**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Council meeting
Thursday 22 February 2018 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-22feb18-en.mp3

Adobe recording: https://participate.icann.org/p6hlh7tp8de/

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://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, Darcy Southwell
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Donna Austin (apology sent – proxy to Keith Drazek), Keith Drazek, Rubens Kühl
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Carlos Raul Gutierrez
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo, Susan Kawaguchi, Philippe Fouquart, Tony Harris, Paul McGrady, Heather Forrest
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Martin Silva Valent, Stephanie Perrin, Tatiana Tropina, Rafik Dammak, Ayden Federline, Arsene Tungali
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Syed Ismail Shah
GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison
Ben Fuller - ccNSO Observer – (apology sent)
Julf (Johan) Helsingius– GNSO liaison to the GAC

Guests: Brian Aitchison

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
Mary Wong – Sr Director, Special Adviser for Strategic Policy Planning
Julie Hedlund – Policy Director
Steve Chan – Policy Director
Berry Cobb – Policy consultant
Emily Barabas – Policy Support Senior Specialist
Ariel Liang – Policy Analyst
Caitlin Tubergen – Policy Senior Manager
Mike Brennan – Technical Support

Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Operations Support – apology sent
Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator
Julie Bisland - Secretariat Operations Coordinator for the GNSO

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 22nd of February, 2018. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Pam Little.

Pam Little: Here.

Terri Agnew: Donna Austin sends her apology; proxy to Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Here.

Terri Agnew: Rubens Kuhl.

Rubens Kuhl: Here.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. And, Keith, I heard you as well. Darcy Southwell.

Darcy Southwell: Here.

Terri Agnew: Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Here.

Terri Agnew: Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Good morning.

Terri Agnew: Good morning. Marie Pattullo.

Marie Pattullo: Here.

Terri Agnew: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Here.

Terri Agnew: Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Here.

Terri Agnew: Philippe Fouquart.

Philippe Fouquart: Here.

Terri Agnew: Rafik Dammak. I do note that we have Rafik on. We'll go ahead and check his audio. I do believe we're getting a dial out for Rafik so it'll be a moment. Actually, Rafik, I do show your telephone line is connected, you may be muted, but I do show Rafik connected on both telephone and Adobe Connect. Stephanie Perrin.

Stephanie Perrin: Here.

Terri Agnew: Arsene Tungali.

Arsene Tungali: Here. Hi, everyone.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Here, Terri, thank you.

Terri Agnew: You're welcome. Tony Harris.

Tony Harris: I'm here.

Terri Agnew: Tatiana Tropina.

Tatiana Tropina: Present. Thank you.

Terri Agnew: You're welcome. Martin Silva Valent.

Martin Silva Valent: here.

Terri Agnew: And again, I note, Martin, you're on audio only. Ayden Férdeline.

Ayden Férdeline: Present, thank you.

Terri Agnew: You're welcome. Syed Shah.

Syed Shah: Yes, here.

Terri Agnew: Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I do also have Cheryl connected on audio. Her line may be muted as well. We'll go ahead and check into that. Ben Fuller sends his apology. Erika Mann sends her apology. And Johan Helsingius.

Johan Helsingius: Here.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. From staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Ariel Liang, Caitlin Tubergen, Julie Bisland, Mike Brennan for technical support and myself, Terri Agnew. May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking for recording purpose and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise? With this I'll turn it back over to Heather Forrest. Please begin.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Terri. And welcome, everyone, to our February GNSO Council call. And thanks, Terri, for taking us through the roll call. Next item on our agenda is update to statements of interest. Would anyone have an update to an SOI that they would like to bring to everyone's attention? Syed, I see your hand up. Please, over to you.

Syed Shah: Yes, actually I provided it the last time before the last meeting but I just wanted to mention it again, that I have joined ITU as area representative for Southeast Asia (unintelligible) and I'll be based out of Jakarta Indonesia.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Syed, very much. Are there any queries for Syed or any further updates to SOIs? I see none so thank you very much, Syed, for your update. You can take your hand down now. And we can move onto Item 1.3 in our agenda which is review and any proposed amendments to the agenda. Does anyone have any concerns with the agenda or any business that they would like to add under any other business? Syed, please.

Syed Shah: Was a mistake, I was just trying to lower the hand rather than raise it.

Heather Forrest: Well done, Syed, no worries. All fine. So given that Syed's hand is the only one up and it's up by mistake, I'm going to assume that we can confirm our agenda and move ourselves onto Item 1.4 which is the status of minutes of our previous Council meetings. Again, many thanks to Rafik and Donna and staff for getting these out in a very timely fashion.

You'll see we have here noted that the minutes of the December meeting were posted on the 8th of January and the minutes of the meeting that we most recently had in Los Angeles at our strategic planning session, the 30th of January, were posted on the 16th. So that gets us up to date; we have no outstanding minutes, which is wonderful.

That brings us to Item 2, which is our review of the projects and action items list. And if we could start with the projects list I think that would be very

helpful. Thank you. Excellent, so this was as per the usual practice was circulated by the staff in both clean and redline version. As I often say I tend to like the redline version because it shows very concisely the changes that have been made.

You'll see here that we had a few items that were added to the projects list that had previously been sitting on the action items list; we referred to those specifically in our January meeting. The logic for that was that the action items list is really intended to be a space to capture, if you like, outstanding tasks for Council and Council leadership. And as soon as something moves into tasks that a working group that we have formed, whether that's an IRT or a PDP working group, or a standing committee, then that shifts itself over to the projects list. So we've made those changes.

Marika, I'll turn to you to fill in any gaps that I might have missed, anything of note that we want to point out from the projects list this time?

Marika Konings: Thanks, Heather. This is Marika. No, I think the main changes indeed as you noted is the reference to the Whois Procedure Implementation Advisory Group under initiation to just record that that is something that's under consideration by the GNSO Council during today's meeting. And we've also marked the implementation of the GAC GNSO Consultation Group on Early Engagement recommendations as completed, so that will basically drop from the next version as with the adoption of the revised GNSO Operating Procedures that basically marked the completion of the implementation of those recommendations.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Marika, that's helpful. And it's always good to see baskets of work completed, and of course we've gained quite a bit of useful outcome in terms of that GAC GNSO Consultation Group so I think that's a win all around. Are there any questions in relation to the projects list as it's updated here?

Seeing none, excellent. We can take this one down then please and put up the action items list. Now of course we cleared a number of action items in our January meeting. We had a few things that had been sitting on action items for a while that we had specifically slated for that time - considerable time we'd have face to face together in January so you'll notice that a number of things are identified here as complete. And many of those come from our previous meeting, our January meeting. So the first three items there you see marked as complete, Council comments to the Operating Standards for ICANN Specific Reviews, that was submitted in good time for the deadline.

The FY'19 ABRs, or Additional Budget Requests, were submitted by Marika, Steve, Rafik, Donna and I at the very end of our three-day strategic planning session, again in good time for the deadline as those were discussed in the course of the January meeting and specifically the Council meeting. And thirdly, the paper on suggested incremental changes to the ICANN meeting strategy, that was also submitted shortly after our time together in Los Angeles.

And I have a feeling I'm looking at a target date there, I suspect that entry date is the first one and target date it doesn't show when we've actually submitted it but it was done there at the end of January. And Marika is noting that that's correct. So excellent. Thank you. Well actually I think it was very early February, it was in those first few days of February.

The next item on our action items list is of course our friend, the drafting team on the charter related to next steps for the ICANN procedure of handling Whois conflicts with privacy laws. That is on our substantive agenda today having been deferred from our January meeting and we have a fair bit to discuss there in relation to the post that Pam Little made to the Council list so we need to follow up with that as a first point of order.

Next item on the list is SSR2 and there was an outstanding action item there, two of them in fact, one of sort of informal and one formal. The formal one

that you see here is of course dealt with in our substantive agenda for today. It's the review by the Standing Selection Committee of the remaining candidates and the selection of one of those to be put forward to replace James Gannon who unfortunately had to step down from the SSR2 Review Team.

And the informal action item, if you like, in relation to SSR2 was coming out of the January meeting I had agreed to update Council via the list on the actions of the SO/AC chairs and did that and you would have seen the documents that went out from myself and from Alan Greenberg on behalf of the SO/AC chairs.

So any question since this is the only reference to SSR2 in today's agenda I'll ask just very quickly if anyone has any questions about SSR2 or if those updates (unintelligible). I will say this, the SO/AC chairs are planning on meeting on the Friday prior to the start of ICANN 61 and I will certainly have an update for you in time for our weekend sessions and can also put them on the record in our March Council meeting as well. So I see no hands in relation to SSR2 so we'll carry on.

And Marika has noted for us the next action item, the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs data request, and Marika says, "Note the RPM item has moved down to a separate category as it's not a Council or a staff action item." And indeed we are shifting that.

What we're trying to do - Council leadership working with staff is come up with a sort of version 2.0 of action items because as we've already noted in reaction to things like the Standing Selection Committee and so on, there are things for Council to do, there are things for discrete groups within Council to do, there are things for leadership to do so this is a task that we've taken on as a small team to try and figure out how to make that sort of reporting cleaner, more transparent and easier to understand.

You'll notice here that the action item is for the PDP working group chairs to work with the Subsequent Procedures Working Group cochairs to provide a consolidated timeline. You'll remember we discussed the sort of information that we would find useful in that consolidated timeline when we met in January and indeed the two leadership teams of those two PDPs met earlier this week to begin to discuss and put forward, you know, an initial thought as to what that timeline might look like.

So we will be hearing from those folks in ICANN 61 with a bit more detail as to how they're thinking looks in relation to that timeline. So we're making progress there and I expect we'll have continued progress when we are on the ground in Puerto Rico.

ATRT 3, we have of course a number of outstanding items here. I will say that following the inquiries that I raised with the SO/AC chairs about ATRT 3, that kicked off a discussion amongst the other SOs and ACs, some actually thought they had had certain candidates selected and endorsed but that wasn't actually the case and others were really not sure where things were. So it's good.

Our own discussions with Council have prompted action within the other SOs and ACs and I think we'll be able to - I think we'll have a clearer picture on this after the SO/AC chairs meet on the Friday before San Juan starts officially and I think you'll see that there's movement in this sooner rather than later whereas, you know, previously it's - the past two months or so it's been a bit on the back burner or forgotten because of the precedence that SSR2 has taken. So I am pleased to report that that's no longer off of everyone's radar and I think we'll be able to make some progress there in the very near future.

We have next on our action items list the revised GNSO Operating Procedures and ICANN Bylaws and of course made very significant progress in that regard in our January meeting. We have tasked the proposed

amendments as a Council. What remains coming out of that activity it's - it is of course - if you like, an easy exercise administratively to amend our Operating Procedures - the GNSO Operating Procedures but a different matter entirely when we talk about updating the bylaws.

And our policy staff have coordinated with relevant Board staff to ensure that those proposed changes are put onto the upcoming Board agenda to be considered by the Board. So that is the process that occurs in relation to - in relation to bylaws changes, so that is underway. And I'm confident we can have an update on that soon after the Board meeting.

The final item on our, if you like, traditional action items list here, is PDP improvements. And these are two matters that we dealt with in our January meeting. The practice you might recall is that when something is about to come off of a - of the action items list it stays on for one more cycle just so everyone's aware that it's about to move. And so when we see this action items list again next time you will not see - you will not see that one anymore.

Here is our additional action items section at the very bottom of that, headed Other Council Related Action Items. As I said, we're trying to capture some of these other things that aren't exactly for Council or particular individuals within Council to do. And you can see here it's the RPM data request given that that has action that comes out of the PDP rather than Council.

Any questions about the action items list? I think we've made some great progress just already in the first month and a half of 2018 so I'm rather pleased to see where we are. Nope, I see no hands. Excellent. So we can take down the action items list, thank you very much.

And we can move into our substantive agenda. And we do not have a consent agenda in this meeting, it's been some time since we've had a content agenda, which takes us into our first vote. We have two voting items in today's agenda, Item 4 and Item 5.

Item 4 is the oft-discussed adoption of the charter related to next steps for the ICANN procedure of handling Whois conflicts with privacy law. This is a motion that was made by Donna Austin. Donna Austin is not with us in today's meeting, she has given her proxy to Keith. So, Keith, if I might ask you to begin by introducing the motion for us and once the motion is introduced we can commence our discussion. So over to you, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Heather. And hi, everybody. So I think we discussed this in quite some detail in our face to face meeting in Los Angeles at the end of January so I won't go into excruciating detail. But I think it's important just to note for everybody that you know, this motion essentially sets the scope for an implementation advisory group to look at the triggers that were previously adopted for the Whois procedure per conflicts with national law.

Heather, I know that there was a motion put forward, sorry, an amendment to the motion put forward by Pam on the email list. I did respond this morning, apologies for the lateness of that response regarding the possible deferral of the call for volunteers until after the May 25 GDPR date because as we discussed in Los Angeles, there's some concern among several groups that bandwidth and availability of volunteers is a concern as we see contracted parties and others really focused on the GDPR issue.

There's a lot of the people who would be engaged in the IAG are likely to be also involved in the RDS PDP Working Group and that there's just generally a concern about adding a new Whois issue to the list of many that exist in the face of the GDPR time crunch. And so I responded to the list saying that I would accept the proposed amendment deferring the call for volunteers to June 1 as a friendly amendment as proposed by Pam. And I think with that, why don't I pause and see if there are any, you know, any comments or thoughts or anything that people would like to, you know, to raise on this issue? But I did want to note that I would accept that as a friendly amendment. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Keith, it's Heather. Thanks very much. I think what we need to do just as a starting point to make sure that we satisfy the Operating Procedures is let's - if you could read the resolved clauses as they are initially proposed into the record for us and then we can work on the amendment. But I think before we, you know, technically speaking now that we're all honed up on the Operating Procedures before we can discuss the motion or indeed an amendment we need to read it into the record, so if you could do that for us, Keith, that would be great.

Keith Drazek: Absolutely, Heather. Thank you. And happy to do that. So I'll read the resolved clauses. Resolved, "Number 1, the GNSO Council adopts the proposed charter for the ICANN Procedure for Handling Whois Conflicts with Privacy Law Implementation Advisory Group," parens, "Whois procedure, IAG."

"Two, the GNSO Council appoints Keith Drazek as the GNSO Council liaison to the Implementation Advisory Group until such time the IAG has appointed a chair, the GNSO Council liaison will serve as the interim chair."

"Three, the GNSO Council requests staff to circulate the call for volunteers to the GNSO stakeholder holder groups," we have a typo there, "with the request for each stakeholder group to appoint up to three members to the IAG on or after June 1, 2018," so the brackets that we see on the screen in front of us are the proposed amendment as submitted by Pam, "as soon as possible."

And so we would need to remove "as soon as possible" if we accept the bracketed text, "on or after June 1, 2018." "Further, staff are requested to circulate through the normal communications channel a call to the wider ICANN community for volunteers for interested participants and observers to join the IAG."

"Four, and finally the GNSO Council thanks the drafting team for its efforts."

Heather, back to you.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Thanks, Keith. And I think what we can do - so, Keith, am I understanding you correctly that you consider the amendment proposed by Pam to be friendly?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Heather. Yes, I do on behalf of Donna, the maker of the motion. I will accept that as a friendly amendment. I do note that there is some concern that deferring the call for volunteers until after the GDPR enforcement date essentially and effectively removes the - any possible changes to the trigger that might come out of the IAG sort of not available as a pressure valve for, you know, dealing with the GDPR issue itself. But frankly I think at this point it was unlikely to be, you know, completed by that May 25 date anyway, so I think - I will accept this as a friendly amendment.

Heather Forrest: Excellent, Keith. And thanks. Then it falls on me under 3.3.3.2 of the Operating Procedures in relation to amending motions as the seconder to also provide my response on this. And I too consider it friendly. So that means then, Marika, what we can do is we can remove the language, amend the amendment on the screen or amend the motion on the screen and then, Keith, if you'd like to lead us through a discussion that would be wonderful.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Heather. So I will - let me just at this point open, you know, a call for comments. Would anybody like to weigh in? I think the issue has been discussed quite some length. I'd be happy to go through, you know, the whereas clauses if necessary. But let's just open it up for a conversation before we hopefully move to a vote and wrap this up. Paul, go right ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady for the record. I just would like to say then I'm still a bit puzzled by the deferral of the appointment of the volunteers or the call for the volunteers. When we took this up in the fall everybody was, you know,

very - everybody who wants to do this, I should say, it seemed to me were very - pressing us that time - this was time sensitive, we needed to do it. And, you know, we all acted quickly because it was time sensitive and we needed to do it. And now a deferral until May, it's just left me scratching my head.

I don't think it's, you know, it's going to affect the vote one way or the other but I just wanted to be on the record that I don't understand the hurry up and wait scenario here. I don't understand the difference between having this on a Council vote when it's timely as opposed to two or three months ahead of apparently when it's timely. But in any event, just wanted to say that I kind of don't get it. That's all. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks Paul. This is Keith Drazek for the record. You know, Paul, I tend to agree with you in the, you know, sort of the sense that there was urgency. I think, you know, as we discussed this late last year and in the fall I think there was some urgency recognized among, you know, many of us or several of us going into the January session. But frankly there were a number of councilors during our January face to face who raised concerns about the bandwidth issue, you know, about adding, as I noted, you know, adding yet another sort of Whois related track to the community's work especially when folks are now so neck-deep in focusing on the GDPR Whois compliance issue and the deadline of May 25.

And so I think you know, and I would welcome other councilors who raised some of these concerns, you know, during our face to face meeting to weigh in here. But I share your concern about the, you know, the fact that this, you know, ideally we would have had this wrapped up late last year and we could have already had the IAG you know, call for volunteers out and maybe that would have, you know, reduced some of the time crunch. But I recognize your concern and, you know, ideally the sooner we can get this going the better, but there are competing pressures, I think that we heard in our January session.

So Heather and then Pam. Go right ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Keith. I'll note just in following up on the comments that Paul has made, I think the IPC has expressed concern from the beginning about the timing of this and whether it was premature. So hence I think in principle delaying the start of this is in line with that thinking. But I can understand you know, Paul's concern. I think my concern in the January meeting in terms of tinkering with the motion and I think what lead us to defer the motion then was the risk of tinkering with the motion and then inserting some sort of random trigger date.

And I think we're in a better position now with after the May - end May implementation date. I think that gives us the certainty - what we were discussing in January was some sort of date between then and now, and it didn't seem to make sense to me. So I feel more comfortable with this amendment as it stands then I did in what we were suggesting in January.

So Keith, I'll just put on the - put a marker down. Marika has put a very helpful question into the chat for clarification. Is it the case that we're calling for volunteers right away and then not commencing the group or is it the case that we'll delay the call for volunteers? So that's a point of clarification we might want to pick up after Pam. So with that I'll turn it back to you, Keith. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Heather. That's very helpful. And I will turn to Pam in a moment and then we can address Marika's question, very helpful. Thanks. So, Pam, over to you.

Pam Little: Thank you, Keith. Hi. I think Marika actually understood my original intent which was to defer the call for volunteers on or after June 1 because we, as registrars, we really have a bandwidth issue. Most of our registrar colleagues are really preoccupied with the GDPR Whois compliance issues or on the RDS Working Group. We feel if we call for volunteers right now people - we

may not be able to find three representatives from our stakeholder group to focus to devote significant time and energy on this IAG group. So that was my original intent.

But if folks feel they cannot support such longer - could be a longer delay then we would consider supporting the first amended version. So my preference or original intent was to defer the call for volunteers on or after June 1. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you, Pam. So I guess the question then as raised by Marika and underscored by Pam is to say do we want to sort of kick off the call for volunteers early - relatively early, you know, say, you know, in the next week or so if the motion passes, and then extend the - that call for volunteers out until after May 25 or June 1? Or do we want to defer the actual call for volunteers going out until June 1? It seems that if we pass the motion it will be clear that this IAG will be formed and whether we issue a call for volunteers or not at least the message to the community is pretty clear that this group will be formed.

So it seems that we might as well, in my view, go ahead and issue the call for volunteers but not have the, you know, the deadline for that until, you know, any time before June 1. I guess that's sort of my initial thinking but I definitely would like to hear from others, you know, on that. So Tatiana, I see your hand, go ahead.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you very much. Tatiana Tropina is speaking for the record. While I personally will be fine with two options, but I think that there is also some kind of psychological component here. As Heather, for example, mentioned on the chat, people who applied for ATRT 3, including myself, for example, cannot predict their capacity so well in advance. And of course they have been patient, but sometimes circumstances change. And they change not only in a negative way but on the - also in a positive way.

For example, I, if you issue this call for volunteers right now I'm sure that I don't have capacity right now. But it might change at the end of May, beginning of June, you know. And I believe for many people who are dealing with the GDPR and Whois right now they're completely all very well, you know what I mean. And this is why I believe that deferring this call for volunteers might give us a better turnout, a better quality of applications because people might get less busy, people could predict their workload in terms of like GDPR, Whois and whatsoever.

But again, while I support the proposal from Pam to defer the call for volunteers, I will be fine with both options also because I was very much convinced by your argument that GDPR and compliance models will not solve Whois conflicts in every jurisdiction. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much, Tatiana. So if anybody else would like to weigh in on this feel free to raise your hand. I think we've had good points on both sides but I think what you've just described is pretty compelling. And I'm okay with, you know, sort of deferring the formal call as we discussed earlier, the formal call for volunteers until later. But I think sending, you know, approving the motion now sends the message and at least puts people on notice that this is coming and gets people thinking about it.

And so I'm okay supporting Pam's original proposed amendment that we defer the actual call for the reasons, Tatiana, that you've outlined and that Pam has outlined to June 1. Is anybody opposed to deferring the call - the formal call for volunteers until June 1 at this time? I see there's some support in the chat. Thank you, Rafik. Thank you, Darcy. Anybody else want to weigh in on this? Anybody opposed to deferring to June 1 for the formal call?

All right, I don't see any hands, Heather, and I don't see - and I see support or no objection in the chat from several folks. Heather, Carlos, Philippe, Susan, Syed, Rubens, so I think we're good to defer the formal call until June 1 and accept that amendment as friendly.

Are there any other comments or any other discussion on this topic before we move to a vote? And, Heather, I see your hand. Back to you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Keith, very much. So I think for good order as the seconder of the motion I also accept this - the call for volunteers on or after the 1st of June as friendly. Keith, that handles you and me, and what we now need to do is I'll take my hand down so we don't have any confusion. Is there anyone who objects to the motion - the amendment that has been made to the motion? I don't suspect so based on what we've seen in the chat but we'll - for good order we'll check.

I don't see any comments in the chat. And I don't see any hands, so that means that the motion before us would have the resolved clause 3, the GNSO Council requests staff to circulate the call for volunteers on or after June 1, 2018, to the GNSO stakeholder groups and so on. So that's the motion that we're voting on, and we can make a final call for comments, anyone have anything they wish to add or say before we call a vote on this motion? J

No, I see no hands, I see no comments in the chat. Then Terri, may I ask you to take us through a vote? I think based on the comments in the chat, Emily, sorry, Terri, before I kick that off, are we comfortable folks, with a voice vote or do we need to do a roll call vote? If there's anyone - Paul says voice vote. If there's anyone who objects to a voice vote could you please make that known now? Lots of call for voice in the chat. And I see no one putting up their hands to say no to voice. So, Terri, looks like we're good to go, could you take us through a voice vote please?

Terri Agnew: Certainly. Thank you. For the voice vote, would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say your name. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion please say "aye"?

(Group):   Aye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Keith Drazek, proxy for Donna Austin, please express your vote. Say "aye."

Keith Drazek: Aye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. With no abstentions, nor objections the motion passes. Back over to you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thank you very much, Terri. And you know, sincere thanks to Keith for taking this up in Donna's absence. Again, on the record, thank you to Donna for submitting the motion, she was the one that managed to get it in on time for document deadline in January. And indeed as Paul has pointed out in the chat, this was a significant effort that actually took place largely over the holidays at the end of the year in an effort to get this onto our agenda for January. There's a huge amount of effort that's gone into this. What I would say now is let's continue the momentum and the spirit that we have, that collaborative spirit that we had in January.

We know that this is a sticky item on our, you know, work plan, if you like, we know that this is something about which there are some pretty strong passions and beliefs and let's make sure that we get folks participating on this group. We don't want to have a repeat situation of not having all the relevant parties in the room and therefore we're having difficulty reaching consensus because we're not all in the room.

So with that, I think this is a fantastic achievement for us, a great way to start off 2018 and finally, hooray, gets this one off of our agenda for now so that's brilliant.

With that, could we move then to Item 5, which is our second voting item on today's agenda? It is the replacement candidate for the SSR2 Review Team. This motion was submitted by Susan Kawaguchi as Chair of our Standing Selection Committee. And it has been seconded by Rafik. Susan, may I turn it over to you to introduce the motion for us?

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you very much, Heather. Susan Kawaguchi for the record. I'll start by reading the resolve clause. "The GNSO Council nominates Rao Naveed bin Rais to replace James Gannon on the SSR2 Review Team."

"The GNSO Council instructs the GNSO Secretariat to communicate Resolved Number 1 to the staff supporting the SSR2 RT as soon as possible."

"The GNSO Council instructs the GNSO Secretariat to inform the selected applicant that he has been chosen and that the GNSO Council expects that the applicant will represents the views of the entire GNSO community in his work on the SSR2-RT and provide regular feedback as a group on the discussions taking place in the SSR2-RT as well as the positions being taken by the GNSO Review Team members."

"Four, the GNSO Council asks the GNSO Secretariat to send a response to the applicant who was not selected thanking him for his continued interest. The response should also encourage him to follow the SSR2-RT work and participate in public comments and community discussions."

"Five, if the Council is in a position to nominate an additional candidate for the SSR2-RT in the future, the Council will consider Scott McCormick as a first choice for this position follow the SSC's recommendation that he is also a strong and qualified candidate."

So the Standing Selection Committee spent time, again, reviewing these candidates and as you know, we, you know, reviewed all the candidates

previously when Emily Taylor resigned from the SSR2. And so we've - but we did our due diligence, spent time again reviewing these two candidates and also staff reached out to them and confirmed they were still interested in participating.

We also reached out to the cochairs of the SSR2 and provided a brief background on each of the candidates to them and asked if there was one that would, you know, have skills or expertise that was more important to the SSR2 Review Team. And we also compared them to the chart of skills, the Excel spreadsheet that the SSR2 recently completed on the - of their own members and felt like either candidate would fit in well. So we have decided on Rao and would like to move forward with the motion.

Any questions or concerns? Heather, please go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. Not at all a question or a concern but an element of positive feedback. I think the way that the resolved clause 5 in particular is worded is extremely constructive in a sense of it offers the SSC an opportunity to communicate a valuable piece of information, which is that you know, our other candidate was indeed eligible from the SSC's point of view, and that is super helpful in a sense of we know that SSR2 is still in a state of flux. And at the same time it communicates a positive message back to the individual himself.

So I think the motion is brilliantly worded, so wanted to put that into the record. Thanks, Susan. And thank you very much on behalf of all of us for the continued work on the Standing Selection Committee, it's proving to be a very useful committee and we appreciate your leadership of it, so thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well thank you, Heather. Susan Kawaguchi for the record. I must say that the spirit of working as a community together on a committee is very strong so we take the responsibilities very seriously but it's a really - and it's really a good committee to work on, I must say. Everybody (unintelligible) discussion,

we don't always agree but we always come to consensus at the end and so I appreciate all the (unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. I'll make a final call here on your behalf. Anyone with any comments, questions, concerns about this motion before we move to a vote? And I'm sorry, there's a bit of feedback on the phone on my end and hopefully it's not disrupting everyone else's - disrupting everyone else's audio as well. May I ask then, is there anyone who objects to a voice vote on this motion? Tatiana is typing so I'll wait for Tatiana to type just in case. No, Tatiana has quit typing. Now Stephanie is typing. Voice vote please. Excellent. All right, wonderful.

Terri, may I ask you to take us through a voice vote on this motion please?

Terri Agnew: Certainly. Happy to. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say your name. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion please say "aye"?

(Group): Aye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Keith Drazek, proxy for Donna Austin, please express your vote, say "aye."

Keith Drazek: Aye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. No abstention nor objection, the motion passes. Back over to you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thanks very much, Terri, for your help with that and very much again thank you to the Standing Selection Committee, Susan, if you can convey our thanks back to the committee as a whole that would be wonderful. I think this was a very good outcome.

I will update you as soon as I hear a reaction, if you like, or a response from the SO/AC chairs. I know they'll be very pleased that this has happened, they were hopeful that it might happen in our January meeting and we just - we weren't quite ready at that point. So I anticipate this will be very good news to the SO/AC chairs.

So with that, we can turn now to Item 6 which is an update on the updated charter for the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance, another item that's been on our agenda in some form or fashion in the past. And for this if I could turn over the floor to Rafik please. Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Heather. So this is by the I mean, the follow up on the motion that we voted on August asking Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance to make a proposal of a new vehicle to replace the working group. And so since then we had discussion in the working group in what can be the best alternative. And what we did in the beginning is to list different requirement and expectation based on what we get as input and feedback from the GNSO Council that the Cross Community Working Group format or framework is not suitable and also to emphasize more about accountability and reporting.

What we did in the beginning also is that we thought about maybe a different structure moving from the cross community working group while we wanted to keep that idea of having a cross community space, and we choose as a name for this new structure, Engagement Group. So I think in terms of semantic and also what the meaning behind is slightly different from what a cross community working group can embed as meaning.

And so after that selecting the name we try to use the previous revised charter and rework it based on the comment we got. The previous charter was somehow inspired by the cross community working group framework, but we had to strike and remove many provision there that were not, how to say,

were not any more appropriate for this new vehicle. And we tried to articulate more in term of reporting by highlighting that we should at least report at least three times per year in this before the ICANN meetings and also to have more updates, more regular updates.

And also we tried to streamline in term of membership and also that we removed all the paths - sorry - remove all the paths related to approval by the Board of any outcome. So we tried to simplify. We also elaborate more on the mission and the deliverable. I hope that it's more clear now. And we tried to work as much as possible in the reporting to make it more systematic to and to respond to the concerns from the GNSO Council.

So as you can see in the beginning that kind of preamble. It's not part of the charter itself but trying to explain how we tried to do the work so we put objective like the creation of the new vehicle, and then revising the charter. And we can see the list of specification and the requirement that we used as a guideline for us within the working group to make the amendments in the charter.

So you may find the similarities with like cross community working group charter but it's also following the other usual charter format. So it's more to making kind of revision to align it with what we are expecting. So we are thinking that having this cross community engagement group we are now moving from whatever a cross community working group may mean and to really to create this new structure that - to have this space for the community to discuss on any Internet governance issue related to ICANN.

So I'm happy to answer any question or clarification. So I know that I shared quite late the proposal, just a few days after the deadline, but I'm looking to hear from other if they had time to review the proposal and happy to respond to any question.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Rafik. It's Heather. What would you prefer, would you like to manage the queue or would you like me to manage it for you?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, I can manage the question, I mean, okay thanks. Keith, please go ahead.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you, Rafik. And thank you for all the work that you've put into this. I just wanted to just publicly say, you know, for this - for the Council and for everybody that I think this is a great progress and addresses a lot of the concerns that were initially raised about and sort of the parameters of a CCWG and what a CCWG as defined by the work of the community in coming up with, you know, those definitions, I think what you've done here is a great step and I look forward to reading in more detail and I think Marika has a question in the chat about, you know, possible reviews.

So I think there may still be some questions that need to be answered but I think this is very much a positive step in terms of addressing the concerns raised previously about the parameters of a CCWG. And I like the fact that we now have a CCEG, an engagement group. Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Keith. Okay, let's go to Michele and then I will try to respond to the question from Marika. Yes, Michele, please go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Rafik. Michele for the record. No just very briefly, I think this is moving in the right kind of direction so thanks for that. I'm not going to get bogged down in the entire mechanisms around, you know, various different structures and all that. One thing I think that coming out of what you're presenting here I think is of relevance to the rest of us is the idea of a consistent update mechanism so that you're able to, as you work, brief us. But that I think is kind of useful. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Michele. So I see, Keith, it's an old or a new hand?

Keith Drazek: Sorry, old hand.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. So trying - I see that Paul is in the queue but I will try to respond to Marika question. So, yes, Marika, that we have that - the review (unintelligible) on that part of the charter. And so I think the idea is that we will ask the, I mean, the chartering organization to extend the mandate but there is kind of, how to say, an absence of formal notification from the chartering organization so we will presume that the continuation of the involvement in the CCEG. So there is a review but we are providing that kind of mechanism to continue.

                   But it's not really seen as a standing committee, per se and we are keen to have the review regular basis so we can consider that it's - we still need that or not so. Yes, Paul, please go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady for the record. So my initial reaction, and it's been tempered by this conversation, is that forming yet another kind of ICANN creature seems a fairly complex, you know, way to fix a problem. But you know, I am listening to Keith and Michele and others who express support the idea so I will ponder it a bit more.

                   The only big concern to jump out at me that's under scope of activities, where it says, "Draft positions papers," I mean, I'm not sure how an engagement group would go about determining what the collective positions are of this chartering organizations and how that mechanism would work. And so I'm a little - I'm wondering if we mean something else there like a draft, you know, community updates on important issues or draft white papers on important issues, or I don't know what it is.

                   But draft position papers almost sounds like you're taking up consensus development and reaching a conclusion and of course this new vehicle doesn't sound like it's going to be built for that kind of thing. So just an initial thought. I'll obviously - I'll read this again and deeper and come back on of

any other big concerns but thank you for all the hard work into this. I do think it's much better than what we had and look forward to working out the details. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Paul. And that's a valid point regarding, I mean, how we can maybe develop position paper and so on. So we had also to think about, I mean, when we talk about consultation process that's outside ICANN if we are trying to submit anything. And we have to go back to the chartering organization to ask them. So we try to define that process in term how we can ask and to get the endorsement. But we have also to be realistic that getting chartering organization to approve submission in quickly - it can be not really - I mean, it won't be realistic.

So we have that provision but personally I'm not sure that we may use that often or in near future. So it's more really now to create that space and we can work on position paper if needed. But also there is kind of maybe a, you know, you will read in preamble about getting support because we don't have staffing and so if we are going on that path that may need more discussion. So in further working group we just put that provision but I don't think we are going to trigger it often or I mean, near or midterm so.

Okay, so I may miss a question in the Adobe Connect, but I don't see anyone in the queue so, yes, Heather, please go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Rafik. Just in terms of wrapping up on this one, could you just remind us - and I know it's envisioned at the start of the document that what the next steps are with this and specifically, you know, what will happen in Puerto Rico in relation to this. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thanks, Heather. So my understanding from the motion that we voted in August we had to submit the proposal by February and that was done. And so to have then the GNSO to discuss, but also if trying to recall the exact

wording that the GNSO will - in Puerto Rico meeting to prepare for joining as a chartering organization the new vehicle.

And if we are going to create this - set up this new vehicle the GNSO Council has to liaise with other chartering organization or other maybe they want to join. So I asked my cochairs to chair - to share the proposal with the ccNSO and the ALAC but so we will have - if we want to set up the new cross community engagement group to liaise with ALAC and ccNSO at least to - on common charter if they also - if they may ask for some revision or something similar so.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Rafik. It's Heather. I've just noted in the chat then that means we need to do two things. Rafik, we'll lean on you to ensure that this makes it in for the document deadline for the March meeting. And note for leadership an staff that when we meet in San Juan with the ccNSO and the GNSO - excuse me - and the GAC, this should be on our list of items of mutual interest for discussion. So two things that we need to follow up there.

Any further comments, questions, concerns for Rafik? We know now how we're moving this one forward. No? Excellent, so well have another opportunity to discuss this on…

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Yes, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: I'm sorry, just to confirm the action. So when we talk about getting this on the agenda, so do we mean to have it as a discussion item for the Council or are you suggesting that we put motion to vote on this? Because I think we still have - we will need to discuss anyway and the motion maybe should happen later if we get - we confirm that we have the same agreed charter between other chartering organization, so.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Rafik. It's Heather. I think having this on as a discussion item to start with is helpful in a sense of I think given the timing on this one coming to this meeting, we could use a bit more time to take this back to SGs and Cs and have some discussion there. So I think having it on a discussion item is a good idea, we can have that fruitful discussion face to face in San Juan. And then also gives us an opportunity to gauge the response from the other possible chartering organizations and work collaboratively with those folks to see then, you know, to the extent that there are any tweaks or amendments that need to happen before it comes to a motion.

So that would be my recommendation as long as that aligns with your expectations and the expectations of the group. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thanks for the clarification, Heather. That's fine for me.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thanks very much, Rafik. So that takes us to the end of this agenda item and with a note to all of us let's take this back to our respective constituencies and stakeholder groups and discuss this so that we can come to the March meeting prepared. And I will note that just based on the timing of how the meetings fall, we have document deadline for Puerto Rico not too far out and of course we'll all start to travel here not too long from now, so the time is a bit tight for getting this back to SGs and Cs, but let's do our best to do that so that we can have a more informed discussion when we get together in March. So that takes us to the end of this one.

And we can move now to our next agenda item which is Item 7, the update and discussion on the GNSO Standing Committee on Budget and Operations, what we refer to as the SCBO. That group is currently reviewing the draft FY'19 - or excuse me, is reviewing the FY'19 budget and is in the process of preparing to a particular timeline the Council's comments on the FY'19 budget.

Ayden, you are our chair of the SCBO and you might be the best person to give us some sense of the background in terms of coming to this draft and any particular points of let's say disagreement or contention that we might want to talk about as a group here. So with that, Ayden, over to you please. Thank you.

Ayden Férdeline: Thank you very much, Heather. It would be my pleasure to speak further about this. Hi, everyone. Ayden Férdeline for the record. So as was just mentioned, the standing committee was recently formed to coordinate and facilitate a dialogue to allow the Council to fully understand ICANN's strategic and operational planning and budgetary processes. And if I'm not mistaken, we now have six members of the Council, six community appointed subject matter experts and three observers who are now a part of the standing committee.

And as Heather just mentioned, the focus of our work over the past month has been in preparing a draft comment as it relates to the Council's remit in managing the GNSO's policy development processes on the proposed operating plan and budget for the coming fiscal year.

So what we've agreed as a standing committee was that we would mesh together some high level observations intended to complement but not to replace any input that would otherwise be provided on the budget by the individual GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies. And to that end, we have prepared a working draft of an initial comment that is in the Adobe Connect room at the moment.

And it might - you might have seen it arrive in your inboxes a few hours ago. It's still a work in progress. We welcome your feedback. The final date that we can submit a comment on the budget is March 8. The standing committee has (unintelligible) call Monday where we will continue to review and to revise our working draft hopefully based on feedback that you provided today, or in

advance of the call and then we'll try to get a new draft to you the same date, next Monday.

We will then, offer you a full working week of review and would ask that you please send us further input or suggested edits by close of business in your time zone by next Friday, March 2, because this would allow the standing committee sometime over the weekend to prepare a new draft and to work on our call the following Monday, March 5. Immediately after that we call we will send the next draft to the Council mailing list for approval.

What I would like to propose, provided you are comfortable with it and this is what we have discussed on the standing committee is that this comment would not be subject to a formal motion and vote by the Council but would instead be submitted on behalf of the Council in the absence of any objection from a member of the GNSO Council.

Now with that said, I think we should turn to the substance and look at just briefly at some of the points that are included in the comment. So I'm going to skip the first page, it is more just expressing our appreciation to the Finance Department for making material available sooner than they did last year and with much more granularity. We are very appreciative of that.

In terms of the substance, we have flagged the gross in personal costs and the spend on professional services is being unsustainable, combined these two items are now 73% of ICANN's budget. Like last year, we continue to question the value proposition of ICANN's global engagement activities. We encourage ICANN to undertake a fast track assessment of the benefit the various capability development programs like the Fellowship have delivered in terms of bringing active participants into the ICANN community.

We have raised questions around the costs associated with the ICANN Academy. And on the procedural front, we have raised questions around like CROP which was a core activity used by various parts of the GNSO, was

discontinued, sorry, discontinued in FY'19 without community consultation or prior notification. So we're not commenting on the merits of CROP, just the procedural issue as to why it disappeared.

We also flagged concerns that the reduction of the additional budgetary request envelope by 50% could have negative implications on the GNSO's policy work. We speak to a need to replenish the reserve fund, though we are silent on how this could or should be achieved. And we're essentially - the comment the Council submitted on the reserve fund I believe last November or December we're really just highlighting that again. We support reductions in ICANN's language services (band) and we say that the ICANN community should not be the first group to be affected by drastic cuts in the budget which is our perception as to what has happened. We say it is our view that budget cuts should happen at all levels.

We are also very cognizant of the need to have adequate policy staff support for ICANN meetings and in our day to day work because that is mission critical to the GNSO. So we're still debating about what the support is and it will be a topic on the agenda for our call this Monday.

So one of the messages on our mailing list today made the point that - paraphrasing a bit here - too often there's talk of the policy development process that the GNSO manages as being slow or inefficient and part of that - this subject matter expert said - part of that is because of deliberate and a thorough process, however, ICANN's financial planning processes also have the ability to ensure that it's not due to resource constraints. So we're thinking very carefully about this how we can input this and sew this into our input that we feed back as part of the budgetary process.

So I'm going to stop there. Again, we warmly welcome your comments, we stress that the document that you're seeing now is just a working draft and that we will be getting a new version to you next Monday. But if there are any questions, comments, concerns, I'd be happy to try to address them. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Ayden, it's Heather. I see you have Michele in the queue and it's probably easiest for you to run your own queue. I'm happy to do it if you'd like me to, just say, but otherwise over to you.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks for that. Thanks, Heather. Michele, if you'd like go ahead, please.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks Ayden. Michele for the record. No, just very, very briefly, I mean, I think the - as Ayden says, this is a draft and getting input from other councilors would be helpful to flesh that further. Ayden and working with Berry, I believe, has done a very good job capturing some of the feedback from those of us on this committee. I mean, our feedback has been quite robust. And what we have here is the output and so far. Thanks.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks very much, Michele. Rubens, go ahead please.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Ayden. I'd like to highlight some ups and downs of the - of this draft as it stands now. (Unintelligible) that was adopted in the paragraph mentioning CROP because it's only questioning the procedural part of the budget. So when ICANN moved it from the core budget to no where's budget without notice, that's a good point. So even though the draft did not (unintelligible) for or against CROP it's focusing on this issue. But that's - has not been the case in other parts of the document, for instance, the part that questions ICANN decision to reduce the additional budgetary (unintelligible).

I believe some stakeholder groups and constituencies would support ICANN's decision to reduce that. So that goes into the area where most - this should come from comments that's actually from stakeholder groups and constituencies and not from GNSO Council, in my opinion, it is correlated to a stakeholder group position as well.

One minor detail that I would like to comment, there is one point where we question ICANN reluctance to do (unintelligible) which is indeed bad that they

are not really to do that (unintelligible), but we need to recommend that (unintelligible) at some level of costs. So if you are proposing that they do (unintelligible) in that expense we should tell them what they could cut that would probably be the same amount of money. So we understand that they are targeting a budget level and that's cautious and safe for it to do budget, that should support.

So whatever we tell them, oh please incur that expense, we should also say where it should be cut from so that target budget is achieved. That's everything I could remember for now but (unintelligible).

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks very much, Rubens. I will take that feedback back to the standing committee and we will discuss that on our call this Monday. Thanks again. Next in the queue is Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Ayden. So one point is process and the other one is more substantive. In terms of a process point I'm just putting on everyone's sort of time check that our next item, Item 8, involves Brian Atchison from ICANN staff who is on the line and ready for us when we - when we are ready for him, we'd envisioned starting that agenda item about a minute ago, so we don't want to keep him waiting for too long.

Ayden, two substantive comments, one is on my personal action item list, so something that came out of the joint RPM and SubPro PDP call earlier this week is both of those groups raised concerns about - and I think they're valid - about the need to focusing Council's comment on core business. And core business of course for us, I mean, I see that there are references here to our empowered community responsibilities and so on. But core business for us remains the PDP work.

And I know that the leadership of the Subsequent Procedures PDP in particular has expressed concern about the fact that the budget doesn't really make any provision for the work of Subsequent Procedures and

implementation should that group finish in line with its timeline. I think in light of the activity that we undertook in January, we know we have quite a significant PDP workload and to the extent that our PDPs have concerns about support for policy development, what I suggested is, Ayden, that the leadership of the Subsequent Procedures PDP either reach out to you or vice versa so that the community can hear some of those concerns.

I know there was an email, so Cheryl's posted in the chat, there was an email on the list that came from Jeff Neuman but I understand that Cheryl shares Jeff's concerns. So I think that's an opportunity for the SCBO to reach out to those folks.

My final comment for you, Ayden, is I wonder as a strategy if there is a logic in putting the specific requests or comments before the general. I wouldn't like to think that anyone would - wouldn't read the document in full, I would like to think that when you take the time to submit a lengthy comment that the whole thing gets read, but I wonder if we ought to lead with our strongest point, our biggest concern. I understand the logic in putting the general comments first, but anyway I turn that over just for the group to think about. So thank you very much, Ayden.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks very much, Heather. I appreciate that. On the second point about the order of the document, I hear what you're saying and we'll take that feedback - I'll take that feedback back to the standing committee and who knows, perhaps in the next version of the draft we will have changed the order slightly. Happy to reach out to some of the PDPs to see what support they may need. Absolutely agree with you that we need to make sure that our comment is addressing the core business. So thank you, we'll take that feedback on board.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Thanks very much, Ayden. So with that we know that we have - we have a diminishing timeline to complete this effort. The SCBO has met quite frequently and we ought to also acknowledge here the very significant

amount of effort that's been put in by Berry Cobb in supporting that group so thank you to Berry.

Let's continue that work, Ayden, and you keep us apprised via the list of anything that we need to know and that would be very helpful. And Cheryl is noting the interest in following up with your group so that looks like that would be a productive avenue.

With that, may I turn our attention then please to Item 8, which is a discussion of the draft post implementation review framework. And Marika, may I ask you to give us an introduction here before turning over to Brian? Thank you.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you very much, Heather. And this is Marika for the record. The document that you see up on the screen is something that we also shared with you as part of your preparation for the strategic planning session so I'll just keep it very brief as I run through that. But basically the reason why we wanted to have this conversation with the Council is that as you know, and I think as you may have seen in the project list, there are a couple of reviews of GNSO policy recommendations that have been implemented that are coming up or planned for in the future. I think the most imminent of those is the IRTP, the inter registrar transfer policy.

And although there are some references in the consensus policy (administration) framework, with regards to reviews and how those should be supported, it lacks the details on how and when that should happen. So staff has been discussing, and this has been a very collaborative discussion between the policy team and our GDD colleagues as, you know, we do understand that reviews are likely going to be a kind of joint effort at least from a staff perspective. So we've been thinking about and looking into - apologies - whether it would be helpful or whether we could think through a kind of general framework that may help guide such reviews.

Again, the idea being there was a kind of framework or structure in place that would facilitate both from a staff perspective but also from a community perspective how reviews are expected or could be carried out. And again, you know, the reason why I think we're using a framework approach is that not every review may be the same, there may be different ways in which certain issues may need to be approached.

So currently at a very high level, and again, this is just the result of staff brainstorming and, you know, we really want to get your input on whether, you know, staff is thinking in the right direction or whether, you know, we're completely off track. So again this is really just the start of a conversation and a request for input in that regard.

So at this stage staff's thinking is, and this follows a little bit the model of for example what happened with the last review of the conflicts with local law procedure, where basically the review kicks off in the form of a staff produced post implementation policy status report which basically outlines what the original policy is set out to do, you know, how was it implemented, what kind of metrics were established either by the PDP working group or the IRT, you know, what data has been gathered or is it available, you know, what issues or complaints may ICANN have, you know, through its either the customer support office or the compliance office.

And basically put then out for public comment to say look, this is what staff has found, you know, we may even be able to make an assessment of saying, you know, there are some specific issues that seem to be linked to the implementation of the policy or the underlying policy recommendations. And basically request the broader community for input on that. You know, did we find the right information? Is there additional information available, for example, with contracted parties that may help inform further conversation.

And then basically we would kind of bundle that all up in a kind of final report and a report of public comments that we would then provide to the GNSO

Council to determine next steps. And again, probably - and we're currently working as well to see if we can put this in a kind of a flow chart because there's probably then different steps the GNSO Council could consider depending on the information and the assessment of the data that has been provided.

For example, if it is clear that the underlying policy is creating issues, you know, the one option you have is initiating policy development process or potentially expedited policy development process. If it's clear or there's a clear indication that the implementation may have issues or may create issues, creation of an implementation advisory group may be the path forward. And again, it's something that you just discussed as well in relation to the conflicts with local law procedure where such an IAG has been - will be chartered in the near future.

But there may be as well other paths for example there may be a need to gather further data to really fully understand what the issues are or maybe a combination of a number of these steps. Again, the idea would be that a framework would provide the different paths that could be considered.

So of course whatever comes then out of those subsequent steps would always flow back to the GNSO Council for review either in the form of policy recommendations or confirmation that changes to the implementation would not conflict with the underlying policy recommendations or a conclusion may also be we've looked at all the data, the policy is working as it is intended so is the implementation, so we're actually good to go for the next couple of years until next review is scheduled.

So again, that's at a high level what staff envisions as the stage - as the overall framework. You know, again, we look forward to hearing from you if that aligns with your expectations and as well, you know, the role of staff as the initiator or at least the initial gatherer of information and then basically turning that over to the GNSO Council for a determination on next steps or

whether there are other ways and this should be structured or could be structured.

There are a couple of specific questions that we included in the document that we provided to kind of initiate this conversation and get some input on some of the items where, you know, staff doesn't either have any specific views or really would need some guidance in order to build that into the framework. So one of the questions is, you know, when should the review process be initiated if it's not explicitly mandated in a PDP working group recommendations.

A couple of items that are on the project list resolve from specific recommendations that the PDP working group made or either the Council made with regards to when would be the opportune moment to review. But I think as you also are aware there are a number of consensus policies that have been implemented quite some time ago but have never been reviewed and neither have any specific trigger mechanism for review. So the question is should there be such a review? Should there be, you know, as the Council as the manager of the PDP, should there be a regular or periodic review of any policy that has been implemented?

You know, similarly, you know, what are the factors that should trigger a review? Is that just periodic regular? Should there be specific issues identified? Would it also be possible for someone else to trigger the review? You know, could the Board or another SO or AC similar to how they request an issue report request the GNSO to commence a review on and implemented GNSO policy?

Who should be accountable for the completion of the review? Again, the current model foresees everything coming back to the GNSO but presumably other groups may also have views or input they may want to provide. You know, what are the expected outcomes? Does a review generate recommendations or only information for the GNSO to consider? What

obligation, if any, does the GNSO have to act on the review report that is provided by staff? Can the GNSO as well, even if staff identifies significant issues to say well, you know, we don't want to do a review at this stage or does it trigger some kind of obligation for the GNSO to act?

What are options for enabling transparency and participation in the review process? And, you know, how can the review process support balance and independent assessment of a policy or what needs to be foreseen or built in there? So again, those are some of the questions we wanted to put on the table. As said, you know, staff is really interested to hearing the perspectives from the GNSO on this.

You know, we know that one of the reviews is imminent or pending so, you know, one thing that at least staff has discussed that if the overall framework worked from your perspective, you know, one possible approach could be to kind of test it for the upcoming IRTP review and then basically after that say okay, did that work as we thought it would, you know, what are some of the tweaks or changes we may need to make before we kind of formalize the framework and use it as a model for any other reviews that may be in the pipeline.

So I think I'll leave it at that. Brian, please feel free to chime in if I missed anything or misstated anything that we've worked on. And otherwise I'll hand it back to Heather. I see Heather, okay, Heather, I can just go to the queue as well. So I see Rafik and Michele have their hands up. So Rafik, please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Marika, for this briefing. I don't have answer to this question but I think you mentioned either we have a trigger for a review so it means there are some criteria leading that we start the review or having the periodic review so both of them they have pros and cons. I think for periodic review we are already seeing the issue in term of the workload because is not just to

talk about policy but for the community we have all the kind of review that going on and we are adding more and more.

But we still have to review if - what we are delivering as policy and then how they are implemented, they are effective or not. So to do that assessment just, I mean, the small question really for the policy staff, for most of the - say the policy recommendation from working group, do they set some target or metrics or something like that that we can use to trigger, I mean, the review if - or are they sometimes setting like timeline they think that it's - when we should starting that?

If not, should we in term when we do the, I mean, draft the charter should we provide such request that they add to staff? So I'm not - let's say I don't recall what we have exactly in term of guidelines and so on, but should we include more of that in term of guidance so the working group when they deliver they have that in mind, it's not just we put recommendation but thinking for afterwards for the implementation then when they are reviewed and assessing their effectiveness, so.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Rafik. And I can maybe try to answer that one. And this is Marika. For the most recent PDPs, and again I think those you see also track in the project list, you know, those did indicate a timeframe for review. You know, similarly the conflicts with local law procedure has within the procedure this yearly review. And, you know, I won't go into why that didn't happen in the first place and actually started only later.

But you're correct, some of the older policies do not have any such provision, although, for example, I think we've seen, you know, UDRP is one of the policies that's currently under review where that was actually triggered by the community recognizing or indicating that there may be a need to review the policy and see whether there was any need to enhance or change any of the provisions either on the policy or the implementation side.

But I think, you know, part of that equation is also this need for either the working group or the IRT to identify metrics, to be able to say, okay, this is what we're setting out to do with these policy recommendations, so we need to measure X, Y and Z to be able to assess after, you know, at Y amount of time whether or not we actually achieved what we set out to do. And if not, be able to identify why that didn't happen. So that's part of what the DMPM, the Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group set out to do and that should be basically part now of every PDP working group effort.

Again, I think it's something where, you know, the Council may need to review when they get the policy recommendations whether indeed that has been done and whether sufficient guidance has been provided.

It could also be indeed if the PDP working group doesn't feel it's in a position to give a timeframe but feels that may be more adequately done by an IRT it could, for example, also be a specific request to the IRT to kind of indicate when they've completed their work and they may also be in a very good position to identify what relevant metrics are that they would be tasked with, you know, providing that kind of what is the point at which stage or you actually kick off a review but beforehand of course you already want to identify which data should be tracked to be able to help inform that review. So I hope that answers your question.

Michele.

Heather Forrest: Marika, hang on. Sorry. Hang on. So I had suggested to Brian in the chat, I want to make sure that Brian has a chance to speak because we did invite him to the meeting and it would be a shame not then to give him the floor. Brian, anything you would like to add for us and then we'll turn to Michele?

Brian Atchison: Hello, can you hear me, Heather?

Heather Forrest: Yes, we can. Well done, Brian. Awesome. Fabulous. Thanks.

Brian Atchison: I got off mute so it's a good start to my day. No, Marika detailed things really well. I don't think there's anything to add other than it'd be great to get your answers to these questions. And just one small point, you'll note that these are - that the post implementation review is sort of vaguely detailed in the consensus policy implementation framework, which we saw two slides ago. And this is something we're going to work on as we build out this process we're going to work on building out that section of the consensus policy implementation framework as well of course for your review. So sort of two parallel work tracks going there. But other than that, nothing really substantive to add.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thank, Brian, very much. Michele, please, over to you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Heather. Michele for the record. I think this is - it's something - this entire thing about post implementation reviews I think is something that's very important. Unfortunately I haven't a lot of feedback from my stakeholder group on this, which again, as I say, is unfortunate. I think the things that are particular to me personally would be questions around, you know, the factors and who has the ability to trigger a review.

                    Because the way I look at this is, you know, a policy is designed usually to solve a problem, plug a gap, plug a hole, or whatever, you know, policies don't created just for the sake - for their sake. I mean they serve a purpose. And generally speaking, when we're looking at policies such as, you know, transfer policies, it's meant to - they're meant to kind of balance, protecting registrants, allowing for a free marketplace, and a whole bunch of other things.

                    Yet sometimes those policies end up kind of, you know, they're aimed to solve a problem, but once you actually implement them you discover that they cause more problems than they actually resolve. And I'm sure people can think of several in that. So I suppose the question is, I mean we - you

want to get to a situation -- and again, this is just my own view -- you want to get to a situation where you are able to start that process of a review when it is warranted.

So you want that barrier to be low enough that it is achievable but you don't want a situation either where we're in a constant - I've got kind of a picture in my head of one of the small animals, that little beagle going round and round, you know, where you're just constantly doing review after review after review. So I suppose the thing is, you know, this entire question about who should be able to request or trigger a review I think is something that we need to look at.

I mean it's something that - I think it makes sense that for example ICANN staff should be able to, you know, highlight that a particular policy just isn't working. It also makes sense if those of us who have to actually work with these policies should be able to raise that question. I would be wary of opening it up to kind of the public, not because the public shouldn't be able to provide input but it's a kind of be careful what you ask for.

So I think, you know, looking at the - I think part of it should be the reasons why the review is being asked for in the first place and that that is not just for the fun of it, which I'm not suggesting is the case, but I'd just be careful with that. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele, very much. Any additional comments on this before we move on. (Brian)'s typing in the chat. Nothing from you. Wonderful, (Brian). Thank you very much for your willingness to join us. I hope that the feedback that you've received initially here was helpful. What we'll do is we'll take this back to our respective stakeholder groups and constituencies and chat further about this and can channel questions or concerns back to you, (Brian). So very much appreciated. Marika, to you please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. If I could just ask the question whether the council is happy for staff to kind of continue its brainstorming and maybe as a next step

come back with a more detailed kind of process flow framework that would allow outline in more detail the different steps and then maybe as well specifically identify where, you know, there are currently gaps or open questions that we need input on, you know, to continue the conversation around this. Would that be helpful?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marika. I think that sounds like a good plan and then that gives us, you know, a vehicle let's say for feeding in any further comments. I'm mindful of the fact that I think it'd be useful for us to take this back and have discussions back and come back to you. So let's work on that plan of action I think, Marika, yes please.

All right, Marika, any final closing off concerns from you or did that - or did that handle - does that handle next steps for you?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, that's perfect. And of course, you know, if after this meeting anyone has any input on the questions or any of the other steps that we outline, you know, feel free to either reach out to me or (Brian) or on the council list. As I said, you know, we hope for our side to have this as an open and collaborative discussion so we can come up with a framework that meets everyone's expectations and also gives the council a concrete tool to work with in its role as the manager of the policy development process.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thanks, Marika. And again, thanks very much, (Brian), for your willingness to join us at an odd hour, and I'll make sure that this stays on our radar so that you get further input once we've had a chance to bring this back. So thanks very much everyone.

That moves us into our next agenda item, which is item nine, planning for ICANN 61. Of course we're in the very final stages of planning here. The final version of the schedule was only just circulated I think about a week ago. You can see that here in - or this is our GNSO schedule that you can see in the AC pod.

We have one significant point of note I would say from a leadership point of view is in order to continue the momentum of our discussions from January, the question that we raised particularly in day three about effectiveness and what this could look like in a PDP and so on, we came out of the January session with an action item to get PDP leadership teams and the broader GNSO community together to have that discussion with them in San Juan.

And so we're in the process of developing the agenda for our GNSO working session on Sunday -- that's Sunday the 11th of March I think it is -- to spend that day in a different way than we normally spend it. We tend to devote it to sort of 30-minute or hour-long blocks of updates from various PDPs and ICANN org staff. And I think what we're thinking about as a leadership team is devoting the entire morning 9 to 12 on a Sunday to that critical discussion, similar to what we have in L.A., but again, roping in the PDP leadership teams and SG and C leaders and the broader GNSO community.

So I wrote a post of drafting an invitation with input from Donna and Rafik to all of those folks to invite them on the Sunday morning to have that discussion. And then we'll have an opportunity in the afternoon for subsequent procedures and RPMs to get together to work further on that integrated timeline, consolidated timeline, and we've also got in mind an update from all of our efforts in relation to IGOs. That includes both curative rights and Red Cross.

So that is how our weekend agenda is shaping up. That's where we are in relation to that. The council agenda of course will be forthcoming after we've hit document deadline, although we have a few items that have come out of this meeting today that will logically end up on the March agenda. You see here in front of you, as I say, this is the GNSO schedule for the week.

Staff, Marika, Steve, Terri, Julie, any concerns that you need raised here in relation to the schedule that we need to discuss? I think everything's pretty

much locked in at this point but is there anything we need to point out to everyone? Multiple attendees are typing. Marika says, "No, not from her side." That's promising and that means from a policy side then we're in good shape. And Terri, from a secretariat side, says no. So that means we're in pretty good shape here.

I would say take this back to your SGs and Cs and we will continue to do our planning around the edges for the council-related stuff. I think one point in my mind that we pick up on the list is the informal council dinner that is scheduled. Refer back to your email on the list.

And I think we still need to firm up our team on making those arrangements, but I think that's underway. So. And I think there were some very good suggestions made around supporting local business and so on. So to the extent that we can do that and help contribute our part to restoring the local economy, I think that would be a great thing.

So are there any questions from anyone, comments, concerns, in relation to the ICANN 61 schedule? I don't see any, so that's excellent. It means we're in a pretty good position now about two weeks out before the meeting -- two and a half. So that's excellent then. Let's continue our discussion about council dinner on the list, and anything else that might pop up we can discuss that on the list as well.

So that brings us to item ten, which is our last major substantive item of discussion today. That is the discussion of council liaison. So what we had agreed in January was that we would come back to that document about the expectations of liaisons. We didn't have any suggested changes to the ccNSO liaison role. We said we really weren't in a position to make changes to the GAC liaison role because that is fixed as per the agreement with the GAC.

But we did have a number of recommended tweaks to the GNSO Council liaison to GNSO working groups. I do want to make a point here because a question was asked of me: Does this include the informal, if you like, liaison positions between PDPs? We have such large PDPs right now that we have some folks who serve as liaisons between, for example, RPMs and sub pro, as between those two PDPs. They're representatives, if you like.

And my response to that question was no, it does not include those sorts of liaisons. We might informally refer to those roles as liaisons but this is specifically obligations that a GNSO councilor would undertake in serving as the council liaison to PDP working groups. And I wonder, Marika, if for absolute clarity do we need to include in the subject line of this GNSO council to - council liaison to GNSO PDP working groups, because we have a separate document for IRTs. Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think we've actually left it on purpose to GNSO working groups because we have I think as well - I think we have a liaison for example to the GNSO review working group, and there may be other working groups that are not PDP working groups in which you may want to have a liaison in the future. So I think that at least from the staff side why it was kept general in the heading.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marika. That makes sense. Thank you very much. So you can also see Marika's noted in the chat there were some suggestions from Jeff Neuman that were circulated on the list and no objections were raised to those. And in fact I think it makes good sense when we're thinking about the communications role of the liaison.

We I think in January we spent a fair bit of time talking about communicating from the PDP back to council, but I think there's equally a role for the liaison to communicate from council to the PDP. So that really goes to the heart of some of the suggestions that Jeff Neuman has raised. You'll see that they, as

I understand it, they - Marika says this document here is on the screen, incorporates those changes. Not a formal vote or a motion here.

We're not required to exercise that sort of formality, but I think it's helpful to ask if anyone has any further, you know, edits or concerns or comments or questions about the document that you see. What we did, just by way of explanation, is coming out of the strategic planning session in January, staff has worked to collate the comments that were made and the discussions we had there and make sure that they found their way into this document. So that's a number of the edits that you're seeing here in addition to the ones that were posed by Jeff.

Does anyone have any concerns, comments, questions about this document? I don't see any and there weren't any raised on the list. I think we've done quite a good job of discussing these things when we were together in January. And Marika notes in the chat that the next step would be to post this on the GNSO Council procedures page so that when we call for liaisons, when that call is made we can specifically link this document and therefore the folks who would volunteer for that call would have a sense of what was expected of them. So. It seems to me that we're in a comfortable place in relation to this document.

What we might do - and we do have everyone on the call. So that's fine. I think we're in a good position then for that. So excellent. Marika, we can consider this one to be, if you like, informally adopted or endorsed that we're comfortable with these expectations. It doesn't mean we might not come back to them in the future but for now, as seen here, the update of - and I would put today's date in that updated date, which would do the UTC time, I think that would be helpful.

So that gives us that. Thank you very much, Marika, for your hard work on turning our January discussion into this document. And I think what we now need to do is, if we can pull up our list of liaisons, I will note as a point of

order that before Rubens left the meeting he confirmed his willingness to stay on as translation, transliteration IRT liaison. So Rubens is confirmed and that's the only place on the list where Rubens' name sits, so that one stays.

I think we discussed in Los Angeles the powerful suggestion that it would be better that I, given my role as council chair, probably step away from some of these things. And what I would like to propose is that I continue to serve as the liaison for the reconvened Red Cross working group on the basis of, as I said in January, council leadership at the time that that thing was reconvened and given it was really a board request that it be reconvened, we thought that it was important that leadership be represented there so that it emphasized really the commitment that council had to that reconvening PDP effort.

So I'm very happy to stay on there. I think it's a good thing to have a member of leadership on there. As to the others, I think that's debatable whether I'm the best candidate for them given my role as council chair. So. I suppose what we could do is go through these one by one, which opens up my next one, which is the RPM PDP liaison role. And Paul McGrady, am I right in remembering that in January you had expressed interest in filling my shoes in that role? Paul, please.

Paul McGrady: Yes. Paul McGrady for the record. I would like to be moved to the RPM PDP and removed from the Subsequent Procedures PDP. I think with Heather stepping away from it, I think it's a good fit for me and also I think we need to get some thought on the Subsequent Procedures PDP because it's a big one in terms of who should fill that role and the time commitment involved. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Paul, very much. So that is helpful to me in a sense that it fills a vacancy that I'm leaving. I agree, Paul, that you're right that, you know, based on the comments that you've made about the five different work tracks and then the convened entire PDP Sub Pro that the liaison role there is a bit of an interesting question.

I wonder do we have any thoughts on how we might go about dealing with Sub Pro? Does anyone - has anyone had a reflections since the strategic planning session on what we might do here? Tatiana, please?

Tatiana Tropina: Hi. Tatiana Tropina speaking for the record. I remember asking the question to Paul during the strategic session because what he was telling about the Sub Pro and how I imagined this, it's a monstrous task. I cannot even imagine how a person having a daily job and all other tasks at the council and working groups can ever, ever do this.

So I remember I asked Paul if it would be - if it would make sense to appoint one person for each track, and I think he was quite skeptical about this, but I also think that maybe it would make sense to appoint several liaisons so they can cover one or two tracks. Because I really - it's hard for me to imagine how one can cover all this. Thank you.

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

Paul McGrady: Yes, so we would - I think we should consult with the co-chairs of the PDP, but my initial thought would be to have one liaison for Work Track 5, which is big and complex and ongoing, and then another one for the other work tracks and the plenary, because the other work tracks, at least in theory, are supposed to be winding down relatively soon, and to split the workload that way. Just with all these work tracks, it's just an enormous amount of calls to be on, and so whoever takes, you know, takes on the role or whoever, you know, whatever the number is of people who take on the role, they just have to be aware of how many weekly calls there. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Paul. Tatiana, before I turn to you I wonder if we might lean on Cheryl here with a question. Cheryl, you know, we have made reference a number of times here to the plenary session. In your view, would it be possible for the liaison to capture all that he or she need simply by

attending the plenary and then it's not death by, you know, attending four bazillion work track calls? Cheryl, I'd appreciate your input on that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Heather. Cheryl for the record. And in the case of many PDP workgroup sense, it would be yes. In the case of the way we've carved up subsequent procedures, I fear that that would not be a confident yes. In fact it would be barely a maybe, the reason being, for example, whilst we have our five specific topic divided work tracks, we also have the overarching issues, and it's the overarching issues that are the predominant fodder of the complete full PDP meetings. So for, again, this particular PDP, I would exercise great caution in that approach.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Cheryl. I appreciate your input. And, Tatiana, I didn't mean to chase your hand away. I just wanted to get Cheryl's sense of that. Tatiana, would you like to - okay, very good. So I'm concerned here that I don't want to get us bogged down in Sub Pro. I think we probably want to come back to it in consultation with Jeff and Cheryl and the leaders of the work tracks. I'm concerned that we don't want to kill our liaison in the sense that this is a rather big job and we want to think about some strategic ways.

I'm just wondering if there are ways that, in combination of the plenary and then working closely with the leaders of the various work tracks, that the liaison could function adequately without having to attend all five work tracks and the plenary session. So let's come back to this one, put a star on that one, and see where we can go usually with that.

Stephanie, you're currently our liaison for RDS. Are you happy to continue in that role?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes I am. I apologize for being rather lazy in reporting but members of the group will admit that progress has been glacially slow. So. But I'll try to do a better job.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thanks very much, Stephanie. And I think we can all acknowledge that, you know, none of us really was aware of - well, as we saw in January, we didn't necessarily have the same ideas and expectations ourselves as to what our roles meant. And indeed, in my case, I wasn't even sure how many liaisons I was serving us. So absolutely no personal apology needed there.

Curative rights, Susan, you are our liaison for that PDP, which is reaching the end of its lifecycle? Are you happy to see that one through to the end?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, no problem on that at all.

Heather Forrest: Much appreciate, Susan. Thank you very much. CCWG IG of course that's changing shape now, Tatiana, so your job would change. I suppose if you are willing to continue in this one, it might be following then the next version of this work. Would you be willing to do that?

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you, Heather. Tatiana speaking for the record. And I - yes, I would be absolutely happy to serve as a liaison to CCWG IG, which will end its existence soon, and to the new vehicle, happily. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Tatiana, thank you. So we'll leave you as the liaison for now with the CCWG insofar as it exists and then in whatever form. We'll make a note of your willingness there. So very much appreciated. Just running over time, so we'll work through the rest of them as quickly as we can. Protection of IGO Names PDP, Keith, that one I think is very much at the end of its lifespan. Are you happy to see that one through to the end?

Keith Drazek: Yes, Heather. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Thank you, Keith. GNSO Review Working Group, Rafik, over to you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, happy to continue there.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Thank you, Rafik. Privacy Proxy, Darcy?

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Heather. Happy to continue on that one.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thank you very much. TNT we said Rubens will stay on with. Thick Whois IRT, Susan, we have you down for this one.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, since that one's on hold it's a very easy responsibility.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Makes sense. SCBO, the Standing Committee on Budget and Operating Plan, I'm happy to stay on. As I said, I was really keen to join that one as an observer in line with my responsibilities for the empowered community. I think it's an important thing that the council chair be informed in that regard. So I'm happy to stay on there. I think it actually aligns rather than conflicts with my role as council chair. So if everyone's happy for me to stay there, I will continue to do that.

Liaison to the ccNSO, Keith, are you happy to stay in that role?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Heather. I noted in chat just a second ago, or a minute ago, that I think I would actually like to stand down from this liaison role and give somebody, maybe one of our new councilors an opportunity to step up to it, noting that I volunteered to liaise with the new Whois Conflicts IAG. I think this is an opportunity for someone else to step up if they're interested. So I would actually like to stand down from the ccNSO liaison role.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thanks, Keith. And apologies. I'm just seeing your comment in the chat now. I think that makes good sense, and this is certainly an opportunity for I would suggest even these roles, to the extent that someone's considering a council leadership opportunity, it would be good training ground for something like that. And as Marika has noted, the ccNSO liaison has a slightly different description around it, and given the particular needs of the ccNSO and the way that it works.

Do we have any volunteers immediately for this liaison role? If not, we can take it offline, but I'd like for us to have that sorted before ICANN 61 just to make sure that that group doesn't feel that it's left alone.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Heather. This is Keith. Sorry to jump back in. I'm happy to continue doing it through this next ICANN meeting, you know, so there's no pressure there. We can take the time to, you know, find the right person and put out a call for volunteers. Happy to keep doing it through '61.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Keith. I think that would be helpful, just in terms of a continuity role. And actually that gives us a good vehicle in the face-to-face meeting with the ccNSO to advise them of a shift. So perhaps what we'll do is, Marika, let's do that as you suggest in the chat, let's re-circulate the description of the ccNSO role on the list and -- pardon me -- call for volunteers and see how we go with that.

And final is (Yulf) of course. You're committed to your role, we hope, as GNSO liaison to the GAC. And, (Yulf), for good measure, would you let us know that you're willing to continue in that role? (Yulf) is typing and he says sure, with a very enthusiastic exclamation point at the end. Excellent. Thank you.

I'm mindful of the fact that we are four minutes over time. That works us through our liaisons. To this list, Marika, could we please also add the new IAG and we'll make note of the fact that Keith has volunteered to serve as the liaison for that role. So that gives us a fulsome list.

With that, we'll turn to our last item and it's really a point for noting in light of the time. You hopefully would have seen that the GNSO Council strategic planning session report was circulated on the list. We've had some fabulous input and comments into that already received, and I appreciate that. You'll see here the edits are made in the margins.

I will say this as well, I had some really lovely feedback from Ben Fuller, who is the ccNSO liaison to the GNSO Council, who said, you know, there are some ideas here that the ccNSO could find very, very useful as well. So it looks like our work is informing some of the discussions that are happening in the broader community as well.

What I'd like to suggest, in light of the time, is let's continue to discuss this list - this document on the list. We have some time sensitivity in a sense that we want to use this document as the basis for our discussions with the PDP leadership and the broader community on the weekend session.

So what I might do is take a final call for comments. If we can have your comments by Monday, I think that would be very helpful because I'd like to give the PPD leadership teams and SG and C leaders and so a good two weeks to read it and certainly get it to them well before they step on to the plan for San Juan. So if we can make a note of that, let's take another five days or so. Let's get us to Monday. Last call for comments on this document, and that way we can circulate it to the community in good time for consideration for ICANN 61.

That takes us to the end of our agenda. We haven't added any other business. Are there any final comments, concerns, questions? Otherwise I will close the meeting and wish everyone well. No hands, no comments in the chat. So with that I'm - thank you very much to everyone. This concludes our meeting of the GNSO Council for February. Safe travels to everyone to San Juan. Look forward to seeing everyone in person. It'll be lovely to see you all again so soon after January. So there we go. Thank you very much and happy rest of the day or tomorrow to all of you. Thanks very much.

Keith Drazek: Thanks all.

Man: Good bye.

Woman: Thank you.

END