'm really sorry. I'm in the middle of nowhere and I might have connectivity issues but I

will still try to speak. My question is – I saw the first public comments on the model and I will not name those who submitted them, but I saw the tendency in some of them to reopen the very controversial issues or the issues of content the GNSO Council basically was trying to resolve in the PDP 3.0. And I'm wondering, Brian, who and how will decide that this issue will not be reconsidered or reopened? Because if your team decided this/you decided, it might look like a bit of arbitrary decision, right? So I'm just wondering have you thought about this process? Have you thought how to filter this comment? Then again, how not to say that it was arbitrary? I mean there is definitely a tendency to reopen some of the issues which are covered by PDP 3.0. Have you taken this concern into account and how you're going to address it? Maybe it's not the topic – to me it's conversation – but I would like to flag it. Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thanks for the question, Tatiana. Yes, if the purpose of this work stream is not to open up questions that have been decided or settled by any particular AC or SO. To the contrary, this is to identify issues that community agrees or issues that need to be addressed going forward, and I would anticipate that through the comments that are submitted, we can certainly identify where there is work being done, where there are solutions that have been developed or being developed, and also that we're not reopening questions that have been decided and closed. That's really not the purpose of this work stream and I appreciate you highlighting that concern.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Brian. Thanks, Tatiana. I'm back. My phone line dropped. I'm not sure if there's anything further on that, Tatiana or Brian, in that exchange. If not, we'll go to Darcy and then to Paul.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Thanks, Keith. Darcy Southwell for the record. Thanks, Brian, for putting this together. This is extremely helpful for us to understand the next step in this process. Curious about what you're thinking when it comes to prioritization in ownership. And if I heard you correctly, the next public comment would put this framework out, which is very helpful to visually see. But what are we thinking when it comes to community feedback? Community members may not be fully familiar with prioritization like, for example, whether some things are already being addressed and if they feel comfortable with how it's being addressed. And who is the ultimate decider? If the community comes back and – I'm just going to throw it out there – it says, "PDP 3.0 doesn't need to be addressed, it's not a priority." It seems like we're setting ourselves up for a little bit of a fight in the event that the community comes back and says, "No, don't do that," but, in fact, the work is already underway and the responsible group feels it is a priority. So, I'm just wondering how what your thought process is there.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you for that. Well, I'll say again what has come through to me and I need to reflect it more clearly is that these issues – this is prioritization of the issue, not prioritization of the work of the GNSO through PDP 3.0. The other thing that's important is that these issues, many of them have what I call a community-wide

dimension. That is prioritization of the work, for example. What's come through in the comments and the inputs is that it is the totality of work across ICANN, among other things, that is creating the stretch of resources, the inefficiencies, the delays, and that in fact there really isn't a mechanism or an approach for prioritizing the totality of the work across ICANN.

Again, these issues have a community-wide dimension. So GNSO has decided it's going to work on PDP 3.0 and go through implementation, and that's fantastic. Nothing will change there. So I don't see an impact. I don't see the prioritization question impacting the GNSO's work. It's more of that community-wide dimension of the issue. Is this an important issue to address across the community or not? That's the answer that I think that the public comment is asking for.

Then there will be the go forward. Okay, there's work being done at GNSO. Is that work that can be helpful across the community? If so, perhaps the work stream doesn't need to be developed here for that reason. I hope that was a clear enough response.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Brian. Thanks, Darcy. Darcy, if you'd like to follow up, feel free. Otherwise, we're going to need to move on. I know Paul McGrady has typed in the chat and I think this is something that we'll continue to talk about and certainly, Paul, we can discuss this, the issue, the evolution model or discussion more broadly but anything specific as well. Brian, in the interest of time, I think we need to move on to our AOB before the call runs out of time. So I want to thank you not just for joining us today but

for all the work that you're putting into this. We look forward to further engagement with you as the council going into and coming out of this public comment phase, and you really want to make sure that the input that you're receiving from council perhaps directly as well as from our constituencies and stakeholder groups is helpful as possible in your efforts. So, Brian, thanks very much for making the time today.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you, Keith. Thanks, everyone.

KEITH DRAZEK: Alright, thank you all for that. We are almost out of time here but we have a few AOB items so please bear with me here.

The first item on our AOB agenda is the public comment on the fundamental Bylaw amendment. As I said specifically at the beginning of the call, this is related to the ccNSO's plan to amend the Bylaws related to appointment process for the IANA Functions Review Team as a decisional participant in the Empowered Community the GNSO will have roles here. And so I just wanted to note that there is a public comment period and the close date is the 26th of July. Thanks to Emily for putting that into chat. So let's make sure that we focus on that as a council and if any stakeholder groups or constituencies have concerns about that, please make sure that we identify those rather than later. And of course, if anybody has comments along the way, put up your hand. Otherwise, I'll just roll through these.

Okay, we have an 8.2. AOB is an opportunity to ask any follow-up questions prior to Marrakech. There was a webinar that was focused on the Nominating Committee Review Implementation Planning Team. So for those who either listened to that webinar or would like to listen to it, it was recorded. We as the council and our stakeholder groups and constituencies have the opportunity to ask follow-up questions, and so I just wanted to note that.

Cheryl, I see your hand. Go right ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, thanks for that, Keith. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. As part of the leadership team on that NomCom Review Implementation Planning Team, I'm perfectly happy to take questions on notice and ensure a prompt interaction with the NomCom Implementation Review Team. I'll help you in the interest of time as well.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Cheryl. It's really helpful. I appreciate it. I guess it shouldn't come as any surprise that you're on the leadership team of that as well as a few others. So, thank you. Question for you in terms of timing as it relates to feedback or questions to the group. Is there any timing that we should be aware of as council in terms of next steps for the Implementation Planning Team?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for the question, Keith. It's a good one. Very briefly, there was a couple of our 27 issues recommendations that are all going

to be implemented that we did seek AC/SO input on that feedback time has formally completed, but we are only just beginning our analysis of any feedback that we have got now. So as of next week's call, we will be starting our analysis. That's going to take us a couple of weeks so I would suggest the time is right if you want to get something here.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah, very good. Thanks very much, Cheryl. That's really helpful. So if anybody wants to provide input or ask any questions at this stage, the time is now. And please flag it for council if there's anything that we should be looking at. Thanks, Cheryl.

Next item on AOB is a reminder of the open public comment period on the draft Financial Assumptions and Projections for the FY 2021-25 Operating and Financial Plan. I think on this one, it's important for me to also flag that there was an e-mail – and I forwarded this e-mail a couple of days ago now to the council list – but there was an e-mail received back in I guess the first week of July that was flagging that the triggering of the period within which the GNSO as a decisional participant in the Empowered Community could initiate a rejection action related to the operating plan and the financial plan.

Just please, everybody, look at that e-mail. I apologize for the delay in getting that forwarded. It was sent only to me. It hit my e-mail box the day that I went on PTO. We're taking steps to make sure that that single threaded approach is dealt with and addressed and we don't have a repeat of this. This is obviously an

important function of the GNSO as the decisional participant in the Empowered Community.

I know Erika has responded to the e-mail I sent with raising a question or some concerns. I will follow up with Erika. She was unable to join the call today. I will follow up with Erika on e-mail and if anybody else feels like they need to weigh in, I would encourage you to do that. The deadline, if I'm not mistaken, for any GNSO action in that regard is next week, the 24th. So I just wanted to make sure that that was noted during our call today.

Then finally, the last item on the agenda 8.4 is the repopulating of the independent review process IOT. I mentioned this during our review of the action items at the beginning of the call. But we have gone through a process following the Board's notice that it was seeking expressions of interest for new members to join and repopulate the IRP-IOT, the Implementation Oversight Team. One of the things that the Board said in its communication is that it encouraged applicants to seek support of their respective SOs or ACs, and we as such basically accepted the expressions of interest.

We had seven people respond and seek support from the GNSO. The list is in front of you on the screen. I won't read the names. There are familiar names there. The council leadership team got together earlier this week and had a conversation, reviewed the list, the EOIs that were submitted, and basically said that we thought that all seven of them would be worthy of our support and that basically that was the message that we're giving to you as the full council. Endorsement I guess is the word that Cheryl is correcting me with.

What you have before you here is a list of seven applicants who will be selected or appointed by the Board but that the GNSO Council leadership team is recommending that we provide our endorsement to this list of seven. So if anybody has any comments or questions about this now, feel free to raise it. If you'd like to discuss it on the list, that's fine as well. The deadline for the EOIs to be submitted to the Board is the 31st of July, so the end of the month. So we have a little bit of time if there's any bit of discussion that needs to take place here. But this is the recommendation from the council leadership team and that's essentially what we have before us.

So, any questions, comments, thoughts on AOB? Any of the four items? Feel free to get in the queue.

Okay, I don't see any hands. Nathalie, is there Any Other Business, anything else that we need to address today before we conclude the call?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Nothing, Keith. That's all for today.

KEITH DRAZEK: Alright, thanks, everybody. This is Keith signing off. Thank you all very much for joining this GNSO Council call of the 18th of July 2019. With that, we will conclude the call.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]