ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Council Meeting
Thursday, 24 August 2017

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: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-24aug17-en.mp3

Adobe Connect Recording: https://participate.icann.org/p62pic8ris3/

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Date: 24 August 2017
Coordinated Universal Time: 12:00 UTC:
http://tinyurl.com/y8tmfkkd
05:00 Los Angeles; 08:00 Washington; 13:00 London; 15:00 Istanbul; 22:00 Hobart

List of attendees:
NCA – Non Voting – Erika Mann (joined late)
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: James Bladel, Michele Neylon, Darcy Southwell
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Donna Austin, Keith Drazek, Rubens Kühl (joined – but had Keith Drazek as proxy should he not be able to attend entire meeting)
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Hsu Phen Valerie Tan
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Philip Corwin, Susan Kawaguchi (absent – apology sent, proxy to Phil Corwin), Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Tony Harris, Paul McGrady, Heather Forrest
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Martin Silva Valent, Stephanie Perrin, Stefania Milan, Tatiana Tropina (temporary alternate for NCSG Councilor Ed Morris), Marilia Maciel, Rafik Dammak
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Julf (Johan) Helsingius
GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison
Ben Fuller - ccNSO Observer
Carlos Raul Gutierrez– GNSO liaison to the GAC (joined first hour only)
Invited Guest:
Jeff Neuman – Co-Chair of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG
Bernard Turcotte – ICANN Staff
Cyrus Namazi - Vice President, DNS Industry Engagement, DNS & Industry Engagement, ICANN Staff
Eleeza Agopian - Manager, Operations and Policy Research, DNS & Industry Engagement, ICANN Staff
ICANN Staff
Markus Kummer – ICANN Board Member (apology sent)

David Olive -Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager,
ICANN Regional (Absent-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 - Senior Policy Manager, Policy Development Support
Amr Elsadr – Policy Manager
Berry Cobb – Policy consultant
Emily Barabas – Policy Analyst
Mike Brennan – Technical Support
Nathalie Peregrine - Manager, Operations Support - GNSO, Policy Development Support
Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator, Policy Development Support

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 24th of August, 2017. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it out now? Thank you.

James Bladel?

James Bladel: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rubens Kuhl.

Keith Drazek: Rubens has noted in the chat…

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: …that he is here. Yes, he noted in chat that he is attending, he's not on the bridge yet but he's dialing in.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for that, Keith. Rubens also has Keith as proxy should he not be able to attend the whole meeting. So Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Darcy Southwell.

Darcy Southwell: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Valerie Tan.

Valerie Tan: Hi, here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Phil Corwin.

Phil Corwin: Present and I'm holding Susan Kawaguchi's proxy.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for that, Phil, that's correct. Susan has sent her
                        apologies in and Phil Corwin is her proxy. Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rafik Dammak. Rafik, can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Stephanie Perrin.

Stephanie Perrin: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Stefania Milan.

Stefania Milan: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Here, Nathalie, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Tony Harris.

Tony Harris: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Tatiana Tropina.

Tatiana Tropina: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: And Tatiana is a temporary alternate for NCSG councilor (unintelligible). Welcome, Tatiana. Martin Silva Valent.

Martin Silva Valent: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Marilia Maciel.

Marilia Maciel: Present, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Julf Helsingius.

Julf Helsingius: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Here, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. And Carlos, I've notified that you'll be joining the first part of the Council meeting only. Ben Fuller.

Ben Fuller: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Erika Mann. I think we're currently trying to dial out to Erika and we'll let you know when she joins the audio bridge. Now from staff David Olive has sent his apology for today's call.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: We have Mary Wong, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Amr Elsadr, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Terri Agnew, we have Mike Brennan for technical support and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, James, over to you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie, and welcome everyone, to the GNSO Council call for 24th of August. As per our agenda, does anyone have any updates to their statements of interest or status as a councilor, please raise your hand in the Adobe room or break in on the audio bridge. Okay, seeing none we'll move on then to review our agenda.

As you note, Item 6 has been proposed to – there's been some chatter on the list to replace Item 6, the Council discussion on changing the name of the GNSO, that has been withdrawn and in its place there is a proposal to

elevate one of our previous items of additional business, which is the report from the chairs on our call with the leadership of the SubPro PDP regarding the Work Track 5 geo names work team. We'll cover that as Item 6 unless there are any objections from councilors to this change to our agenda? Please raise your hand if you have objections or questions regarding this proposal. Okay, we'll consider that agenda change adopted.

Finally noting that the status of the minutes for two previous meetings were posted on June 28, July 13 and August 3. I think those meetings are now…

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: …the link. Those meetings are now available at the links that are appearing on your screen. And as Rubens notes, we can now strike AOB 9.2, we'll remind us when we get to that.

Okay, let's then move onto review of our projects and action items list, if we could ask staff to please load the projects document. Okay thank you very much. The projects document is now loaded and you can see the status of the various GNSO work streams, including the item here that notes that Council deliberations for cross community working groups to develop the framework for use of country and territory names, that is Item Number 4 on today's agenda. We have two items that are still pending, a Board vote, which is of course the IGO INGO and the Geo Regions Review, and then we have several items still in implementation.

Any questions or comments or discussion on our open projects? Okay. Kind of a tame audience this morning but I'm sure that'll change here as we get going. So if we could ask then to load the action items list please?

Okay, thank you. Just to note that items that are green are complete and will not appear in next…

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: …action items. I'm sorry, was there someone trying to speak? Okay, items that are green are completed and will not appear on the next meeting's action items list. Items that are blue appear on our agenda for today and items that are yellow are pending or ongoing.

So approval of our representative to the empowered community is complete. We have adopted the fundamental bylaws changes as part of the empowered community. We have completed the pilot program for PDP leadership sponsored travel. We're discussing ICANN 60 schedule today. Although that may more appropriately be yellow rather than blue because I think that might go on for one more meeting yet.

We have our GNSO response to the GAC communiqué from Johannesburg; we can talk about that in the next item. The Standing Committee of the Budgets and Operations really is an idea at this point and something that we need to put some meat behind to get that kicked off. Charter for CCWG IG, as mentioned, is on our agenda. We have a Privacy Proxy implementation adoption of IRTP-C, that is pending. We're waiting some discussions to come out of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

The Red Cross reconvened PDP is underway. The IGO INGO PDP recommendations is ongoing. Hoping that – that was someone else and I'm not disconnected. Okay. And then the PDP improvements is also tagged here as ongoing.

So that is how our action item list stands and I think that we should probably just change ICANN 60 from…

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: …yellow but otherwise. Okay, thank you. Okay, let's then move onto agenda Item 1 – sorry, 2.2, which is a report of the results of the electronic vote on our response to the GAC communiqué. First off, I just want to note to everyone, thank you very much for those who worked on this response. I know it was coming at a difficult time between meetings and also we were trying to do so on our own calendar as such a way to not have to schedule a supplemental meeting, and so by holding this – by working offline and then holding this ballot electronically I think we were able to avoid burdening everyone's calendars with additional GNSO meetings.

So I think at this point we can – if it's necessary we can pull up the exact count but I think it is – we can ask staff to confirm that the electronic ballot was adopted I believe unanimously. And that communiqué response was transmitted to the Board in late July, early August. And I believe that was a component in the Board's discussion with the GAC to review the Johannesburg communiqué which occurred about a week ago.

And the latest update is that the chairs are working with staff to obtain a transcript or recording of that meeting. And I don't believe that that's available yet, but it is something that we are following up and we'll certainly distribute that to the Council and the GNSO community once that's available. That's the status of our communiqué – our response to the Johannesburg communiqué. Any discussions or questions on that? Okay, great.

Agenda Item 3 is our consent agenda, which is currently empty. So we'll move on.

Agenda Item 4 is our vote on the CCWG Internet Governance. This motion was deferred from our last meeting which means it is no longer eligible for a deferral today. We can discuss it, we can amend it. And I think there were some proposed amendments on the mailing list that have been – have since been adopted and incorporated into the motion.

Keith, as the originator of the motion, would you be willing to introduce this motion and read us the resolve clauses and then we'll begin discussion. Otherwise if you're…

Keith Drazek: Yes, thank you, James.

James Bladel: Okay, go ahead.

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks James. This is Keith Drazek. I'm happy to read the resolve clauses. Just to confirm, do you not want me to read the whereas clauses? They did not change since the last reading. I'm happy to do it if necessary but if we can skip to the resolve clauses in the interest of time that would be great as well.

James Bladel: Yes, Keith, I think since they're unchanged from last month and the motion was deferred, I don't think it's necessary to read them again. I think folks are fairly well familiar with that. I think it's more let's focus on the new language for the resolve clauses if you don't mind?

Keith Drazek: Yes, perfect. Thanks. Okay, so again, I'd like to thank everybody, before I read the resolve clauses, everybody for the input that you've provided; Rafik and Wolf-Ulrich in particular provided some substantive comments and recommendations via email and we had some conversations on the previous call and I was pleased to be able to accept you know, sort of this final batch of recommendations as friendly. And James as the seconder of the motion accepted them as friendly. So thanks to everybody for the good work in between our meetings.

So the resolve clauses are, Number 1, "The GNSO Council expresses its gratitude to the CCWG-IG for its work in ensuring that discussions on Internet governance take place within the ICANN context."

"Two. The GNSO Council emphasizes that it fully recognizes the importance of the continued involvement of the ICANN community in Internet governance-related activities that are appropriate to ICANN's mission."

"Three. The GNSO Council requests that members of the CCWG-IG and others interested parties come together to explore a framework or model that more fully addresses the concerns that have been expressed by the GNSO Council, and submit this framework or model to the GNSO Council for its consideration at the Council meeting mid-way between ICANN 60 and ICANN 61." And I have in parentheses here, "Insert date if we have one, January or February seem appropriate."

My recommendation is that we use the February GNSO Council date, which is the one immediately prior to the March ICANN 61 meeting. So I just want to pause here and ask if anybody feels strongly one way or the other whether it should be January or February?

James Bladel: Thanks, Keith. And noting that I think the Council calendar for 2018 is still TBD, so I don't think – I don't know that we have a lot of whole lot of information. January or February sounds appropriate to me.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, James. I'll continue then. "Four. To facilitate the work as requested under Resolved clause number 3, allowing for a reasonable time to coordinate with other SOs and ACs to develop a new structure, and to ensure there is no gap between the retirement of the CCWG-IG," there's a typo there, "and the establishment of its successor group, the GNSO Council shall withdraw as a Chartering Organization from the CCWG-IG effective at the conclusion of ICANN 61 in San Juan, expecting that a replacement structure will be ready for approval by the Council at that time."

"Five. The GNSO Council emphasizes that its planned withdrawal as a Chartering Organization from the CCWG-IG reflects solely the Council's conclusion that, based on the reports it has received from the CCWG-IG, a

CCWG is not an appropriate vehicle for the CCWG-IG's work, and the GNSO Council's decision on this narrow point is not intended to prevent any GNSO community members who have been participating in the CCWG-IG from continuing to participate in the group's activities should they decide to do so."

"Six.. The GNSO Council requests that the GNSO Secretariat communicate this decision to the CCWG-IG and the other Chartering Organizations."

And I think that's it. So, James, back to you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Yes.

James Bladel: Thank you, Keith. Excellent and thanks for pinning down the language on Resolve 3 regarding the midway meeting between ICANN 60 and 61. That's the motion language resulting from the acceptance of the friendly amendments. We can now table the motion for discussion if anyone would like to speak to this, has questions about some of the recent changes, or how this will play out over the next six to eight months. Waiting for that to clear. Okay, for those next six to eight months, now we'll open the queue for questions and particularly if those folks who were discussing this item on the mailing list have other thoughts, now is a good time to raise those as well.

First up is Heather. Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. Heather Forrest. Just to note the IPC is happy to support the motion, is keen to see the Internet governance framework that will develop out of this in a form other than cross community working groups. There was a fair bit of discussion within the constituency as to the timing and the logistics in terms of other chartering organizations having adequate time to consider the framework. You know, now that we've given our February date, I think

that's – from our perspective, from Council's perspective, that's perfectly appropriate.

We just need to consider whether other SOs and ACs will be able to act quickly enough to do whatever it is that they need to do with that framework accordingly. So wanted to put that comment in the record. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Heather. Noted. And next up is Rafik. Go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. Rafik speaking. Yes, first I want to thank Keith and also Wolf-Ulrich for that suggestion and the amendment in the motion so we can find a common ground and something (unintelligible). So joining the comment from Heather, I think is quite important to synchronize and coordinate with the SO and ACs maybe kind of forgot about that.

But if we can – I understand with the motion we need to communicate the decision to them but just if we can start at early stage because how – what is the best timeline to get the proposal reviewed and when they can approve. So it's also for us, I think in the working group so we can schedule our work and try to deliver as soon as possible.

James Bladel: Thank you, Rafik. Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, James. And thanks to Heather and to Rafik for highlighting the fact that coordination will absolutely be necessary among the chartering organizations. I just do want to note that during the face to face meeting of the CCWG-IG in Johannesburg, that there was actually some discussion – some detailed discussion about this challenge. So I think there is a recognition and I typed some of this in the chat but I just wanted to state it for the record that there's a recognition across all of the chartering organizations that this work is probably both necessary and imminent.

There is – even during the session in Johannesburg, and I'm sure it's available in the transcripts, there was a question posed to the room as to whether anybody in the room felt strongly or I think the word that was used was – is anybody in the room wedded to this work having to be done in a CCWG you know, in a CCWG structure? And around the room everybody sort of agreed that it was not necessary to be in a CCWG and that perhaps an alternate structure would be a better fit.

So – and in separate conversations with different representatives from ALAC and ccNSO, I've heard personally that I think they're moving in the same direction that we are, perhaps maybe not as quickly as we are, but that there's a recognition that that cross community work is still important and that it's important to find a structure where we can continue to engage across the various community silos or structures and just make sure that it can be done in a way that respects the formal structure of a CCWG. So I think the expectation is that that work should begin pretty quickly. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you, Keith. Cheryl, you're up next. Please, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, James. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And Keith just mentioned the ALAC so I thought I'd just make a clear statement to the Council here. And that is to say that at the meeting before Johannesburg, in fact, when we more recently looked at and continued our endorsement of activities on behalf of the ALAC for Internet governance work, the resolution that the ALAC passed was specifically noncommittal on the type of vehicle but committed to the process. So it's absolutely in keeping and happy to report that as a result of the GNSO Council's deliberations and resolvings, there will be no need for the ALAC to shift any of their current resolutions at all. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Cheryl, for that update. And the queue is clear. I just want to say thanks to Keith and Rafik and Heather for their contributions. I think to Keith's point, we are perhaps a little bit out in front of the rest of the community on

this, but not by much, given our conversations from going back to Johannesburg and Copenhagen. I think our commitment to the subject matter of Internet governance is unchanged and that was part of our initial conversations with the other communities, the ccNSO and the ALAC going back to Hyderabad this time last year.

So it sounds like this motion captures that timeline and captures that commitment as well. And then projects our path forward through ICANN 60 and ICANN 61. Okay, Stephanie, last word on this one and the we will – I'll move to close the queue. Go ahead, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just wondered if anyone had a concept of what particular structure we have in mind replacing this with?

James Bladel: Thanks, Stephanie. I think there has been some discussion on that but nothing has been pinned down. I think one of the potential options floated were models for work that's currently occurring in other parts of the community. But I'll let Keith respond. Go ahead, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, James. And thanks, Stephanie, for the question. I think in an email going back a few weeks, maybe even a little bit longer, I suggested that, you know, from my perspective, this could be as simple as changing the name of the group. And, you know, not necessarily having a whole lot of detailed or complex structure or, you know, obligations behind it, you know, of course there's the other end of the spectrum that, you know, where somebody might feel like we need to have, you know, whatever is going on this group whatever we call it, you know, sort of a clear line of responsibility and reporting and things like that.

So you know, I had suggested that perhaps just change the name to be a discussion group or an engagement group and problem solved because the name, CCWG, cross community working group, has a formal and very clear

definition in the ICANN space. That was the result of the CCWG on CCWGs, we could call it something else like a discussion group or an engagement group and it doesn't carry the same implications of being something as formal.

So I think that's a conversation that the group needs to have and that the Council you know, and the other chartering organizations need to have is, you know, how formal do we want this group to be and do we, in a sense, you know, tie its hands or limit its effectiveness by creating a lot of formal structure? And maybe it needs to be a little bit more freewheeling but fully transparent.

I think those are all important questions but I don't think anybody has the clear answer at this point. But I expect that, you know, the next seven or eight months should give us as a community the time to figure that out. Hope that's helpful. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Keith. Very helpful. And I note that there's some similar comments in the same vein in the chat that are reinforcing some of your comments. Next up is Rafik. Go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. This is Rafik speaking. My understanding is that we are asking the working group to make a proposal in new structure. So I see there are some ideas like discussion group and so on. But again I think we should not preempt any solution for now. We are tasking the working group and it will take in consideration the different requirement and also what was raised as a concern previously in the Council but in other space too, so for example, I think we will take in consideration what the comment from Heather about the communication loop and the accountability and so on.

So the group should work on that taking on consideration all those elements and try to propose a new structure that can be cross community and so on. Just maybe for information like we get a document previously from the GNSO

which is listing the different structure the GNSO created in previous year so we can start with that using the description and develop around that. So I think there are different options and my understanding from the motion that we are tasking the working group to have to do the homework and to maybe to make one or different proposal so we will see what will be the outcome from that work. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Rafik. And just to echo your last point there that this question of what the successor organization looks like is exactly what we're asking the CCWG to come up with in the next few months and probably not something that we're going to effectively solve during this call in the next four minutes. But it is something – it is good to note that is something that the GNSO Council is aware of and mindful of and to Heather's point is also looking for certain elements of communication reporting and accountability. So the idea of taking a look at other work streams as a model and socializing those with the other SOs and ACs to ensure that they have compatible working groups as well I think is probably a good starting place as Rafik mentioned.

So the queue is clear, I'd like to move then to – we transition Item Number 4 to a vote. If there are no objections, I'd like to proceed with a acclamation vote unless anyone is concerned, we can certainly do a roll call. Okay, no objection so Nathalie, if you don't mind if we could move to a vote on Item Number 4 by acclamation.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, James. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say your name now. 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.

Nathalie Peregrine: Again, Phil Corwin, proxy for Susan Kawaguchi, please express your vote and say "aye."

Phil Corwin: Aye for Susan.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. No abstention, no objections, the motion passes, James. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. And thank you, councilors and thanks to everyone who has worked on this topic over the last several meetings, and also for the work that's yet to come. I appreciate the commitment for everyone involved, including the – of course the CCWG-IG folks and those contributing members from other communities.

Okay, let's then move to Item Number 5. The Item Number 5 is a replacement – it's another motion, it's a replacement for the GNSO representative to the SSR2 review team. As many of you are aware, Emily Taylor, who was previously a GNSO member and I believe a cochair of that group, stepped aside recently and we've asked the SSC – the Standing Selection Committee to engage in finding a replacement with an emphasis first on I think looking at the alternate members that were identified during the initial creation of the slate of GNSO delegates to this review team.

And the good news is the SSC has taken this up and very quickly come back with a proposal for replacement and that's the motion that we have in front of us today. So if Julf is available and would like to present the motion I gladly turn this over to Julf and have him read through the – read the motion into the record. Julf, would you do the honors?

Julf Helsingius: Sure, I assume it's enough to – yes, it's enough to go through the resolved I guess?

James Bladel: Yes, and just for the record I will second this motion so that we can begin the discussion. I notice that we were absent a seconder.

Julf Helsingius: Excellent, thank you. Thank you, James. Okay, so the motions resolve part
so, "One, The GNSO Council nominates Norm Ritchie to replace Emily Taylor
on the SSR2-RT."

"Two. The GNSO Council instructs the GNSO Secretariat to communicate
resolved number 1 to the staff supporting the SSR2-RT as soon as possible."

"Three.. 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 represent 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 GNSO Review Team Members."

"Four. The GNSO Council asks the GNSO Secretariat to send a response to
those applicants who were not selected, thanking them for their continued
interest. The response should also encourage them to follow the SSR2-RT
work, and participate in Public Comments and community discussions."

There we go.

James Bladel: Thank you, Julf. And thank you, to the SSC, I know Susan is high up in the
Andes and probably not able to attend our call but thanks for everyone who
worked on this. I do have one question regarding the Resolved 4 and then
we'll open the queue for discussion. When we say that we are sending a
response to applicants who were not selected, do we mean the other
alternate members aside from Mr. Ritchie or are we talking about other folks,
for example, that may have expressed an interest in joining the SSR2 in the
interim? I'm not really clear who we're sending this response to. Julf, go
ahead.

Julf Helsingius: Yes, I mean, we did go back to the candidates who were not selected in the
first round and asked if they are still prepared to stand so they are kind of

knowing that they kind of were candidates so they are the ones we want to inform.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, Julf, for that clarification. And certainly we'll work with staff to make sure that that's clear and that goes out to those effected individuals. Okay, that's an open queue. Does anyone have any comments or questions regarding this motion? And just to reiterate, I did second the motion so we can correct that in the language above please?

Okay, the queue is clear. If there's no objections we can move to a vote by acclamation. Nathalie, would you do the honors?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say your name now. 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.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Phil Corwin, proxy for Susan Kawaguchi, please say "aye."

Phil Corwin: Yes, Susan votes aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Phil. No abstention, no objection to the motion, it passes. Thank you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. Thank you, councilors. Special thanks to the SSC and to Norm for continuing his interest and to expanding his commitment in this role. And we will communicate and work with him to get this change affected as quickly as possible. So thank you, everyone, for that.

Okay, moving then to the next item of business, which is a discussion of the report from the GNSO chairs on our conversation with the SubPro PDP

cochairs regarding Work Track 5. Certainly we'll defer to Heather and Donna to weigh in as they see fit. I'll try and kick off this topic here and I'm sure I'll – at this early hour I'll probably miss something.

But there was quite a bit of discussion on the list about the nature and structure of Work Track 5. And just as a refresher, Work Track 5 is begin created in the wake of the discussions – cross community discussions in Johannesburg as a means to tackle the issue of geo names in subsequent rounds of new gTLD applications.

And this is a mechanism by which an existing PDP that is exploring all of the issues associated with the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs and folding this issue of geo names under that umbrella of that PDP. The leaders of that PDP, Jeff Neuman and Avri Doria, have proposed this idea, this somewhat innovative idea of Work Track 5 which would be a sub team of the PDP but would in many respect resemble a cross community sub team, or some other animal that doesn't exactly exist in ICANN. But it would have leadership representation from other SOs and ACs, particularly the GAC, the ccNSO, ALAC, etcetera. And they are working to put out invitations to kick off that effort.

There's been some discussions on the list as to what the role for the GNSO Council is and, you know, and managing Work Track 5. And I think the conclusion is that, you know, that we have traditionally allowed PDPs to create and dissolve sub teams as they see fit to address their needs and purposes and this Work Track 5 would certainly be no different despite the fact that is taking on a broader topic and including membership from outside the GNSO, which is something that we've always encouraged.

So how will it – I think the two issues that were discussed on our list would be how would it, you know, arrive at decisions on this group? And how would those decisions roll up to the broader PDP? And would those decisions still be subject to consensus on the PDP? And then of course a Council vote

before they'd be submitted onto the Board. So that's generally I'll just kick off the topic there, the discussion of Work Track 5.

And to address these questions, myself, Donna, and Heather scheduled a call with the PDP cochairs to discuss some of these questions and to confirm their expectations for Work Track 5 and how it will operate, how it will arrive at decisions and additionally I think one of the other takeaways is that we want to ensure that the GNSO delegates to the ICANN Board are aware of Work Track 5 as well and make sure that they are up to speed on what this is and what it's doing and socializing that concept amongst the Board.

So that's kind of where we left it for now. And I would certainly defer to Heather or to Donna if they'd like to add any color or context to that. But otherwise I have a queue right now is just Paul. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, James. Paul McGrady for the record. So with this one, I don't think there's much concern that, you know, whatever the Work Track 5 comes up with wouldn't go through the normal consensus process or the main working group, that's how it's been set up, nor any concern that it would bypass the GNSO Council ultimately. I'm also not concerned that it looks more like a cross community working group sub team. I think in the ideal world, if we had all parts of the community participating within the GNSO consensus building process, that's what these would look like a lot.

And so and there certainly is no rule against anybody participating who wants to. And so neither of those are a concern that I have. The reason why I wanted to elevate this topic is just because I'm a little concerned about whether or not we're getting that participation at the leadership level. I was able – so with my hat on as the Council liaison to this particular (unintelligible) reached out to Avri and asked where we were with that.

Avri was kind enough to respond even though she's – even though she's really out of pocket right now. And she said that essentially that the ccNSO

has decided on Annebeth Lange and that ALAC has sent a message saying they're still working on it; they need more time. And I guess as of a few days ago, well I guess it was Sunday so it was more than a few days ago, that they hadn't heard yet from the GAC.

And so I'm wondering if we could you know, if there's anything that the Council could do to, you know, continue to reach out to the GAC to see if we can get them to let us know who their leadership person may be and to make sure that they're feeling you know, extremely welcome into this process. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. Yes, that was an important component of our discussion is buy-in and participation from all members of the community. It's good to note that we've had some updates. Your information is actually a little more current than mine. I think that we will continue to work with staff and work with the leadership of the PDP to ensure that the GAC is aware of this invitation and encouraged to participate.

I would note that the GNSO also – although this is a GNSO PDP, the GNSO also is encouraging some folks to volunteer to the PDP as cochairs to make sure that the GNSO is also one of the coleaders of Work Track 5. So yes, absolutely, the worst thing that we could do here is not achieve the desired buy-in or participation despite rolling out the red carpet for everyone in the community and encouraging them to join and certainly that is, you know, that's going to be a key ingredient to the success so thank you very much for highlighting that. But it sounds like we are – we're still in process with some of the other SOs and ACs.

Next up is Phil. Phil, go ahead.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you, James. Phil for the record. And this is a subject that I have aired with members of the Business Constituency and we engaged in some discussion on our last BC call last week. And I wanted to make sure I was not

on my own and had the backing of the BC on this question. And I do – before speaking, I just have one question perhaps Heather or Donna can answer is whether the conversation with the cochairs has yielded anymore light on what decision making process will be employed by this work team.

My understanding – and it may be incorrect – is that where it kind of was is that they were telling us, well, it can use – they weren't really defining what it would say but saying it can use any decision making process it wants because whatever it reports back to the full working group it will be – can be reviewed and altered under standard GNSO process. Is that still the state of play or is there any more clarity as to its – the work team's decisional process? I just had that question and I'll speak more fully to this issue.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Phil. And I'll respond quickly. I note Heather jumped in the queue so maybe she wants to address that as well. But, yes, we did discuss that and I think that that is your understanding is a fair assessment of the response that this work team would be given some fairly broad latitude, like all PDP sub teams to arrive at its own decision making. However, that once that rolled up into the broader PDP it would be subject to the consensus level – just wait for that to clear. The consensus levels that were defined in the PDP operating manual and those would then take over.

Heather, I saw your hand go up and then down so I apologize if I jumped on top of your response there but feel free to weigh in on this as well.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. Heather Forrest. Just to very quickly add, you know, for the point of emphasis, not so much add but emphasize, this is just like any other PDP working group. I think that the only thing that's a bit – that's a bit different here is that we're taking the opportunity to ensure that we have leadership from other SOs and ACs. You know, it's certainly the case that we have other PDP working groups right now that have you know, involvement from other SOs and ACs and have – we've got work tracks with leaders from other SOs and ACs and so that's – or other SOs. Sorry, Cheryl, you're ALAC.

So I don't see this as being any different. The job of those leaders will be to ensure that there's balance but this is going to be business as usual really. Thanks.

James Bladel: Great. Thanks, Heather. Yes, I think and just one final point before we continue on on the queue to Phil's question, one area of caution that we did flag for the GNSO – or for the PDP leadership was the potential scenario where this Work Track 5 were to arrive at a decision that did not achieve consensus support amongst the PDP you know, the PDP at large, meaning the point of (unintelligible) or whatever of the PDP so that for example we would, you know, extend all of these invitations, we would get broad participation, there would be some mechanism to make a decision and then that decision would fail either at the broader PDP or possibly even at the Council level.

And that, in a way, would backfire on this attempt to broaden participation on this topic. And so we made sure that the PDP cochairs were aware of that risk and that they were monitoring Work Track 5 and managing those expectations accordingly, so that was just one other point on that. But otherwise I think Heather nailed it.

So we have a queue developing here, Phil, I don't know if you had more to add or if that's…

Phil Corwin: Yes well actually I do. I wanted that question answered. This will take me a minute or so but I do want to address the substance because I do think this is important and I know that my constituency thinks this is an important issue.

The Council has a clear role here in that we chartered this working group, they derived their authority from Council. I know speaking for myself and my constituency we welcome the participation of other groups from outside the

GNSO in this process. We've been including at the leadership level. We've been striving for that for several years certainly in regard to the GAC.

But the one place I think we need to draw the line in a diplomatic way is to indicate that the – while the participation of these non-GNSO groups is welcome, that the imposition of a cross community type decision making process would not be acceptable. This work team is a sub team of the full working group, it derives its authority from the full working group. It operates within the rules of the GNSO.

To be honest, I know we've heard that the full working group will review its recommendations but we all know that if it achieves consensus, if it achieves a decision any modification of that by the full working group is likely to be quite modest just around the edges. But if we don't make clear that the – its decision making process must be one that's consistent with GNSO rules, frankly we make the situation more charged and make it more difficult for the working group to change its recommendations in any way because it introduces a non-substantive element – a political element where if they use a CC type decisional process which would be one vote per AC or SO, it opens up a situation where if any significant change is made at the full working group level those groups outside the GNSO and probably in particular the GAC, will charge – will see the GNSO process does not give full accord to the views of the entire ICANN community.

So I'm not suggesting we intervene now, or in a heavy-handed manner. We don't want to do anything that discourages participation from outside the GNSO in this work team. But I do think that at some point we need to not dictate a decisional process for this work team but simply reassert the view that whatever decision making mode it employs to reach final conclusions to report back for the full – to the full working group, must be consistent with GNSO rules. Thank you very much.

James Bladel: Thank you, Phil. And just to be clear, I don't think anything that you've just stated, either on your personal behalf or on the behalf of the BC is at odds with the message that we took to the PDP leaders and the message that we left them as far as setting expectation for full participation and decision making of this work team.

But I see Donna's in the queue and Rafik, if you don't mind, she was at that meeting so I'd like to go to her next. Donna, you want to respond?

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks, James. And thanks, Phil. So Phil, I think, you know, what you've outlined is important and I think it will be – once the co leaders for this group is identified I think it will be important, Phil, probably Jeff and Avri as the work – the working group leaders of the overall task to take the work track leadership through the process and how they expect it to work.

So, you know, maybe a little bit of a educational tutorial on this is the way that we do business and this is the way we expect this work track to work. And this is the steps in the process that it will go through. I think that will be really important, you know, before this work track kicks off so that everybody's on the same page and understand the expectation moving forward as to how this group will work.

So I think that will be an important piece of the, you know, bringing this team together. So and I'm pretty sure that Jeff and Avri already have that in the back of their minds anyway. But thanks for raising it, Phil.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you, Donna. Thank you, Phil. Good discussion here. And next up is Rafik. Go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. This is Rafik speaking. So maybe just to first to comment about the concerns from Phil. I don't think the cochairs of the working group are trying to replicate cross community working group more than in the work track. It's more about cross community participation. And so I think we can

just maybe remind about that the work, how to say, the work track of that sub team will follow the Working Group Guidelines in the matter of decision making. I think that's why I also ask in the mailing list if just we can outline those kind of – to remind about this and to give them guidance. I don't think we should have any prejudice on how the sub team will work.

And I really do think that I believe that Jeff and Avri will really follow the guidelines, I mean, based on their own – their experience in many working groups. And also I trust having Paul as liaison. He will monitor and probably report to us if there is anything of concern. So I mean, I understand here the concern that we are maybe there is the risk of precedent that we try to use the cross community model for whatever topics including for the PDP and so that can our ability as the GNSO to manage our own process. But still if we keep following the guidelines I don't see any risk for now, so just we can monitor and if there is anything alarming then we can intervene, so we should not be kind of preempt any way or methods for working.

And so on that, I think since we are trying to get the participation of the GAC and the ccNSO, and to be aligned and to consistent with our own response to the GAC communiqué, I encourage that the leadership of the GNSO to reach the GAC and ask them how to appoint someone to the Work Track 5. And also for our side, in the GNSO, to task the SSC to work on appointing someone from the GNSO as a co leader, so that we need to show a leadership from our side too and to support the cochairs work on that matter. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Rafik. I agree with your first intervention that we should trust the processes, trust the leadership and certainly trust our liaison to this group, Paul, to manage the work of this working group and to flag anything for Council that would require an intervention.

I disagree with your second part. As far as appointing the GNSO co leader to Work Track 5, the GNSO typically does not use its – either its old processes

or the new SSC to appoint PDP chairs or work team chairs or cochairs or vice chairs. And I don't know that in this particular situation that we would want to weigh in with, you know, in a heavyweight management style that we would continue to defer those types of organizational and structuring decisions to the PDP leadership.

I certainly would welcome further discussion on this if I'm alone on these thoughts. But I think that the PDP leaders have – the cochairs have a process to invite and select members or delegates or co leaders to Work Track 5, and I think that they should include the GNSO in that outreach effort and that we as a Council should allow them to do that as any other PDP would. But I'm certainly – if this is, you know, something that folks would like to…

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: I'm sorry, can I respond to that quickly?

James Bladel: Yes, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you, James. I think the cochairs already outreached to ask and that's why I talked about the SSC. I think they asked at and then because in their communication to the different SO and ACs to appoint someone so that was my understanding. I don't have really specific take in which who will appoint SSC or even the Council, but just was going to say that the GNSO may need to take the lead here and appoint first a co leader. But just I recall that we received a communication from the cochairs about appointing someone. So I don't think they were expecting to make the call themselves and so on.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Rafik. Well I think where we are now is that we're still in the process of building the leadership for Work Track 5. So what I'd like to do to start to wind down this topic is noting that a lot of the discussions that we've had here today and on the list on this topic were very similar to the

communications that we had with Jeff and Avri. I think that all of the concerns and expectations and aspirations for this – for participation in the Work Track 5 and its work are shared and understood across that group.

The cochairs have also reported to the GNSO members of the ICANN Board, and that's Becky, Markus and Matthew, made them aware of what we're doing and what this PDP is up to and hopefully allowing them to socialize that with their colleagues on the Board and make sure that everyone at the Board level is aware of this as well.

I think we're going to be relying fairly heavily on our liaison for this PDP, and that's Paul to table at future Council meetings any issues where perhaps the Work Team 5 is coloring a little too far outside the lines.

But otherwise I think we are - at this stage in the game and very early stage in the game we are treating it as a PDP under the PDP rules, and we are giving them some broad discretion to organize this work stream, Work Track 5.

So, you know, that's the state of the situation as it is today and I think that we're doing well, and I think we should commend Jeff and Avri for trying this novel approach and this reinforced effort to try and get cross-community participation on this topic.

So I'm sure we'll – we will see more of this in the weeks and months to come, but at this stage of the game I think that we all have a very clear understanding of the path forward.

So thanks for all who participated and I hope that you will continue to monitor this diligently. Thanks. Okay moving then to Agenda Item Number 7 we have a discussion, which is a review of the ICANN procedure for handling WHOIS conflicts with the local privacy law.

As you recall we adopted the last review of that which was a bit overdue. I believe we did that in Hyderabad and we had a nice couple of meetings where we didn't talk about this topic but it's back and bigger than ever.

So with that we'll turn it over to - I believe Cyrus is on the call from GDD, ICANN Global Domain, and we'll have Cyrus present a letter that was recently sent to me and Donna and Heather via Akram and it was posted to the Council list. So Cyrus if you're on the call please take it away.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you James. This is Cyrus. Greetings everybody from Los Angeles. I actually have Eleeza Agopian from my team with me here who is going to walk you through the details of the review and the letter that we drafted and sent to the Council leadership along with some proposed actions by the staff. Eleeza please.

Eleeza Agopian: Sure. Happy to help. Good morning everyone, good afternoon, good evening wherever you may be. I'm just going to briefly walk you through the letter.

Since you've obviously already read it I don't want to read it back to you, but in short I wanted to summarize our approach. When you asked for a review of this particular procedure we kicked it off by going back and revisiting some of the discussions that happened in the predecessor group, the Implementation Advisory Group that actually proposed the alternative triggers that was just incorporated into the revised procedure.

We looked at some of the discussions that happened there and felt that the best way to approach a review and assessment of the procedure itself was to see where the opinions were falling then, as well as solicit some more discussion from government representatives, from other contracted parties, registries, registrars and other interested parties to see what their take is and if they've attempted to use the procedure yet.

As I'm sure you all know no one has yet used the procedure as it stands nor had they used it in its previous form before we revised it with the alternative triggers, so we were kind of at a loss as to how to review something that hasn't actually been – that hasn't actually worked in function.

As a result we came up with that paper that we published back in – a few months ago. I think it was in April or May and we received quite a bit of response which was great both from government members, from GAC, from data protection authorities in various jurisdictions not just Europe, which I know is a, you know, a place where this has been of particular concern.

And we put together the staff report of public comments and a – subsequently sent you this letter that you see before you from Akram Atallah that outlined a couple of options that we see as a path forward.

As we noted in the letter we're not limited to these options. These just seem to be perhaps your best bet for tackling what I know many in this group have raised as a challenge of utilizing the procedure.

So just to briefly outline them we suggested pursuing an expedited PDP to get back to the underlying policy issue that resulted in this procedure in the first place.

But we do know that even under an expedited PDP that could take, you know, at least one year if not longer to complete and then of course to implement a procedure from there.

Then of course there's a standard PDP, which have – which would of course have a longer timeframe. And then finally we suggested the consideration that you consider adopting one or both of the other alternative triggers that were proposed by the predecessor group, the Implementation Advisory Group, one being the contracted party request trigger, which would obviously commence initiation of that registry or registrar indicating what the conflict is

with national laws, and including written support from their relevant data protection authority or whatever government agency is relevant as well as a legal opinion trigger where the trigger would actually come from a, you know, reputable law firm – an opinion from a reputable law firm.

So these are the actions that we outlined. We're – we are here to discuss those with you if you have questions. We are also open to any other ideas you might have so I'll just leave it there briefly so you can have your time to discuss. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Eleeza and Cyrus. And just to note that this letter was received I believe on the first week of August and circulated to the list shortly thereafter, so hopefully folks have had an opportunity to read it and digest it.

And I'm looking a little bit to staff here because I don't have the exact dates but the – part of our – a motion that was adopted previously on the IAG indicated that we would reconstitute or revisit this issue in the fall, and I thought that that was sometime in the September/October timeframe or possibly as late as the end of this year.

I don't know if this letter augments that request or could possibly be fodder for that work, or if it would kick off that work a little earlier or supplement it in some way.

I mean, I think that's one possibility and I'd certainly entertain a discussion from Council on the options that are outlined in this letter. If, you know, I think when this topic has come up in the past I think we have called it the agenda killer because we just – we get stuck in it and we just can't seem to get ourselves out.

So I would caution folks to focus on the process of what we do here as far as the outlined procedural options or how we fit it into our existing or planned work plans and not start litigating the subject of WHOIS and local privacy,

because it seems like that's the temptation that we have trouble resisting and it always takes us off the rails, so that would be my only bit of guidance on this.

And I see we have a queue from – starting with Michele so go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James. Michele for the record. I mean, I – this letter I think from Akram and his team is helpful because it does kind of concentrate and focus minds on a number of options, and also gives some of the downsides to the various options.

Any form of PDP is going to drag on for a year, two years, possibly longer and considering the amount of work that's already undergoing with respect to WHOIS and the upcoming introduction of GDPR plus other things that are – that we all know are going on, I don't think either of those two options is viable.

Speaking personally if there was a legal opinion trigger available then it would make it much, much easier for people to at least apply to use this particular policy.

As it stands even with the updated triggers it is the policy that exists that nobody can actually use, which renders it completely useless. By allowing for a contracted party to get a proper legal opinion from a recognized law firm then maybe that – maybe the request would be rejected but at least you could have a – you could actually test it and discuss whether the triggers – where it can be triggered or not.

As it stands with – even with the new triggers it's just completely unworkable. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes thanks Michele. It's – this is something that we've heard previously, which is this is a – potentially a useful tool if it could be made more

accessible. I would put a question – I'll put myself in the queue. Sorry. Paul go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady for the record. So I guess I had a couple of questions and I don't know if I should just ask them all at once or let staff respond. But, you know, from – my primary question really is is this action premature?

We have a alternative trigger that's only been in place for four months. I'm – I know Michele is of the opinion that it's unusable but I'm not sure that four months is the, you know, the ultimate window to test that theory.

And also I think when the conflicts – when the public comments were sought on this the new trigger was only a few days old. And so I'm just kind of wondering, you know, is this – is what this letter is suggesting – is it a little early?

Should we at least give the alternative trigger a chance to exist out there in the ecosystem for a bit? And so that's in general, you know, in general Question Number 1.

And then Question Number 2 – I – I'm not an expert on the IAG but I'm pretty sure that a couple of these other proposed processes that staff has put forward again here or the GDD specifically has put forward again here were the subject of hot debate in the IAG and they couldn't reach agreement on those.

And so I guess I'm trying to figure out are – and specifically I think they couldn't reach agreement because there was not agreement, and that they were consistent with the underlying policy itself.

And so I guess my second question in addition to is this premature is has staff, the GDD staff specifically, come to the conclusion that these two

additional proposed triggers are consistent with policy, and therefore even though the IAG couldn't reach agreement on them they're being reproposed by GDD staff? Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Paul. Two questions there and it sounds like your second one and possibly the first as well were directed towards – in the direction of Cyrus and Eleeza. Cyrus, Eleeza, would you like to take a shot at responding?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you James. This is Cyrus. I'll make an attempt in trying to respond to Paul's comments and questions. On the first one in terms of sort of the maturity of the new trigger mechanism and how long it's actually been in effect it's a valid point.

But I'm not sure if it follows from there that therefore we can't with enough confidence deduce that it's really a bar that is not expected to be able to get to, to be able to actually trigger the mechanism and provide a useful tool for the staff to relieve potential conflicts with local law.

It really does not change the equation from my perspective. We from the staff side need to have a mechanism enabled by the policymaking GNSO Council to be able to effectively take in issues that are brought to us in terms of conflicts with national law, be able to process them and hopefully be able to grant the right waiver to people who are in the danger of being in noncompliance.

So I don't think that this particular added trigger mechanism is going to reach to that level to provide the flexibility. I am much more - and this is just my personal opinion -- it's obviously up to the Council and its leadership to decide it -- that a legal opinion is much more – has much more utility for us.

We have actually that similar – a very similar tool for data retention that we have used in the past with our registrars and it has proven to be a very useful tool.

The second one I would defer to Eleeza who was actually running the IAG. My recollection is that yes it didn't reach consensus but it was sort of divided among the different participants of the IAG to be able to reach consensus on the other two mechanisms.

Eleeza do you have anything to add to that? That was a while ago, unfortunately about three years ago.

Eleeza Agopian: Hi. Thanks Cyrus. No I don't. You're correct. I was around for the IAG although not for the entirety of it. But from what I recall in the conversations and looking back kind of on our notes when we were putting our paper together, there was quite a bit of debate about those triggers and as we noted in the letter there wasn't consensus reached on all of these.

There was some support for them but clearly not consensus support, and that's why we included them in here for you to consider. On the other question regarding whether it's consistent with policy or not we didn't do an assessment of that.

You know, obviously we leave that up to the Council to decide whether it does meet the expectations of the underlying policy. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Cyrus and Eleeza. Very helpful and Eleeza I think you anticipated my next question, which was the distinction between something reaching consensus support on the IAG versus something being determined to be consistent with the underlying policy, and I think that is the question that did not reach consensus of whether or not it was consistent. Is that – did I get that right?

Eleeza Agopian: Oh I'm sorry. Could you say that again? There was a bit of noise in my ears today.

James Bladel: No problem. So the decision that did not make – reach consensus on the IAG was whether or not these alternative triggers were consistent with the underlying policy.

Eleeza Agopian: I think the debate was more whether or not the IAG wanted to support the triggers. I don't think the debate had to do with whether or not it was actually in keeping with the policy.

                  If I recall correctly they were – I'm not sure that the – they considered their compatibility with the policy before the proposals themselves were distinguished – were proposed.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. And I'm reading Marika's points in the chat and I may call on her in a second to elaborate. But it sounds as though – because the GNSO did vote, did consider and ultimately after several meetings we did adopt or determine that the proposal from the IAG was consistent with the underlying policy.

                  That was the language of our motion. But I guess these triggers were not included in that slate of proposals that we evaluated because they didn't reach consensus on the IAG. Is that – am I saying that correctly Marika?

Eleeza Agopian: That's correct. Exactly. They weren't put forward as a proposal because it wasn't something that the IAG was able to reach consensus on. You're correct.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay and so they've never really been subject to that test maybe.

Eleeza Agopian: Exactly.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay thank you. And I think Marika's hand just went down so I think okay I finally untangled it. Thank you and I'm sorry for maybe perhaps being the only person in the room that didn't get that.

Okay. I put myself in the queue mainly because I wanted to break my own guidance here and talk a little bit about the second to last paragraph. And I'm going to ask Eleeza and Cyrus to maybe shed a little bit of light on the interrelationship between this letter and the ongoing work that ICANN's doing relative to exploring some of the issues of GDPR.

And I'm just, you know, without opening that can of worms, which usually contains more cans with more worms, can you just clarify is this letter being prompted by that work?

Is it related to that work? Is it parallel and unrelated? Can you just kind of just characterize this letter and these options? Does ICANN see the policy - the WHOIS conflicts with privacy law policy as perhaps a mechanism that could be employed to address some of the issues associated with GDPR that they're uncovering, or am I just getting too far out ahead of this? I'm interested in the interrelation.

Cyrus Namazi: James this is Cyrus. I'll make an attempt in responding to your question. The short answer to your question is no and in fact there – this is part of the reason that we drafted the letter the way we drafted it.

We're not tying this really to the GDPR work, although as one could reasonably surmise there is probably going to be some interrelation between the ability of ICANN the organization being able to grant waivers and some of the new privacy laws that are going into effect in particular in the European Union region and probably in some other parts of the world.

But we wanted to specifically highlight it to the Council that we're not tying this - efforts to that particular exercise and project that is going on that most of you are aware of the details of it.

This is a very important tool that, you know, the policymaking engine has given to the ICANN staff. It needs to be – for it to be effective it needs to sort of be modified as you all know, and is hopefully highlighted in the letter and in the public comments that we have received and inputs from in particular our contracted parties.

Michele and others spoke about it. For it to be effective and for ICANN to be able to utilize it - to be able to work with our contracted parties to keep them from running afoul of local law it needs to be modified.

It needs to be taken a look at again by the Council and hopefully be able to be formed into a shape that is useful and effective, but the GDPR exercise is something that's ongoing in parallel.

There is a likelihood at that – at some point hopefully if the trigger mechanism is adopted to be actually more friendly and useful for lack of a better term, then perhaps it can also be utilized but I wouldn't actually tie the two works together. I hope that helps.

James Bladel: Thank you Cyrus. That answers my question exactly. They're related but not connected. Okay the queue is clear. I'm not sure how that happened especially given this topic.

Does anyone else have any specific questions on this topic or the letter from Akram while we have Cyrus and Eleeza on the call? I'm also trying to keep up with the chat here as we go. Michele go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James. Michele for the record. Just to understand because I – I'm never too good at the mechanics of how the – some of these things work, if we wanted to look at Option 3 there, which would be this – the legal opinion trigger and the contracted party request trigger, would we need to put forward a motion to put that there or how would that work exactly? Could somebody explain that to those of us who are a bit slow witted?

James Bladel: It's a good question Michele. I think what I would note is that we already have from a previously adopted motion that Mary's posted in the chat, which I believe goes back to February, that the IAG would review again because it was overdue the policy, the procedure and presumably the triggers.

We could - and I'm just saying conceptually we could refer this letter and these additional alternatives to that working group, which is scheduled to begin on October 1.

That is the – that is something that's already going to happen and all the, you know, already on our schedule. So we could certainly take this on board and refer it to that work, which of course presumes that that group will form on time and will garner sufficient participation and all the other challenges associated with it.

But assuming all of that works as planned then this could be a part of its charter or its mission. Marika has her hand up as well. Did I get that right Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I – James not exactly or not completely because I don't think necessarily another IAG is required. The procedure doesn't prescribe that a working group or community working group needs to be created.

It just talks about doing a review so at least - and I don't want to speak for Cyrus and Eleeza but – so I hope they correct me if I'm wrong. At least I think the staff's thinking was that indeed through public comments there would be, you know, views expressed which then would be turned back to the Council for the Council to decide how you would want to deal with this.

Is it indeed something you want to give to a group to look at again? You know, I do know that, you know, some of the options that were considered in

the public comments were already considered by a community group that didn't come to agreement.

Again I think - as I posted in the chat as well I think, you know, one option is as well similar to what you did with the previous consideration of the alternative trigger.

For the Council to consider these triggers and provide an indication of whether or – you – not you consider these consistent with the policy because at the end of the day, you know, if there is indeed the view that the issue is with the implementation of the policy the Council there has kind of an overseeing responsibility.

So it's not for the Council to say, you know, "This is how it should look like or this is how it should - looks like." We're looking to the Council to indicate, you know, whether or not there is an inconsistency with the underlying policy recommendation if Avenue A or Avenue B is taken.

And again, you know, the two – one trigger has been added. Two triggers/opinions were requested through the public comment. And I would encourage everyone to review the public comments report as well as the comments submitted, because there are quite a few groups that actually expressed their perspectives on indeed whether the trigger that has been added - whether they will be workable in practice as well as views on those alternative triggers that were considered but did not get a consensus necessarily of the IAG.

So again I think the discussion or question here for the Council is really what should be the next step? Is there indeed a need to form a separate group to look at this again and if so, you know, how would that be different from what has been done before?

Does this indeed provide new information that will help inform those deliberations, or is there another way or path in which this review should be conducted?

I said that I believe that the procedure itself doesn't specify how it should be done, so that's really open for discussion and also, you know, dependent on the timeline that you have in mind in reviewing or addressing issues that have been identified.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Marika. I do note I have a little bit of discomfort I guess with the idea that Council would make a determination of whether triggers that did not arise from an IAG would, you know, would be consistent with the policy.

It feels like those were tabled and not submitted by the previous IAG; that the only correct avenue for us to consider then would be to come from another IAG.

And I think some of what you said would be very appropriate for the first two options, the expedited PDP or a full PDP. Council can certainly – we can certainly make a motion to consider those at our next meeting and get those launched, and get a staff issues report going and get that ball rolling.

That's something that we could do at this level unilaterally, but noting the downsides that were outlined in the letter and then also that Michele was - I think his question specifically focused on Option 3, looking at the alternate triggers.

So it sounds like, you know, we do have kind of a blank piece of paper. We could create a new review group or refer it to a group that we know is coming shortly.

But I just – I – the only part I'm not comfortable with is for Council to kind of wade in on the question of whether or not those alternative triggers are consistent without, you know, commissioning a group to do that for us.

Noting we have a couple of more folks in the queue and then we'll probably cut it off for there because that one – this topic is going to be with us I think for a while yet. First up is Paul and then Stephanie. Paul?

Paul McGrady: Thanks James. Paul McGrady. Really quickly would just like to agree with James about the level of discomfort of the Council circumventing the IAG outcomes and circumventing the community on this.

I don't think that sounds right. I do recognize the public comments, which came in a few days after the alternative trigger was introduced, you know, exist.

And I am thankful to staff for their letter but at the same time I don't think bypassing the community on a topic this important is the way to go. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Paul. And just to note I don't know that Cyrus or Akram are recommending that. I think they're kind of weighing this out and saying, "Do this – with this what you will."

So it's really kind of up to us. I don't believe they were asking us to do an end around so…

((Crosstalk))

Paul McGrady: Yes I don't think they were either. I think that this suggestion has come from others in the chat and otherwise on the call. I don't think it was Cyrus. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay we next have Stephanie and then Cyrus. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record and anybody who's heard me on this topic realizes that as far as I'm concerned this whole WHOIS conflicts with law policy and procedure is in Monte Python terms a dead parrot, and to continue to spend time on it strikes me as a complete waste of time.

I've said that many times and I was on the IAG. I'm just wondering because I take two points that were raised in the chat. Number one, as Donna says the trigger's only one part of this difficult, obstreperous how can we maximally get in the way with compliance with law policies.

And I don't think that's sustainable or tenable with the GDPR facing us in May, so we have to fix more than just the trigger. Secondly, as Keith says we need something and we need it fast.

There is a legal opinion that has been obtained through the RDS Working Group. I believe that that legal opinion helps to make my point that this is a dead parrot. Perhaps if a PDP is going to be struck, it could instantly come up with an ICANN policy on some fine points of law because other countries are going to be following the GDPR lead. We have the GDPR in front of us, that's the eminent threat and very bad risk that ICANN has taken, but other countries will be doing the same thing.

They have the mechanisms to take entities to court and sue them for money right now, so, I just think it's time to do a massive rethink and come up with something rather quickly that allows an organization quickly to comply with the law, thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Stephanie, I think my concern is that none of these options that we've discussed include the word quickly and that's just my chief concern.

Last word on this is Cyrus and then we will move on to our next agenda item, Cyrus, go ahead.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, James, I just wanted to slightly from my own personal perspective and I suppose to some extent, from GDD perspective, I like the fact to all of you it's really stating the obvious, that we really have a practical issue at hand. Our hands in GDD are tied in being able to help support compliance with the local law because of what appears to be somewhat the ineffectiveness of this mechanism, so, just wanted to again raise that to your level and the counsel's level to consider as you discuss how best to approach this, that at the moment there appears to be an unworkable tool provided to us to be able to help support our contracted parties.

So, whatever you can do, and of course, this is completely at your disposal, is deciding which way to go forward considering that fact and I would underline that word, would be important hopefully in your deliberation, thank you very much by the way for the time today James, and the counsel.

James Bladel: Thank you Cyrus, thank you (Aliza), thanks to all counselors who contributed and Cyrus and (Aliza), please extend our thanks to (Ochram), note that we have received this letter, we are discussing it and it is receiving our wholesome attention, I don't know that we have – as you can tell from our conversation – we don't have a clear path forward as of yet, as of today on this call, but it is something that is certainly front of mind for the counsel and for our stakeholder groups.

So, let's close the discussion on this topic here, noting we have about 25 minutes left in our call. We have a few more items left on our agenda including item number 8, which is counsel planning for ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi which is coming up after the new think, good news on this is I believe – and really, kudos to GNSO's whole staff and all of the staff and secretariats around the community for working to finalize this ICANN 60 schedule so early so that we're not setting up for a repeat of what we experienced this time last

year going into Hyderabad where the things were still changing while we were getting on airplanes.

But generally, there is a community wide block schedule that is starting to take shape and then we have a block schedule for GNSO and GNSO specific events, counsel events as well as allocated times for PDP working groups, face to face meetings and IRT working groups as well as time allocated for SG&C meetings as well.

So, I don't know if there's someone from staff who would like to maybe walk us through the block schedule as it stands today, it's certainly something that we can circulate and I think I'm going to take on Natalie here for a minute, I think that we're getting very close to being able to sensitize our block schedule into the larger draft schedule which means that we could have something available for review as soon as next week, or shortly thereafter. So, that's the state of affairs right now currently with the block schedule for ICANN 60, I don't know if folks have questions or if a staff member wants to flush out that introduction. Chat, just following the chat, everyone is still talking about the previous topic, so.

Okay, I guess I'll take that silence to indicate that folks are pleased with how this is taking shape, that there's still some opportunity to weigh in on some of the tweaks, I will note that we've identified that there are some PDPs that have the potential to collide in some cross community discussion sessions, we've asked the leaders of those PDPs to be thoughtful about that as well as noting that Friday, almost the entire day is open for PDPs to schedule unconflicted blocks of time, however, Friday is the last day of a very long meeting and given the flight situation, getting to the European and North American regions, a lot of folks may not stick around for Friday, so attendance could take a pretty big hit, if a meeting is scheduled for that day.

But the schedule is fairly clear on that. We're going to go ahead and assume that Cyrus is an old hand, so we'll go then to Donna and Rafik, Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks James, Donna Austin, I was just going to note the same point that you did, so, from a planning perspective and this has certainly been a conversation we've had within the registry stakeholder group, because the ADM and the public forum is on Thursday, and nothing is looking like of any substance is going to be discussed on Friday, the registry stakeholder group is avoiding scheduling anything on the Friday, and from conversations we've had with staff on scheduling, we're trying to avoid that as well because I don't think it's optimal that we schedule a PDP working group on Friday, even though it would be terrific because it would be unconflicted with anything else.

It's going to be useless if nobody is available and if they were available they're probably going to be near anyway. So, and I think, you know, probably a conversation that we can have during the strategic planning in January, but, you know, the seven-day meeting is in my mind, a little bit of a fail because the AGM and the public forum is put on the Thursday, so, it really is a six-day meeting, I think, you know, we are people of tradition and the AGM and public forum has always signaled the end of the meeting, so, I think it's a little bit hard to get past that kind of tradition. And I think after six days we'll all be happy to get on a plane and go out as well, so, I think, you know, just to bear that in mind whether the, you know, there are some conversations about making tweaks to the meeting schedule, and that was part of the discussion that was held with (Yourin) and senior staff in the last few weeks.

So, there is starting to be discussion about whether we start to tweak the meeting schedule or whether we start to talk about some standard changes to it, so, the meeting strategy working group, I think concluded its work in 2014, we've run this process now I think for – I think this is the second year – so, there's a discussion about whether it's time to review the, you know, the

meeting strategy working group recommendations or whether it's, you know, we can look at just making some minor tweaks to the schedule, so, sorry, that was a little bit more than I wanted to go into, but, yes, it just came to mind. So, sorry James, thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Donna, no apologizes necessary, that was very useful particularly the bit about perhaps revising the format and I think given your experience, on the meeting strategy working group and also in implementing this, I think faithfully over the last couple of years, I think you are in a great position to note those concerns and propose those tweaks. Next up is Rafik, go ahead Rafik.

Rafik Danmack: Thanks, this is Rafik speaking, so, just two quick questions, first about the thought for the PDP working group, are they going to be over the whole week or just like we are trying to put them in the same Friday or something like that to give them three-hour sessions? And my second question is for the stakeholder group and meeting SDC request, how does the request be handled then, how any conflicts will be managed or handled?

James Bladel: Thank you Rafik, I'll defer to Natalie, but I think there are a couple of days, I think Monday and Thursday and potentially Friday, that are open, so, Natalie, go ahead.

Natalie Peregrine: Thank you James, this is Natalie, to your question on conflicts and how we're handling the SDC request, it's a collaboration on handling, well, considering all the secretariats of each of these and the registry and Terry from Genesis Support are all working together to minimize conflicts and to make sure that all measures are taken into account, so, the individual SGT request as well as the joint meetings and the meetings of the board. So, the aim is that we are working together and not having individual SGT requests filed that we can actually get a successful schedule the first time around and again, all be aware of what's involved in avoiding clashes.

James Bladel: Thank you Natalie, Rafik, does that address your question? Great, thanks, noting the chat, thank you Natalie. Okay, so, as Natalie noted in the chat that the, all the groups are looking to nail down some of the last open questions on the schedule, including when the PDPs individually will be having their face to face meeting, and all of that is targeted to be resolved early next week, but I'm going to be a little more maybe realistic and generous and say by the end of next week or shortly thereafter.

But I think the overall message is that the meeting is taking shape much sooner than the previous AGM last year, that we have a much clearer picture of what the schedule will look like and there is this paradox of the Friday schedule being completely unconflicted and also very lightly attended, which Donna noted might be fodder for a revision to the format itself.

So, thanks to everyone who contributed to that and special thanks in particular to staff and to Heather and Donna for their work on this since I missed the last call. Look for more updates then on the schedule for ICANN 60 and the final meeting coming up in the next few days, the final meeting schedule, sorry, posting in the next few days.

Okay, so, then that takes us to the end of our formal schedule, we do have a couple of items of AOB, including AOB 9.1, which is an update from the cross community working group on accountability workstream 2, and for that I believe we also have another guest presenter, which is Bernard, is Bernie on the call?

(Bernie):   (Bernie) is here, can you hear me?

James Bladel: We can hear you just fine (Bernie), so, (Bernie) is going to give us an update on the workstream 2 revised timeline and I think folks if you recall, we, the counsel as a chartering organization reauthorized the charter and budget for workstream 2 to continue its work beyond the original projected end date.

And so, (Bernie) will give us an update on what the new projected timeline and end date is, so, with that, go ahead and take it away (Bernie).

(Bernie):   Thank you sir, I'll make this quick, the slide you have on your screen right now is the workstream 2 revised timeline, you'll notice the first month on there is May and basically the cultures have been driving home since that May period, this slide, which basically says the first line is about groups that will only be producing one public comment. So, that takes them to mid-March to wrap up that public comment and the second line is about the plan to produce a final report.

You will remember that as we distributed information to the various chartering organizations, that our plan is to run public consultations on what is now the eight separate topics that workstream 2 is covering. And ask for any substantive comments to be made during those public comment periods, we will then assemble all the recommendations into a consolidated report and we will ask the chartering organizations and the public to comment, but to focus on any inter-dependencies or conflicts that have to be resolved given the fact that we're running eight independent groups that may make recommendations into one another's areas, one example of that is the transparency sub-group, which is recommending that the Ombus take on some new responsibilities with respect to the peak requests.

So, again, co-chairs who apologize, unfortunately we could not get one of the co-chairs to attend this for you, the co-chairs have been set since May with the schedule and there have been no amendments that have been made and people have been told if you are not ready to have a document approved for a second reading by the end of Abu Dhabi, that the plenary will consider simply saying there can be no recommendations for that sub-group because we will not be able to fit it in to the process to wrap up by the end of June, which is an objective that is near and dear to our co-chairs, some of whom have been at this for almost three years.

Next slide please, I guess I'll give it a try – oh, I have control, excellent – thank you, this is a listing of the topics and their progress as presented internally and to the co-chairs as of yesterday. And basically, good faith conduct, you'll remember is about identification of SO or AC participants that undertake to have a board member removed and could be sued and that is progressing very, very well. There were almost no negative comments from the public comment period, there were some concerns from the ASO about the language because the ASO is, as we all know, a slightly different SO.

We met with them at ICANN 59, I believe half the problem was explaining exactly what this was about, the other half was listening to them about how we could amend the language slightly, that language has been amended and is under approval by the sub-group working on this and should be sent to the ASO next week.

So, our expectation is by the time we hit Abu Dhabi, that one is going to be done and dusted as you will. Ombudsman is actually progressing a bit more than what we show here. Unfortunately, Ombudsman group seems to be the one that is inheriting requirements from a number of other groups to add functionalities to itself. Additionally, we inherited a requirement that we perform an external evaluation of the office of Ombudsman from previous reviews. And so, that took a bit of time to get done, that is now done, it has been received, will be part of the final package.

It will be a little tight, but currently we are in the process of writing the final report and expect to meet the deadlines for that. Staff accountability is working through some issues with the objective of completing its work by the deadline and the draft report is now out for internal comments within that group.

And ASO accountability, I believe you've all seen the comments that were made in the public comment, they are currently being integrated into an updated report, that work is almost finalized, it is currently expected that it will

be presented for a first reading of the final report at the September plenary meeting of the CCWG accountability workstream 2 and should easily meet its deadline.

Transparency has been a bit jammed up as we're waiting to have a meeting with ICANN legal, that is now scheduled and is supposed to happen in the next ten days and given the state of advancement of the initial report, overall it was okay, there were a few key areas that were of concern, especially to members of this SO, and those are being worked on. So, we're hoping that that one will resolve that limited number of issues so that we can get that finalized.

Jurisdiction, if you haven't been following it is, shall we say, a tough slog, amazingly enough peace broke out in the meeting yesterday and there was a general agreement across one draft recommendation. There are several other topic areas that are being considered, but as a minimum we will have at the peaks one recommendation to present. But everyone basically agrees there is no way we're going to be able to take on all the issues that have been brought forward.

Human rights is completing its review of the public comments and integration of the comments that were made and basically similarly to the SAOC accountability, expects to have its final report in for the September plenary and there is – given there are very few changes – there is no expectation this will go through a second public comment and similarly to good faith, will probably be accepted as a final report by the ASWG accountability in Abu Dhabi.

Diversity, we have Rafik here who's been working very hard on this and we're pleased to announce that the sub-group has agreed to a draft set of recommendations and those have been forwarded to the plenary for consideration on the 30th of August. So, actually they're doing fairly well, we've been working with the diversity group and I believe the set of

recommendations meet the requirements of various communities that are participating while still being reasonable for everyone to consider and implement.

That's my general report, I'll be glad to take any questions if there are any.

James Bladel: Thank you (Bernie), very grateful for your detailed and comprehensive update and I think, you know, that just looking at the chart, obviously, it's jurisdiction stands out as the problem child. But as you note, hoping to see some progress on that fairly soon. We have just couple of minutes remaining in our allocated time and one item to discuss, so, I will go to Keith next, Keith go ahead. Keith lowered his hand, but he did put a note in the chat regarding carryover bit of work from workstream 1, so, I think perhaps it was related to that.

(Bernie): The INT is progressing, we don't report on it because it's sort of a cousin to our work, it was just from a budgeting point of view to stick it under the workstream 2, but it is an independent effort and it's progressing slowly, the public comment ended in February, but the items that are being considered can have significant ramifications, so, it's moving slower than people expected I believe, but there is very deep care being brought to every modification that is being considered, thank you.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, (Bernie). Okay, let's go ahead and conclude this item of AOB and say thank you to Bernard and to staff for updating that and thanks to everyone who is participating on workstream 2, sounds like the work is progressing and reaching some critical deadlines. So, please follow that carefully and make sure that your SOs and AC, your SGCs are engaged.

I just wanted to raise – we have three minutes left – I just wanted to highlight a discussion that's occurring on the list and staff is reminding me correctly should have been included in our discussion of ICANN 60, which is that the proposed counsel development session that is targeted for January of 2018

is, those dates are coming the week before the non-contracted inter-sessional but are colliding with a new industry event that is gaining some stature called NomCom, which is occurring that same week.

Phil and some others have noted the potential conflicts, the options for moving things around are not good, the impact to attendance, you know, if you go one direction you lose the contracted party house and if you go another direction you lose non-contracted party house, so, it's just looking very, very rough and staff is telling me that if anything is going to change or move regarding the development event or the inter-sessional, it needs to happen like really, really quickly because they are starting to line up facilities, etcetera, so, my request and I see Michele's hand going up, but we're out of time, my request is, folks, please take a look at that item on the list, please weigh in whether or not you will be able to attend either of those sessions because we may actually circulate a doodle poll that just tries to get a head count on who would come if these things were noted or not.

Phil is the only one that's noted a conflict, I'll go ahead and put myself down as I'm not sure yet if I'm invited to the counsel development session, but if so, I would probably be conflicted as well and I would suggest that other folks please weigh in on that and that is something that really can't wait until our next meeting, we need to get that nailed down.

So, just wanted to make sure that was front and center for a number of folks because our window to making changes to that is closing fairly rapidly. Okay, with that we have one-minute left, Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James, just on this particular topic, at the moment on the list, Phil has said that he has a conflict, there's been a bit of muttering about other potential conflicts but we don't actually have any real data, so, I would suggest maybe that staff circulates a doodle so that we actually know who has a conflict and when, taking into account the dates and availability of space and staff and everything else.

At the moment, we don't know if there's a conflict impacting more than one person, if it's only one person, that's very different than if it's ten people, thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele, it's a good idea, we will circulate that, we will also need to circulate it to the counselors that we know will be joining in the next session by January, some of those feeds are still subject to elections, so, we don't know everyone to include in that doodle poll but it's something we can take away and we'll work on that fairly quickly.

I just want to point out, you know, we're all kind of road warriors here and just want to note that Los Angeles and Las Vegas are not, it's not a huge undertaking to get between one and the other, I just want to put that out on the table, it's not like we're talking about, you know, Tokyo and Paris or something like that, these are fairly inter-connected cities that are not too far apart. So, that may be an option that we can find some workable solution to squeeze the two events together.

So, please take note on that, weigh in on that thread on the list and we will work with staff to get a doodle poll circulated to everyone that we know might be included in that, including current counselors and potential future counselors. So, okay, so with that, we've reached the end of our agenda, we've reached the end of our AOB, we've concluded a couple of important votes so, I would say thank you to everyone for today's call, we are two minutes over, so, I appreciate your patience as usual.

With that we can, if there are no objections, we can adjourn for today and I would ask staff to stop the recording and we can wrap up. So, thank you all counselors and staff and our guest presenters for today's call.

END